

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE 21ST AFRICAN-AMERICAN
CONFERENCE

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, in early January I had the privilege of traveling to Cairo, Egypt for the African-American Institute's 21st African-American Conference.

Not every conference is worth such a long trip. This one was. Taking part were delegates from 29 African countries, the United Nations, business, church groups, and 28 Members of Congress. The former head of state of Nigeria chaired the important session on democratization in Africa. The South Africa panel had representatives from both the African National Congress and the National Party of South Africa.

For over two decades the African-American Institute has helped solidify the relationship of the United States and Africa. January's conference showed that it is continuing this important work.

Mr. Speaker, so others might see the range of issues covered during this conference, I insert the message to the conference from President Bush, and those of the institute's president, Vivian Derryck, in the RECORD:

PRESIDENT BUSH'S ADDRESS TO THE 21ST AFRICAN-AMERICAN INSTITUTE CONFERENCE IN CAIRO

(Cairo: The following address to the 21st African-American Institute Conference in Cairo was delivered, on behalf of President George Bush, by Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Herman J. Cohen.)

I am delighted to send my warmest greetings to everyone gathered in Cairo for the 21st African-American Institute Conference.

Momentous developments on the African Continent give us reason to believe that there is hope for peace and democracy in the regions. All parties must seize this opportunity to move ahead in a spirit of compromise and tolerance, flexibility and patience. Let me assure all of you that the United States government is actively engaged in efforts to support the positive changes currently underway in Africa.

In South Africa, we will continue to support the process of negotiation and the non-violent path to democracy. With regard to political and economic reform throughout the African Continent, the United States will continue programs designed to support transitions from state command-centered systems to decentralized, market-oriented systems. Finally, the United States stands ready to lend its good offices and support to the resolution of conflicts wherever our involvement is considered constructive.

As I said when Nelson Mandela visited the White House, the future belongs not to the dwindling ranks of the world's dictators but to democracy, to millions of friends of freedom around the world. I believe that we can strengthen the ties between the United

States and Africa and effectively consolidate democratic change and economic development throughout the continent. You have my best wishes for a productive and enjoyable conference.

OPENING STATEMENT BY VIVIAN LOWERY DERRYCK, PRESIDENT, THE AFRICAN-AMERICAN INSTITUTE

Your excellency, Dr. Boutros Boutros Ghali, excellencies, honorable ministers, distinguished members of parliaments and Members of Congress, conference participants, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the African-American Institute, welcome to the Twenty-First African-American Conference. Thank you for hosting us and a gracious welcome.

This particular meeting is convening at a historic time. We are meeting in Egypt, the crossroads of Africa and the Middle East, one week before watershed decisions.

You know, 1990 has changed our vocabulary. Threshold, watershed, sea-changes are words of momentous import that we now routinely use to describe daily events. But the operative word and the operative concept is change—to transform; to make radically different; to replace with another; to alter, vary, modify.

As we meet here in Cairo we are in a conference that deals with the management of sea-changes. We meet to determine balance between continuity and change.

Of course, we meet in a world which is greatly altered. It is a new world, without precedents and without guidelines. For 45 years we have been able to divide the world between East and West, North and South. No longer. Within the past year, we have seen the end of predictability.

Nelson Mandela has been released, the ANC is unbanned, and Oliver Tambo is back in South Africa after 30 years of exile. Namibia is independent.

Multipartyism, for better or worse, now is mandated in approximately 20 nations of Africa. At the historic Arusha Conference on Popular Participation, NGOs asserted their rights to be participants in government.

It was a year in which progress in economic and social development was impeded by regional conflicts and civil wars. From Liberia to Somalia, civil conflict ravaged nations, killing citizens, destroying economies and exacerbating ethnic conflicts.

It was a year in which many African peoples demonstrated incredible hospitality to their neighbors, as Guineans and Sierra Leoneans and Ivoirians welcomed Liberians, as Liberia became the country with the highest percentage of refugees and internally displaced persons in the world, with fully 50 percent of its citizens living outside of their homes.

1990 was a year in which hopes were raised and dashed for settlements in Angola and Mozambique, Senegal and Mauritania. It was a year which underscored the importance of regional organizations, testing their mettle in situations as varied as reacting to civil strife in Liberia, to initiating plans to prepare to deal economically with a united Europe of 1992.

It was a year of the Children's Summit when our attention was riveted to the fact that worldwide 40,000 children die every day from preventable illnesses. The majority of them would have lived and grown up in Africa, the continent which has the highest average under-five mortality rate in the world.

It was a year in which interdependence was brought into stark focus by the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait.

It was a year in which ordinary people seized their own futures. From Czechoslovakia to Benin, average citizens demanded that they have a voice in how they were governed.

In this world of unprecedented change, how could AAI and its co-host, the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt under the auspices of President Mohamed Hosni Mubarak and the Institute of Diplomatic Studies, plan a conference. The challenge before us was to capture the momentum between change and continuity, to discover strategies that have worked and to share them.

AAI has been holding these dialogues since 1968. Three key questions continue to run through our discussions. First, how can African nations develop and sustain workable political systems that integrate diverse groups? Second, how can African nations develop viable economic systems that efficiently use available resources. Third, how can friends in the international arena—in this case, Americans—help.

Three questions that we could have asked in 1971, 1983 and again this year. The same questions, but the context has been radically altered.

In planning the meeting, AAI worked with our Egyptian cohorts to craft an agenda that would address two overall questions: What do the global trends mean for Africa? How does Africa find the right mix between change and continuity?

The conference organizers and the Directing Committee of senior African and American decision-makers worked to identify major issues of importance to Africa and to African-U.S. relations. Four themes were identified as the core agenda for this conference.

The first theme is expanded pluralism. The people have spoken, asserting their rights to be included in governance, in decisions that effect their lives. In that changed political landscape, what are the roles of traditional institutions: the army, the church, universities, the legislature, the media and the judiciary?

Are the trends to multiparty pluralism likely to be integrated solidly into the political fabric of the continent or is multipartyism a fad? Does multipartyism necessarily lead to democracy?

How do leaders find the right mix between the security of continuity and the acknowledged need for change?

The second theme is economic reinvigoration. Lost in the pre-occupation with the Persian Gulf, Eastern Europe, Japanese economic indicators and the decline of the USSR is the fact that economic problems continue to plague a majority of African nations. According to some colleagues, the most common saying in Nigeria is "SAP

* 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.

(Structural Adjustment Program), is sapping me." African regional organizations are meeting to begin structuring an African economic community. In this conference we can examine those national and international actions that we can begin to spark to ignite growth in Africa in the 1990s.

The third theme is restoring social and human resources development growth indicators. There is a tension between the pessimism felt worldwide over the lost decade in development terms of the 1980s and the optimism of African people. Almost all of the human development indicators for Africa are down for the eighties—from school enrollments, to caloric intake, to infant mortality. On the other hand, there are some trends to celebrate. For instance, crude birth rates are down in Kenya, Botswana and Zimbabwe and universal primary education has been realized in Nigeria.

In addition, there are some new issues in this third theme of rebuilding sectoral development. In addition to the human/social development needs, the issues of agriculture and the environment loom large. The environment, for instance, is a longterm, simmering problem as Africa loses a species of tree every day, 40 percent of topsoil has been eroded in some areas and land limits have been reached in many countries throughout the continent. Traditional practice—continuity—versus change. The question is how can such a longterm, invisible problem claim attention with the pressing problems that many leaders face of feeding and sheltering citizens.

The fourth trend or issue that we must examine is the growing fear that Africa will be further marginalized. The global community still thinks of Africa as the continent of famine and war. As many industrialized countries are turning inward, worried about rebuilding Eastern Europe, deficit reduction and recession in the U.S., the amount of money available for Africa may well face net decline. I remember the story of the British PVO searching for a camera team to cover Namibian independence. None was available because they were all committed to Eastern Europe and the German reunification drive.

But this is an African/American conference, so we should properly examine issues in terms of U.S.-Africa relations. We can note actions at both the executive and congressional levels. Assistant Secretary of State Herman Cohen's discussions on Ethiopia, the efforts in Liberia, Kenya and Mozambique all indicate the US's sustained interest in conflict resolution on the African continent. The Congress demonstrated its continued commitment by raising the authorization for the Development Fund for Africa by \$250 million for fiscal year 1991. And all Americans were heartened by what we viewed as movement on South Africa as a result of Congressionally passed sanctions.

But there is a danger that economic assistance will breed paternalism on the part of the donor. The challenge before us is to develop a rationale for mature political relationships that takes into account the sea-changes I have mentioned, even though economic inequality will exist for the foreseeable future.

Pluralism, economic reignition, human/sectoral development revival, and the reversal of African marginalization—four powerful themes.

The goal of this conference is to present these and other issues of managing change to an eminent group of Africans and Americans who care about the future of the continent. We have tried to present a variety of view-

points on every issue, for it is through honest debate among people of goodwill that new thoughts, new strategies, new solutions occur.

Our deliberations are guided by a Directing Committee comprised of foreign ministers, international organizations heads, businesspersons, journalists and opinion leaders. The committee is ably co-chaired by His Excellency Dr. Boutros Boutros Ghali, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of Egypt and our host, and the Honorable William H. Gray III, Member of Congress and Majority Whip of the U.S. House of Representatives. Congressman Gray holds the third most important position in that deliberative body.

Many people have asked why Cairo? Especially now. We view this conference as providing a unique opportunity. The Persian Gulf has both direct and indirect implications for Africa as well as the Middle East. Egypt is at the crossroads, uniquely positioned to impact on two cultures. We are pleased that over 100 eminent colleagues, representing both governments and the private sector, felt the same way. We are particularly honored that the American delegation has been augmented by 26 Congresspersons representing Republicans and Democrats and a variety of interests, united by caring about Africa. We have assembled a stellar roster of African statespersons.

The U.S. delegation is partnered with many of the leading thinkers, decision-makers and internationalists of Africa. I daresay, with adequate resources, the brainpower in this room could probably solve many of Africa's problems.

Perhaps our deliberations will be made easier with the help of proverbs. I am a student of African proverbs: they provide me with insight and inspiration. In the early months of 1990, I would think daily of the adage, "When elephants fight the grass is trampled, and when elephants sleep the grass is also trampled." To me the proverb embodied the essence of the Cold War, its end, and its impact on Africa.

Now I am seized by another proverb: "Until the lions have their historians, tales of hunting will always glorify the hunter." Africans are becoming "lion historians," powerful and wise, seizing history and the future.

I have a colleague who asks at the end of any activity, "What will success look like?" For me, success will take the shape of new understanding of the impact of global changes, new strategies for South-South cooperation, renewed commitment to building an African and American constituency for Africa. Success is a common vision of Africa that we can all hold until we meet again next year.

Professor Adedeji described that vision, and therefore success, in another venue. I close with words of the ECA Executive Secretary in describing the coming era of a new Africa that can be ushered in by the Arusha Declaration on Popular Participation: "... an Africa in which democracy, accountability and development for transformation become internalized in every country and deeprooted at every level of our society; an Africa where the enabling environment that promotes initiative and enterprise and guarantees the dignity of each human being becomes pervasive; and an Africa where the empowerment of the people and the democratization of the development process is the order of the day.

THE 21ST AFRICAN-AMERICAN CONFERENCE

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the majority whip has introduced a number of speeches from the African-American Institute's 21st African-American Conference, held in Cairo in January.

I think it's also fitting that the majority whip's address at that conference—thoughtful, incisive and candid—get wider attention and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM H. GRAY III

The President of Egypt, his excellency Hosni Mubarek, whose leadership in this critical moment in world history so richly deserves acclaim;

The Honorable Boutros Boutros Ghali, Minister of state for Foreign Affairs and cochair of this Congress; I, a man deeply committed to the full participation of Africans in all areas of policy;

Ambassador Fawzi El-Ebrashi, director of the Diplomatic Institute, who has worked so hard to make this conference a success;

Chairman Maurice Tempelmann, President Vivian Derryck, Senior Vice-President Frank Ferrari, my friends at the Institute with which I have been involved for over a decade;

Honorable members of the diplomatic community, friends and guests:

It is a great honor to speak today before so many distinguished African leaders, and so many friends and champions of Africa.

While we focus on Africa, though, world attention today is focussed on Baghdad and Geneva. As Americans watch Secretary Baker jet from country to country, as they see the footage each night on the news of American troops in the Saudi Desert, they debate American options.

The disagreements are real. The debate has been sharp. How long should sanctions be allowed to continue? How do we ensure that Congress meets its constitutional authority? How do we marshal world support?

But basically, these are debates about tactics. Nobody wants to leave this fox in the henhouse. On one fact both American political parties are united. The unprovoked aggression against Kuwait cannot stand.

For to demand less would undermine the most hopeful series of world events since 1945.

We see these changes every day. Chunks of the Berlin Wall sell for a few dollars in souvenir shops. A dissident playwright named Vaclav Havel becomes the new President of Czechoslovakia, and Mikhail Gorbachev wins the Nobel Peace Prize. People line up to cast ballots in Romania and Poland.

Nelson Mandela walks outside prison gates to crowds of supporters who never thought they would see him alive again.

And in March, Namibia celebrates its first year of independence.

The old order has tumbled. The business of creating a new world has begun.

For Americans, though, this is not just a time of hope. It's also a time of deep concern about their place in the world—particularly when it comes to the world economy.

Americans used to think it was they who furnished the world with sophisticated fin-

ished products made from raw materials provided by the Third World. Now, Americans sell the Japanese wheat and timber. They sell Americans VCR's and CD players. The United States invented computer memory devices. Today it gets 19 out of 20 memory chips from Japan.

Americans worry about whether they can compete against the new economic Goliaths of the Pacific Rim countries. They worry about the aggressive manufacturers and marketers in France, Germany, and a newly united Europe.

Then there's the deficit. Americans got used to seeing themselves as the largest creditor nation in the world. Now, the United States is the largest debtor nation in history. One out of six U.S. tax dollars goes just to pay interest on the national debt.

Against this backdrop we must view the future of United States-African relations.

How does all this affect Africa? More to the point, how does this affect American attitudes towards helping Africa?

Because Africa's needs are unmistakable: Sub-Saharan Africa contains 20 of the 25 poorest countries in the world;

Over 100 million Africans face chronic problems of nutrition;

In some African countries, 25 percent of children die before turning five.

This continent of 500 million people has a rising debt about equal to its gross national product. In 1960 before the tide of freedom which saw country after country on this continent gain its independence, Sub-Saharan Africa could feed itself. Now it can't and it's not likely to soon—not with a population growing at 3 percent a year, the highest in the world.

The richest country in the world has much to offer Africa. America can be a source of investment. It can be a source of technological help. It is a repository of ideas. And it is a country which has seen helping other countries as in its interest, whether in the billions it put into the Marshall Plan or the \$150 billion a year it spends today defending Japan and Europe.

We have seen our opportunities and acted in world affairs.

But let us face the plain, unvarnished truth. America has never taken advantage of opportunities in Africa. There is an unintended irony in our response to Saddam Hussein. After all, when South Africa invaded Angola in the 1970's did the United States respond the way it has responded to Kuwait? Of course not.

And we all know that for over half a century South Africa illegally occupied Namibia, raping the country without a move from Western superpowers.

Why? And—a more relevant question—why can't America respond to Africa as generously as it did to Europe after World War II?

Part of it is ignorance. There are 30 million African-Americans—more blacks than in Kenya. But to the remaining 220 million, Africa seems alien. With images formed from Tarzan movies and the nightly news, Americans see Africa as a primitive region, dominated by drought, famine, wars, repressive regimes, and indifference to modernization.

They do not see enough. The African efforts for peace in Liberia, for an end to the conflict in Mozambique, the openings in Angola, and the trend and movement for political and economic development all over Africa.

But they will! They will!
Second, frightened by a stagnant economy, Americans are less generous than they were when it comes to any kind of aid. Under the

Marshall Plan the United States spent 2.9 percent of its GNP on economic aid—14 times as much as it does now.

Finally, the breakup of the cold war, so good for the long-term health of the world, makes things more difficult for Africa. Americans are now interested in increasing aid to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

American companies talk in glowing terms of opening plants in Czechoslovakia, or Poland. The Harvard Business School wants to run Soviet students through its MBA program, and MacDonalds talks with pride about opening an outlet in Moscow's Pushkin Square.

It's shortsighted.
After all, in Africa, American corporations have a market almost twice the size of Western Europe. And it's a growing one. By the year 2020, Nigeria alone will have as many people as the United States.

Furthermore, those of us who follow Africa closely can see signs of progress.

In the area of government, Americans believe in democratic and open systems of government and free enterprise. We support and prefer nations with democratic systems.

America must be careful that multiparty government doesn't become its sole criteria for determining aid. But certainly Americans should favor systems that allows dissent and free political expression. That's the kind of system that exists in Egypt, Botswana, and Namibia. And in Nigeria the government of General Babangida is poised to return Nigeria to democratically elected civilian leadership.

In economic development, America believes in free markets and countries that foster such systems will receive greater support from us.

Since 1985, food production for the continent has risen faster than the population. The actual decline in living standards has stopped. And Botswana, Kenya, and Senegal have made real progress with family planning.

In foreign policy, there is still much to do when it comes to South Africa and Southern Africa.

The sanctions worked.
There were so many who doubted. But looking back, it's clear that the heavy hammer of tough sanctions drove huge cracks in the wall of apartheid.

There is more work to do.
There is a movement sweeping the world to allow people to control government and Africa must march in the forefront of that movement.

There is an old saying that "money goes where it is treated well." Africa can do more to assure those who control investment capital that Africa is a hospitable place for those seeking profit.

There is more to do in South Africa. I made it clear to Mr. De Klerk when we met last fall that the opponents of apartheid will not change—but he and his government must continue to change. We will not rest and sanctions will not end until a government exists in South Africa that has been put there by the majority of its citizens. And that day will come, ladies and gentlemen, that day will come.

It won't come because of what Americans do. It will come because of what Africans do. But Americans can help. We must not, we will not abandon the continent of Africa.

I have hope! I know the importance of hope because I remember the steps it took to achieve basic civil rights in our own country. It wasn't so far back.

In fact, it was exactly three decades ago yesterday—January 6, 1961—that the State of

Georgia was horrified to see a young, black high school graduate win permission to enter classes at the University of Georgia.

How could this be, they asked?
How can we be forced to have our children sit next to this young woman in class, to take tests with her, to eat meals in the same cafeteria? They demonstrated. They wrote bitter editorials. And there were riots on the Georgia campus.

The young woman wasn't scared off. She registered. She attended class.

And tonight, Charlayne Hunter-Gault is helping direct this conference. She is not only a brilliant journalist. She is proof that in the fight for freedom, courage and dignity can win; that in the fight for a place in the Sun, those who have hope—and luck—will not be denied.

I'm confident that her struggle can be writ large, not just in America; that the great continent of Africa can achieve its rightful place in the Sun.

It won't be easy? It will achieve that place as the result of a partnership of public sector and private sector. It will achieve that place with the help of people of goodwill around the world. It will achieve it after a struggle that will take decades. Some of us won't be around to see it happen.

But happen it will. When it does, Africa can put its enormous resources to work. And it will bring sunlight to those around the world whose lives are still etched in shadow.

DON'T STRONG-ARM ISRAEL

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read the excellent op-ed which appeared in the New York Times regarding the fantasy of "land for peace" in the Middle East.

The article follows:

DON'T STRONG-ARM ISRAEL

(By Eugene V. Rostow)

Many well-meaning people imagine there could be peace in Palestine if only the U.S. could browbeat Israel into giving up its claims to yet another slice of the land promised to the Jewish people in the British Mandate. They are deluding themselves and in effect preparing the way for another war that would threaten Israel's destruction.

Secretary of State James Baker, back from the Middle East, discovered that the Arabs are as reluctant as ever to make peace with Israel.

Security Council Resolution 242, approved after the 1967 war, stipulates not only that Israel and its neighboring states should make peace with each other but should establish "a just and lasting peace in the Middle East." Until that condition is met, Israel is entitled to administer the territories it captured—the West Bank, East Jerusalem and Gaza Strip—and then withdraw from some but not necessarily all of the land to "secure and recognized boundaries free of threats or acts of force."

The practical reasons behind both halves of that bargain remain valid today. The first requires no withdrawal without peace—a rule often wrongly described as "trading land for peace." Actually, it is quite different. It prescribes that there should be no withdrawal until peace is made; then there

can be a complete withdrawal, a partial one, or none, depending on what the parties decide.

The second reason is that Israel's new boundaries need not be the same as the armistice lines of 1949. This provision specifically addressed the problem of peace with Jordan. No state has title to the land between Israel and Jordan. Jordan's claim to have annexed the West Bank, never generally recognized, has been abandoned. The rulers of the Ottoman Empire were the last recognized sovereigns in the territory.

The Jordan-Israel armistice line, the "green line," merely represents the position of both countries' troops when the fighting stopped in 1949. At Arab insistence, the accords provide that the lines are not political boundaries but can be changed when the parties make peace.

From the viewpoint of security alone, it was obvious in 1967, and still is, that Israel must retain a substantial part of the West Bank for defense, considering the uncertainties about future Syrian, Iraqi and Iranian designs. Beyond security, there is the moral claim established by law.

Israel has a stronger claim to the West Bank than any other nation or would-be nation because, under the League of Nations Mandate, Israel has the same legal right to settle the West Bank, Gaza Strip and East Jerusalem that it has to settle Haifa or West Jerusalem. While this proposition is not seriously disputed, the United States has sought to block or limit such settlements on the grounds that they would discourage the peace process, a dubious proposition, since only Egypt has made peace with Israel since 1967.

This does not mean Israel will or should insist on the entire West Bank. There is room for compromise; Israel has always maintained that it would make sacrifices for peace and wishes to remain a predominantly Jewish state. The West Bank Arabs are mainly Jordanian citizens and should have the right to live in Jordan if they wish; today, Jordan denies this right.

That issue aside, the soundest solution for the territories—the solution widely discussed when Resolution 242 was drafted—involved separate states in Palestine: Jordan and Israel. This would include special arrangements for the holy places in Jerusalem and an economic union embracing the entire area: Israel, Jordan and the disputed territories. Every dispassionate commission that has studied the Palestine problem has recommended this approach. It was the idea behind the General Assembly's ill-fated partition recommendation of 1947, and it was Israel's policy for years after 1967.

This should be the main goal of President Bush's peace offensive and what he presses for when he visits the Middle East. The U.S. should not seek only an interim autonomy plan for some Arab parts of the West Bank, however desirable it may seem for a transition period toward peace. If Mr. Bush's initiative fails, Israel should put such an autonomy plan into effect temporarily. But it should not lead to a separate Palestinian state.

While Israel, Jordan, the West Bank Arabs and Syria struggle with the problems of making peace treaties, the other Arab states should comply with 242. They have no territorial disputes with Israel and can normalize relations by diplomatic recognition. Such action could profoundly alter the atmosphere of Arab politics and make Israeli negotiations with Jordan and Syria much easier.

A peace conference of any kind should be avoided. A large international parley would

only be a forum for the stale rhetoric that has poisoned so many General Assembly sessions on the Palestine question. The way to proceed, when the Arabs and Israel are ready to negotiate, is bilaterally, with the help of the U.S. as conciliator if the parties wish.

Perhaps Mr. Baker will come to appreciate that Resolutions 242 of 1967 and 338 of 1973 (which makes 242 legally binding) provide the only possible agenda for negotiations because they constitute the only guidelines the parties and major powers profess to accept. Perhaps he also found in the Middle East that what cannot work is a plan to achieve peace at the expense of Israel's rights.

Roman law has a wise maxim: "Law cannot come of a shameful act"—in this case, betraying Israel's rights. Wars can come, however.

Eugene V. Rostow, a fellow at the U.S. Institute of Peace, as an Under Secretary of State (1966-1969) helped write Security Council Resolution 242.

**PRAISING THE PERCEPTION OF
HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI THAT
THERE SHOULD BE DOMESTIC
FOCUS ON CHILDREN**

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, just the other day the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, gave a very important speech. Speaking before delegates to a meeting of the National Association of Children's Hospitals, our colleague made an impassioned plea that the President and Congress turn from the success in the Persian Gulf to our domestic needs and that we set children as our priority. I hope that all my colleagues will read the chairman's speech and give heed to his plea.

CHAIRMAN DAN ROSTENKOWSKI SPEAKING BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS

This has been an interesting year. Even exciting. It will take years for historians to sort out all the lessons we've learned from our experience in the Persian Gulf, but one is clear already.

America is hungry for leadership. Americans expect their President to lead. When he does—forcefully and with strong conviction—they will be quick to follow. Americans like to win—and, if the goals are honorable, they are willing to pay the price of victory.

That is a lesson that has been repeated often in our history, but one we haven't been reminded of recently—until this year.

President Bush is riding high—and with good reason. He has an abnormally high public approval rating—and he deserves it. I am happy to be a member of the chorus singing his praises.

But popularity is fickle. The public attention span is short. The President must do more than bask in the applause aimed his way. The logical question is—what can he do for an encore? The obvious answer is—lead us.

The President should set domestic priorities. That's his job. We don't need a thousand points of light. We need a single spotlight that will focus our attention on one important but manageable domestic issue. We

don't need to be told we have more will than wallet. We need to know how our limited resources can best be invested.

It won't be easy. Priorities aren't always obvious. Saddam Hussein was a gift from central casting—an obvious villain everyone loved to hate. In the domestic arena, conflicts tend to be more muted. You don't have a clear contest between good and evil. Domestically, the enemy is often indifference.

The President should invest some of his popularity and skills to create the same enthusiasm for domestic progress that he did for victory in Kuwait.

If I were the President, I'd focus on children. They've been in the dark cellar of policy debates for too long. Their problems are stark. They cannot plead their own case. Their inability to create political pressure means they deserve a strong champion in the White House.

And kids are a good investment. If we help them today, they'll strengthen our economy tomorrow.

I began talking about the need to commit more resources to children's programs more than two years ago. So far, I have minimal progress to report.

On the other hand, I preached on the need for deficit reduction for a decade before the message got through. No one ever said that political process moves quickly.

I don't want you to think I'm one of those bleeding heart liberals who never met a social spending program he didn't like. As people who operate children's hospitals, I figure there's a good chance you're in that category in any event.

Instead, I'd like to talk about the long-term impact of neglect, tomorrow's economic cost of today's unaddressed social problems. There's a depressingly logical momentum here—kids who start off on the wrong foot spend a lifetime trying to catch up. And often fail.

Kids who don't have enough to eat tend to get sick. Kids who lack adequate medical care tend to miss a lot of school. Kids who aren't in class don't learn how to read. Teenagers who are illiterate tend to drop out of high schools. High school dropouts can't get good jobs at good wages. Often they can't get any jobs at all.

They contribute little to the nation's economic growth. Those who become dependent on the government for aid actually divert resources that could be used better in other areas. Teenage pregnancies cost government more than 20 billion dollars a year.

Throughout our nation, one of every five children is born into poverty. Think about that, one in five.

And every teenager who begets a child instead of going to college faces an adulthood with very limited horizons.

Consider the parameters of the problem:

One child in five is poor.

One child in four lives in a single parent family.

One child in four is born to a mother who has never been married. Nearly two-thirds of black births are to unwed mothers. Among whites the ratio is one in six.

That's why about half of all children born in the past decade—and nine out of ten black children—spent at least part of their lives in a one-parent family.

More than 12 million children don't have any health insurance.

Two million cases of child abuse are reported annually.

And if you're bothered as I am by the idea of children having babies, I hope you join me in being both offended and appalled by drug-addicted children having addicted babies.

What we have here is simple and cataclysmic—millions of kids are being denied a normal childhood. They're hungry. They're sick. They're not protected and nurtured as they should be by parents and schools that are overwhelmed. They're being cheated by life.

What will happen to American society when these millions of kids become adults? A few will succeed. Many more will be unable to overcome the impediments of their childhood. And some will go out of their way to repay the society for their mistreatment. Not a happy picture.

We know how to respond to their problems. We're not waiting for a major medical breakthrough. There's no magic bullet we can get on the cheap. It requires a long-term commitment to the type of comprehensive programs that we know can work.

There have been ample experiments. The press—especially the American Agenda series on ABC Television—has shown the American people what works. All we need do is expand these programs to reach a broader population.

What can you do? Your attendance here today suggests you're clearly aware of the problem. Many of you know more about it than I do.

If you care, you can do what people traditionally come to Washington to do, lobby. Send a strong message to your elected representatives—including President Bush—that you will follow when they lead. Let them know that you are getting impatient.

You won't be alone. There's a growing realization within the corporate community that our neglect of children is becoming a problem with obvious long-term economic consequences for the country. Earlier this year a delegation of top corporate executives told the Ways and Means Committee how adequate funding for the Women, Infants, and Children—or WIC program—is a top priority for them.

But lobbying doesn't yield immediate results. There's a need for growing and constant pressure. The White House must realize that this is more than a fad.

I've known George Bush for more than 20 years and consider him my friend. He's not perfect. After all, he is a Republican. But none of us is perfect. Even Democrats have flaws. But George Bush is a good President and he has the potential to be a great President. Help him achieve greatness. What I'm telling you today is nothing more and nothing less than I've repeatedly told him.

But if George Bush is a good man, one who feels the pain when I describe the plight of children in need, he is also a good politician, who doesn't want to stray too far from the mainstream.

Although our backgrounds are very different, our political attitudes are similar. We are both centrists. We think we know the difference between leadership and ideology. There's a word for politicians who get too far ahead of their constituents. That word is "former."

What you must do is send George Bush a message that you are ready to march. That you elected him to lead. That you might not re-elect him if he fails to lead.

I'd be surprised if you didn't think that larger expenditures on children's health issues should be the first priority. But I urge you to hold your fire on that one. Parochial squabbling has been the death of many a big idea in Washington.

What we need first is a commitment to the general goal. The goal is to create a better life for America's children—especially those

who are today deprived of the bare necessities, the most basic requirements of a decent life. Unless we win on that point, there will be no need to discuss whether sex education for teenagers ought to be a higher priority than prenatal care.

Government is often—and properly—criticized for being too friendly to powerful elements in our society. It is true that the squeaky wheel is greased first. And there are those who say that the government tilt toward programs for senior citizens is a direct result of their political participation.

Good for them. That's how a responsive political system works—its called democracy.

But those of us in government, those who have the privilege of exercising power, should also feel a special obligation to the powerless in our society. We can't expect effective lobbying from a 15-year old pregnant girl who lives in a one-parent home. She's too preoccupied with her own immediate problems to write letters to her Congressman—or her President.

Nonetheless, we have an obligation to the powerless—in political, in economic, even in moral terms. They deserve political representation even if they don't have the strength to fight for it. Their humanity entitles them to a decent standard of living.

Kids can't vote in this country. Kuwaitis can't either. But that didn't prevent us from helping them out in their hour of need.

I supported the President all the way in the Persian Gulf. I voted to authorize the war. And I'm delighted that we won it so easily.

But I think we owe our kids the same kind of commitment we gave the Kuwaiti people. Both cases involve a combination of economic and humanitarian motivations.

One reason we were in the Persian Gulf was because we were worried about our oil supply in the future. That's nothing to be ashamed of. Call it enlightened self-interest. This same enlightened self-interest should compel us to invest kids today because of our same concern about our nation's future.

If you're concerned about the economic growth in Asia, if you're interested in the economic upheaval that's taking place in Eastern Europe and if you plan on getting regular Social Security payments after you retire, you have ample reason to be concerned about America's place in the new economic order.

Let me close by thanking you for all that you and your institutions have done. If I have painted a bleak picture here in trying to promote emphasis on the problem, it is not because I am ignorant of the public service provided by children's hospitals.

Things could be a lot worse. And they probably would be, had your institutions not stretched to help meet the need. But one of the lessons we've learned in the past decade is that community institutions can't solve this problem, regardless of their resolve. It is simply too big. That is why the government must step in.

Enjoy your visit here, but don't forget the kids. If you agree with me that they deserve help, let your elected representatives know.

They know you send them here. And they try—regardless of party—to represent you. But first they have to get a clear message about your commitment, and your expectations about what theirs should be.

IN HONOR OF COMMUNITY OF CAMBRIA 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the community of Cambria on the 125th anniversary of its founding. The community of Cambria, CA is an important part of the 16th Congressional District of California, and I am proud to recognize its contributions and achievements.

Founded in 1866, Cambria has evolved into a caring and productive community. The residents of Cambria have withstood the natural disasters that their coastal town has been subjected to with courage and determination. They have survived the mud slides that have prevented access to their community; they are surviving the fifth year of drought that is facing California, and they will continue to find strength from within to overcome any obstacle they are confronted with.

The community's inner strength and dedication is apparent in the recent planning of their anniversary celebration. They have formed a committee to celebrate Cambria's 125th anniversary jubilee in conjunction with the Cambria Historical Society, to eagerly plan for this very special occasion. Plans for Cambria's 125th anniversary jubilee will include yearlong tie-ins with existing Cambria events. The community will emphasize a series of events honoring pioneer families who lived in Cambria at the time of its establishment and throughout its history. A U.S. Post Office first-day cancellation stamp has been designed in honor of this occasion incorporating Cambria's unofficial slogan, "Where the pines meet the sea." Exhibits will be displayed that will reflect upon the American heritage and values that contribute to the strength of the community of Cambria and the strength of this great Nation.

The community of Cambria is surrounded by beautiful grassy hills, towering pine trees, and a pristine coast line. The majestic beauty is one of the most breathtaking scenes in the world and the residents have strived to preserve its tranquil atmosphere. The growing tourist industry contributes to this serene setting by allowing people access from all over the world to share in the beauty of this natural wonder.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues now to join me in honoring the citizens of the community of Cambria on the occasion of the 125th anniversary of its founding. It is with great pride and respect that I pay tribute to Cambria's achievements and contributions to the 16th Congressional District of California.

RENOWNED FILM PRODUCER AND AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE FOUNDER GEORGE STEVENS, JR. PRESENTED WITH CONGRESSIONAL ARTS CAUCUS AWARD

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to inform my colleagues that the congressional arts caucus today presented the highly esteemed cultural leader, George Stevens, Jr., with the Congressional Arts Caucus Award. George Stevens is a friend of many of us in this body, one who has combined a career in the arts with distinguished public service are connected, how, as he has put it, the two "reinforce and nurture each other."

A commanding presence in Hollywood as a film and television producer, writer and director, he is equally so in Washington as a former member of the planning committee of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and the founding director of the American Film Institute. As director of the AFI from 1967 to 1980 and in his present position as life trustee and cochairman of the AFI's Board, George Stevens has had more to do with the preservation of our film heritage than perhaps any other American.

As the son of the famed director George Stevens, George Stevens, Jr. had an auspicious beginning in the film industry, working with his father on the films "A Place in the Sun," "Giant," "The Diary of Anne Frank" and the "The Greatest Story Ever Told" as an associate producer and director of location sequences. He immediately established his own, independent reputation and, by the time he was 28 years old, had directed episodes of television series such as "Alfred Hitchcock Presents," "Peter Gunn," and "Philip Marlowe."

Immediately thereafter, at the age of 29, he was appointed director of the Motion Picture and Television Service of the U.S. Information Agency from 1962 to 1967. As such, he was responsible for the production and overseas distribution of some 300 documentaries a year. In fact, his documentary entitled "Nine from Little Rock" won the Academy Award in 1965. Another film made in 1964 entitled "John F. Kennedy: Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," a stirring account, received tremendous critical acclaim.

His remarkable artistic accomplishments continued concurrently with his devotion to public service. In 1965, President Johnson appointed him to the planning committee of the Kennedy Center, where he advocated an organization to care for America's treasure trove of old films and to support high quality films in the future. In 1967, President Johnson announced the creation of the AFI and appointed George Stevens as its director.

His brilliance and devotion to the AFI over the next 12 years established it as the pre-eminent national institution for film preservation and motion picture study in the country. Under his supervision, the AFI helped to locate and preserve more than 24,000 American movies.

Mr. Speaker, I must remind my colleagues that American motion pictures have represented the American heart and character, American dreams and ambitions, more than any other medium over the past century. The preservation of these films is no small matter. It is no less than the maintenance of our cultural identity.

Aside from film preservation, George Stevens initiated other AFI programs such as the Center for Advanced Film Studies, the Directing Workshop for Women, the Independent Filmmaker Program, and the successful magazine "American Film, the Magazine of the Film and Television Arts." Today, the AFI is a thriving institution with activities on the east and west coasts, a cultural center for film training, advocacy, and exhibition.

But, if these accomplishments do not overwhelm already, his simultaneous successes in the arts cannot help but impress. He is the creator, producer, and writer of the American Film Institute Award shows, which won an Emmy Award in 1975 for the salute to James Cagney. In addition, George Stevens is the creator, coproducer and writer of the beloved tradition, the Kennedy Center honor series, which Americans anxiously wait for and greatly enjoy viewing each year. These two series have been recognized with a total of three Emmy Awards and the Peabody Award.

In 1985, he completed what must have been a labor of love, but also an outstanding success: "George Stevens: A Filmmaker's Journey," a motion picture biography of his father. He wrote, directed and narrated this film which, in its only competitive submission, was awarded the special jury prize in the feature film competition at the Chicago Festival. The film not only enjoyed a successful release in theaters across the United States, but was also honored with showings at international festivals in Cannes, Venice, and Deauville. For his work on this film, George Stevens was also honored with a special award from the National Board of Review of Motion Pictures and the Film Advisory Board's Award of Excellence. It was also televised as a 3-hour special on ABC.

Further artistic accolades have followed. His 5-hour miniseries, "The Murder of Mary Phagan" starring Jack Lemmon, which he produced and coauthored the screenplay, garnered an Emmy Award for Outstanding Miniseries for 1987-88, the Christopher Award for Outstanding Television Special, and the George Foster Peabody Award.

One eagerly awaits his latest endeavor. He recently wrote, directed and coproduced an ABC 4-hour miniseries, to be aired next month, dramatizing the historic Brown versus Board of Education school desegregation cases of the 1950's and starring Sidney Poitier.

Mr. Speaker, George Stevens is a man whose abilities are diverse and whose talents are manifold. He epitomizes what a Congressional Arts Caucus Award seeks to recognize—the interplay of devotion to the arts and to public service. It is with great pride, then, that the congressional arts caucus honors this outstanding man, artist, and guardian of our American cultural legacy.

TRIBUTE TO JUSTICE CORNELIUS J. O'BRIEN

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the "Queens Borough Lodge's Judiciary Honoree for 1991," my very good friend and a great Irishman, Justice Cornelius J. O'Brien. Lodge No. 878 of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks annually honors a prominent jurist from my home county of Queens, NY. I am very pleased that they have chosen Neil O'Brien for this year's honor.

Born in Woodside, Queens County, NY, Justice O'Brien has dedicated his life to the study of law and its application in a fair and just manner. Neil has demonstrated an untiring dedication to his community in his able and active participation in the judicial process. I believe Lodge No. 878 has made an excellent choice in their selection this year to be honored at their Judiciary Night celebration on April 9.

Mr. Speaker, Neil attended Fordham University, where he excelled in his studies as demonstrated by his 4 years on the dean's list. He earned his bachelor of science degree in 1954 and graduated in the top 10 percent of his class. After college, Neil served 2 years in the U.S. Army and, in 1956, entered Fordham Law School, where he once again proved his worth. He received his LL.B. in 1959 and, once again, was named to the dean's list in each year.

After graduation, Neil was associated with the law firm of Rudser & Fitzmaurice until 1961, when he opened his own law office in Woodside, Queens. Shortly thereafter, Neil accepted a position with the U.S. Federal Trade Commission, where he worked until 1964, when he left to join the firm of David Walsh, Esquire.

In 1967, Neil joined the Queens County District Attorney's Office and was eventually assigned to the appeals bureau. After 7 successful years in this position, Neil was elevated to bureau chief of the appeals bureau. In 1974, Neil's hard work and dedication were further rewarded when he was selected as executive assistant district attorney.

Three years later Neil was appointed to the bench of the criminal court of the city of New York. In 1982, he was appointed as an acting supreme court justice and he was elected to the New York Supreme Court in 1988. Once again proving himself and his abilities, Neil assumed the position of justice of the supreme court, appellate division, second department, in May 1990.

Justice O'Brien presently lives in Woodside with his lovely wife Alice and their daughter, Alice Marie, who is following in her father's footsteps by currently attending law school. However, Alice Marie has made what I believe is a wise decision by attending St. John's University School of Law, my alma mater.

Mr. Speaker, it is with deep respect and friendship that I offer my congratulations to Neil and his family upon his selection as "Judiciary of the Year." I know Queens County

and the State of New York have been and will continue to be well-served by Justice Cornelius J. O'Brien.

MIAMI'S PROMINENT BUSINESSWOMEN

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, several businesswomen of the South Florida area have excelled notably. On March 18, 1991, the Miami Herald recognized these women and their accomplishments. It gives me great pleasure to present this article for its inclusion in the RECORD:

BUSINESSWOMAN PREFERS SOLO PATH TO SUCCESS

(By Derek Reveron)

Sometimes, Pamela Watson wonders if success is worth the lonely battle.

Her business consulting firm is her daytime, evening and weekend companion. But that's the way it has to be, says Watson. She is a black woman fighting to fit in an industry of white men.

"You have to be aggressive and don't let that deter you," Watson says. "You ignore it and approach things from the technical side."

So far, the sacrifices have paid off. At 35, she runs Watson & Co. Consulting Services. It has nine fulltime employees and annual sales of more than \$400,000.

She has done so well that last week she was named one of Miami's five outstanding Women Business Owners by the Miami chapter of the National Association of Women Business Owners. Winners met the following criteria: They own at least half of their firms. They have been in business for at least five years. They have showed steady growth in sales, volume or employees.

Watson & Co. was chosen because it showed healthy growth in sales and the number of employees, said award judge Kurt Nystrom, vice president of the Beacon Council. "She moved from being an accountant for a Big Eight firm to competing with them," he said.

Her firm, Watson & Co., is among a burgeoning number of South Florida companies owned by women. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, there are more than 33,000 women-owned firms in Dade County. Since 1982, their growth rate has been 61 percent, compared with 57 percent for the United States as a whole.

Watson started her company in 1985, along with a partner, Jackie Bailey. They pooled \$38,000 in savings and loans from relatives, and opened offices at 20401 NW Second Ave.

Within a year, Bailey got married, made plans to move to Philadelphia, and sold her interest in the company to Watson. At first, Watson struggled to get clients and pay bills. To obtain customers, she tapped relatives, friends and former business associates in South Florida and in Jamaica.

In December 1985, Watson landed her first "big" contract—a \$22,000 joint venture with another accounting firm to provide accounting services to Metro-Dade. She went on to land a \$50,000 annual contract with the Jamaican government. She became an auditor for the city of Miami through a joint venture with Deloitte & Touche.

Today, Watson & Co. has about 200 business clients. Most of them are small- and medium-sized minority-owned firms. They are retailers, manufacturers, law firms and doctors. "My client base is as diverse as the South Florida economy. Most of the clients I've had from the beginning I still have," Watson says. "I'm a trouble-shooter. I review constantly, and if there's a problem, I fix it right away."

Says Marlene Bernard, vice president of 5-year-old Apricot Office Supplies of Miami, "Pam has been with us from the beginning. We are like her baby. Every problem we have, we take it to her, and she solves it."

Watson grew up in Kingston, Jamaica, where her father and mother owned an import-export business. "Growing up in a family business made me want my own business that much more," Watson says.

As a young woman, she worked as a bookkeeper for the family business. Meanwhile, she took business courses at the College of Science and Technology in Kingston.

In 1978, the family moved to Miami. Watson worked full-time in the loan department of City National Bank while studying for an accounting degree at the University of Miami.

She was graduated in 1982, then went on to work as an accountant for Arthur Andersen & Co. and as a senior auditor for KPMG Peat Marwick & Main. In 1985, Watson decided that she had enough experience to strike out on her own. Now she can't imagine life any other way.

AIDA LEVITAN

When Aida Levitan founded her advertising and public relations firm nine years ago, it had \$330,000 in billings. Today, that figure is more than \$10 million.

The clients of Sanchez & Levitan include the Florida Lottery, Coors beer and Eckerd drug stores. It has 12 employees.

Levitan and Fausto Sanchez, her husband and partner, each own half of the firm. But it was Levitan who got the firm off the ground. She ran the company for two years as a public relations agency before she met Sanchez in 1984. He persuaded her to add an advertising component, and billings grew.

Levitan, 42, was born in Havana. In 1961, at age 13, she came to the United States with her family. She earned a bachelor's degree in languages from the University of Miami in 1969, followed by a doctorate in Spanish literature from Emory University.

CLAUDIA KITCHENS

In 1978, Claudia Kitchens left her job as a Dade public school teacher.

She borrowed \$6,000 from relatives to open Red Road Kids Club, a clothing store for children in South Miami.

Today, the business has sales of \$1 million and six employees.

For Kitchens, 40, business ownership "has always been a lifelong ambition," she says.

While teaching, she was constantly trying to come up with a good business idea.

A few months after the birth of her first child, it hit her: More and more women are having babies.

Children need clothes. Everybody sells everyday clothes. But few people sell upscale clothing in a boutique setting.

The idea caught on with customers, and business continues to grow.

JOANN BASS

JoAnn Bass was raised in the family apartment above Joe's Stone Crabs. At age 12, she began working in the restaurant.

Today, the Miami native is the third-generation owner of the 78-year-old Miami Beach landmark.

She assumed complete control of the restaurant in 1985, after her divorce and the retirement of her parents. Since then, the eatery has continued to grow, Bass said. Revenues are more than \$10 million annually. There are 206 employees.

At 59, Bass has held only one other job in her life. She worked part time as a sales clerk in a dress shop while her husband attended the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill.

After coming back to Miami, she returned to working for the family business and has been there ever since.

NANCY FREHLING

Twenty-one years ago, Nancy Frehling and her husband bought a tiny shop from an elderly man.

They groomed it into Gift Enterprises, a successful gift shop and wholesale business. They own Nessa Gaulouis, an upscale gift shop in Bal Harbour.

Nancy Frehling declines to give sales of Gift Enterprises. But she says that sales for 1990 were the best ever. Most of the operation's sales come from the wholesale business.

Started 14 years ago, it sells furniture and decorative accessories. Nessa Gaulouis, named after its founder, sells china, crystal and flatware.

Nancy and Robert Frehling divide responsibility. She runs the retail business. Robert runs the wholesale end.

For 10 years, they had a second retail store in Mayfair. It was closed in 1989 because it was unprofitable, Nancy Frehling said.

I would like to take this opportunity to personally congratulate Aida Levitan, JoAnn Bass, Claudia Kitchens, and Nancy Frehling. Women of their caliber are the foundation of the community's growth and diversity.

LATVIAN DEPORTATIONS

HON. BERNARD J. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1991, we will commemorate the 42d anniversary of the deportation of Latvian citizens to Siberia.

Over 42,000 residents of Latvia were forcibly relocated under Joseph Stalin's collectivization of farmland policy. The small nation's population had already been appreciably reduced because of Stalin's first deportation in 1941, coupled with the ravages of the war.

The trials of the Baltic Nations have not ended. While communism has broken down in the Eastern bloc nations of Europe, the Baltics are still struggling to regain their independence. The United States has always recognized their right to independence and we must continue to do what we can to see that this goal is realized. The commemoration of the 1949 deportations serves as an opportunity to keep the history of Latvia alive in the West and to signal to our friends in Latvia our unwavering support.

THE 39TH ANNUAL NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

HON. CHARLES W. STENHOLM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to serve as chairman of the 39th Annual National Prayer Breakfast, and I am pleased today to submit for the RECORD the program and transcript of that inspiring event.

In the Gospel According to Matthew, our Lord Jesus Christ reassured us that "Whenever two or more are gathered in my name, there shall I be also." Mr. Speaker I am pleased to report that on the morning of January 31, 1991, there were 3,838 individuals from 140 different countries gathered in His name, and His presence was undeniable.

One of the beauties of this annual event is that it serves as a graphic reminder that God's people come in all colors, shapes and sizes and from all walks of life. People unable to communicate through the same language, people who stand on the opposite sides of the aisle in Congressional Chambers, people who live in mansions and those who live on streets—these folks may have little in common by the world's standards, but were brought together at the National Prayer Breakfast for one simple reason: we are all God's children. Standing at the podium looking out at the sea of brothers and sisters in Christ, it dawned on me that I had never been to a family reunion quite like this one.

From Red Steagall's "Cowboy's Prayer" to Dr. Jordan's New Testament reading in sign language to Joe Gibb's lessons learned by a football coach to President's Bush's request for prayers for peace, the Word of God was spoken and heard that morning.

Naturally, on January 31, when the conflict in the Middle East was barely 2 weeks old, a prayer for peace was on the minds and in the hearts of everyone there. Prior to the breakfast, some folks had called my office to ask if the Middle East crisis was going to cause the cancellation of the breakfast. Our immediate decision was that if ever our country needs a National Prayer Breakfast, certainly it is at times such as these. I believe every person at the breakfast felt reassured knowing that we could bring our cares and offer our collective prayers for peace to God that morning.

Events like the National Prayer Breakfast don't just happen. I want to thank Doug Coe and all of his wonderful staff for the hours and prayers and labor of love they committed to this event. I also want to express my appreciation to the House and Senate weekly prayer groups, not only for their participation in this one event but for the year-round support and fellowship they provide Members of Congress. And I most especially want to thank all of the folks who participated in the program of the 39th annual breakfast.

Mr. Speaker, a great number of people, not only from our country but around the world, are interested in the National Prayer Breakfast. I ask, therefore, that the program and transcript of this marvelous event be printed in the RECORD for today.

NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

January 31st, 1991, 8 a.m.

Chairman: The Honorable Charles W. Stenholm, U.S. Representative, Texas.
Pre-Breakfast Prayer, Antonia C. Novello, M.D., M.P.H., Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service.

Opening Song, Morehouse College Glee Club, Atlanta, Georgia.

Opening Prayer, The Honorable Bill Gray, U.S. Representative, Pennsylvania.

BREAKFAST

Welcome, The Honorable Charles W. Stenholm.

Message, Dr. Billy Graham.
Old Testament Reading, The Honorable Buddy Roemer, Governor of Louisiana.

Remarks—U.S. House of Representatives, The Honorable Marcy Kaptur, U.S. Representative, Ohio.

"The Cowboy's Prayer" Mr. Red Steagall, Fort Worth, Texas.

New Testament Reading, Dr. I. King Jordan, President, Gallaudet University.

Remarks—U.S. Senate, The Honorable Pete V. Domenici, U.S. Senator, New Mexico.
Prayer for Peace, Admiral Huntington Hardisty, Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Command.

Message, Mr. Joe Gibbs, Head Coach, The Washington Redskins.

The President of the United States

Group Song, The Honorable Daniel K. Akaka, U.S. Senator, Hawaii.

Closing Prayer, Mr. George Gallup, Princeton, New Jersey.

Closing Song, Morehouse College Glee Club.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Congressman STENHOLM. May we come to order, please? My name is Congressman Charlie Stenholm of the 17th District of Texas. I have the privilege of being the chairman of the 39th Annual National Prayer Breakfast. And I would like to welcome all 3,838 of you here this morning.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. I want you to know that for a farmer from Ericksdahl, Texas, this is mighty tall cotton for me to be standing here looking out over this audience this morning.

You've been listening to the fine piano playing of John Haugen, who has and will continue to be bringing us a number of national anthems of the world this morning. Thank you, John.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. And now I'm pleased to introduce to you Dr. Antonia Novello, Surgeon-General of the Public Health Service, who will bring us our first morning prayer. Dr. Novello.

Dr. NOVELLO. Good morning. In my family we have a custom that when we pray, we hold hands. So may I please ask that all of us hold hands?

Let us pray. Dear Heavenly Father, you are the divine physician who heals our bodies and soothes our souls. You are the prince of peace and we your humble servants. Yet we, a peace-loving nation, now turn to you as a nation at war. Father, it is a paradox of our human condition. We have learned through human history a bitter lesson, that peace at any price is no peace at all, and that, therefore, there are times when we must reluctantly take to battle to preserve our ideals.

We are confident that our cause is just, our motives right, our spirit pure, our conduct proper. We pray that you will guide and pro-

tect our troops and those of our allies. And that our women in uniform, who are demonstrating through their courage that honor knows no gender, be granted your special blessing.

We pray also that our nation's children will understand that what we do, we do ultimately for them, that they and all the world's children will inherit the peace that so reverently we seek. We fervently ask that those American children whose courageous mothers and fathers now so gallantly wave our banner in the sands of Arabia will soon be reunited.

We pray, too, for our enemy and especially for the innocent civilians who may inadvertently come into harm's way.

Heavenly Father, our joined hands form a chain of love for you and symbolize our unshakable chain of support for our President. We stand proudly with him and share his burden. We pray that as he conducts the war that will surely be won by bravery and perseverance, you guide him to a peace that will be won by wisdom and understanding.

And Lord, as we turn our attention back to a world at peace, we also must ask that you help us and guide us in easing the suffering here at home. We must heal those who are sick and heal those who cry out in pain.

Lord, our President has spoken of a new world order, where the power of justice and liberty will prevail. And so it is that in your name we pledge ourselves to a new human allegiance, the yearning of all your sons and daughters for peace, dignity and freedom. We ask these things in your name.

Dios (Inaudible) a los Estados Unidos de America. Amen.

Congressman STENHOLM. Everyone please be seated now. Due to a specially called National Security Council meeting, our President will be a few minutes late this morning. In the meantime, please enjoy the breakfast and the program will continue shortly.

We will now hear the Morehouse College Glee Club of Atlanta, Georgia. In addition to the young men before us, I want to thank Dr. Leroy Keith, College President; the Honorable James Hudson, chairman of the board; and David Morrow, music director, all who helped make it possible for this group to be present with us this morning. Now let us enjoy the music.

VOICE. Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States and Mrs. Bush.

Congressman STENHOLM. Our greetings to the President and First Lady who have just joined us.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. Before moving on, I want to express our sincere thanks to the Morehouse Glee Club for their musical number.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. My friend and Congressional classmate of the 90th Congress, Majority Whip of the House of Representatives, and probably, more importantly, the minister who stands in the pulpit of Bright Hope Baptist Church in Philadelphia nearly every Sunday morning, the Honorable and Reverend Bill Gray will now lead us in our opening prayer.

Congressman GRAY. Let us pray. We are grateful for the occasion that allows us to come together, O Lord, that calls us to a time of reflection, that reminds us of our oneness with the human family, and our interdependence and mutual reliance on spiritual powers beyond our understanding. We are thankful for the human spirit that reaches out to touch the inner life of others, that lifts us to another dimension of hope

and aspiration beyond the materialism and the physical limitations of this life.

We are thankful for the awareness of the strivings of all those who struggle to preserve this spaceship earth for generations yet to come. We are thankful for the spark of the divine within all humanity that prompts us to worship and pray and respond to that spark in the life of others.

We are keenly sensitive and deeply appreciative, O Lord, of the physical blessings that are ours even as we share this food, that sustains our bodies in a world in which many persons never have enough to eat.

We know our need to be forgiven for our insensitivity to pain and suffering, for greed and self-centeredness that destroys the fabric of our life together. Forgive us for the apathy and sloth that permit us to rest in smug self-satisfaction, for the narrow parochialism of a nation and clan, for the shortsightedness that in itself blinds us to the vision of the eternal.

Teach us, O Lord, to pray as we work, as we walk in our daily chores, as we go to our homes, as we live in our families, as we strive to find meaning in our human existence. Teach us, O Lord, to pray in every experience of life. Teach us to pray with meaning and depth, with perception and empathy, with personal involvement and passion. Teach us to pray from our hearts. Teach us to pray with insight, comprehension, with reckless abandon, with openness to whatever may come. Teach us to pray with the frightful knowledge that we may have to be useful in the answering of our own prayers.

We are grateful for the leaders of our homeland and representatives of many nations. We pray for our President and the first lady, who are today present in our midst. Grant to him wisdom and patience, strength and courage and faithfulness to his own best leadings. Grant to all public servants the judicious stewardship of their gifts and talents. Grant to all those locked in mortal combat the inner peace that we all seek. And grant to everyone of us the strength that comes only when we rely upon eternal values.

And finally, O Lord, teach us to pray not our will, but thy will be done. Amen.

Congressman STENHOLM. At this time, Dr. Abdullah Khouj of Saudi Arabia, director of the Islamic Center in Washington, will bring us a reading from the Koran in which we see that many of the universal truths appear in a number of the world's religions. Dr. Khouj.

Dr. KHOUJ. I greet you all with universal salutation of a Moslem by saying may the peace and blessing of God be upon you.

I start with praising God who has guided us to this gathering today. We could not have been guided had it not been for his guidance. Indeed, this is the truth.

Concerning our predicament of war and the solution for that, in the Koran God states, if two parties among the believers fall into a quarrel, make ye peace between them. But if one of them transgresses beyond bounds against the other, then fight ye all against the one that transgresses until he complies with the command of God. But if he complies, then make peace between them with justice and be fair, for God loves those who are fair and just. The believers are but a single brotherhood. So make peace and reconciliation between your two contending brothers. And fear God that ye may receive mercy.

And then God states in the Koran that all mankind are equal. All mankind, he created you from a single pair of a male and a female and made you into nations and tribes that ye

may know each other, not that ye may despise each other. Verily, the most honored of you in the sight of God is he who is the most righteous of you. And God has full knowledge and is well acquainted with all things.

We are grateful to almighty God, master of our lives. Through thy benevolent ways and mercy, we have assembled here this morning in the spirit of joy and happiness to express our thankfulness and seek thy blessings on this occasion. We beseech your help in all of our daily endeavors and express our sincere thanks for the guidance you have shown to us.

O God, guide us to your ways, the ways of righteousness and peace. Grant us peace, O Lord, peace. Help us to do your will in our lives, in our relations and in our affairs.

O God, send your mercy on those who die in the good cause of yours, and make heaven their last rest.

O God, bless the sincere intentions of those who are gathering here today. Amen.

Congressman STENHOLM. Once again, good morning. I've always loved King Solomon's words, to everything there is a time and a season. As a farmer, which is what I am in real life, I understand the idea of a time to sow and a time to reap. We have some great sowing going on here this morning through the messages we will be receiving through our honored guests, through the fellowship occurring at each table, through the overwhelming sense of belonging to one family in Christ. As we look around at this crowd of brothers and sisters, 140 countries are represented, with 450 international guests here this morning, seeds are being planted everywhere. And it's not just here that the fellowship of believers are gathered. On this very morning, 71 groups involving 2,563 people in 32 states are joining us in prayer. I know that after we leave our various gatherings, God will continue to provide sunshine and rain so that all around the world those seeds will produce beautiful crops for later reaping.

But the Bible also makes clear that while certain things are for a given time or a season, others are for all times and all seasons. Take rejoicing, for example. Sitting in a cold, dark prison, St. Paul told us to rejoice in the Lord always. As a nation, yes, even as a world, we have many serious concerns today. We worry about the lives of those who are separated from us. And we worry what the future might bring. But the word of God tells us that even in dark days, perhaps especially in dark days, our spirit needs the rejuvenation which rejoicing in the Lord brings.

St. Paul tells us of something else which isn't seasonal, but rather is for all times, who instructs us to pray without ceasing. One of this week's messages on the "Day-by-Day with Billy Graham" calendar sitting on my desk says this: "Prayer is the rope that pulls God and man together. But it doesn't pull God down to us, it pulls us up to Him." On behalf of the House and Senate Prayer Breakfast Groups, I welcome you to join in the planning, the reaping, the rejoicing and praying this morning will bring. With hands united with our brothers and sisters, and reaching upward toward our Father, we ask him to pull us up so that we might be blessed by his gracious love and then sent forth into all the world to carry his good word.

Now let me introduce a few of the people sitting at this head table. First, the lady who needs no introduction to anyone in America, especially the children of our country. Let me present to you our dear first lady, Barbara Bush.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. Mrs. Bush, you made us all smile a while back when we heard of your antics on the sled—

(Laughter.)

Congressman STENHOLM [continuing].—Antics—I heard you wiped out half a forest, but—

(Laughter.)

Congressman STENHOLM [continuing].—But your grandchildren enjoyed it. But we want you to know that you've warmed our hearts even more by the care you've taken in reminding us of the special needs of all of our children right now. War is a particularly frightening thing for children. And you're the one who has helped us adults remember to take time and plenty of hugs in trying to explain to our youngsters the events of today's world. You may be "Granny" to your own grandchildren, but you're supergrandmother to the whole country. And we love you for it.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. Next, I'm honored to introduce several foreign dignitaries who have traveled many miles to be with us today. Three heads of foreign state—first off, President Arpad Goncz of Hungary. Mr. President?

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. Prime Minister Jeffrey Henry of the Cooke Islands.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. Prime Minister Ratu Sir Kamisese Mara of Fiji.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. In addition, we have with us the Vice President of Costa Rica, Vice President Serrano.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. And Vice President Salgado of Guatemala.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. And Vice President Garcia of Peru.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. We are especially pleased that each of you are with us today.

Now let me quickly introduce some of the others sitting at our head table. I would ask each individual to stand as you're introduced and to remain standing and to please hold your applause until we can properly greet them all. Beginning at my far left, Mrs. Kingsley Gallup, wife of George Gallup.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. Only in the Congress can we disagree with the rules.

(Laughter.)

Congressman STENHOLM. Mrs. Sally Hardisty, wife of Admiral Huntington Hardisty.

Mrs. Nancy Domenici, wife of Senator Pete Domenici.

Mrs. Cindy Stenholm, wife of Charlie Stenholm.

Mrs. Ruth Graham, wife of Dr. Billy Graham.

Mrs. Linda Jordan, wife of Dr. I. King Jordan.

Dr. Joseph Novello, husband of Dr. Antonia Novello.

Now welcome everyone.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. And I goofed—Mrs. Millie Akaka, wife of Senator Daniel Akaka.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. We're pleased to have all of you here this morning.

Turning now to a man who needs no introduction to this crowd or truly to virtually anyone in the world. The man who has been the president's pastor for many administra-

tions, Dr. Billy Graham will bring us a brief message. Dr. Graham.

(Applause.)

Dr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, Mrs. Bush, Mr. Stenholm and distinguished guests, we're meeting at a time of world crisis, a very critical moment. And I'm delighted that my friend, Joe Gibbs is going to bring the message because he can tell us how to win games. And next year, I hope that there will be a peace and perhaps he can have some of these people like General Schwarzkopf and the people that are running this war sitting by his side so the Redskins will be at the Super Bowl, and win the Super Bowl.

(Applause.)

Dr. GRAHAM: But we've come here primarily as we've already heard for one reason and that's to reflect on God and his concern for us. We've also come to pray that He will give us a spirit of repentance for our failures to live up to His commandments and to ask Him for wisdom at this crucial hour in our history.

And perhaps more than any prayer breakfast that I can remember, the one main subject that everybody is thinking about is peace. None of us knows what the future holds. But almost all of us would agree that the world is passing through an extremely dangerous time. And if ever there was a need to pray and to seek God's help, it is now.

The word peace is on the lips of everyone today. The Bible—and as we've already heard the Koran—tell us that throughout the history of the human race peace has been the constant cry of the human heart. Even today when Arabic speaking people meet, they greet each other with the word salaam or peace. When Jewish people meet, they greet each other with the word shalom, which is the Hebrew word for peace. When the angels announced the birth of Jesus, they declared, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace." And it's interesting that the three great religions of the world, three of the great religions of the world—Islam, Judaism, Christianity—all come from that part of the world in which our eyes are on the television screens today in which the difficulties are occurring.

And yet, almost 2,000 years after we heard so much about peace, peace is elusive and fragile and difficult to obtain. And we ask ourselves what is the basic problem? Jesus said, in this world you will have trouble. He did not teach that the world would ever have complete peace till the Messiah comes and the Kingdom of God reigns. In fact, he said the opposite would be the case. Does that mean we should not work for peace and pray for peace? Certainly not. We should do everything we can to promote peace. Jesus himself said, "Blessed are the peacemakers." But at the same time, Jesus warned us not to be surprised when peace breaks down.

The problem of war and peace is not just a political or an economic problem alone, important as that may be. The problem, the Bible says, is a deeper one. It's the problem of the human heart. There come times in human history when nations have to stand against some monstrous evil like Nazism or as we're standing today.

The writer of the New Testament Book of James says, what causes fights and quarrels and wars among you? Don't they come from your desires that battle within you? You want something and you don't get it. You kill and you covet, but you cannot have what you want. The real problem is with the greed, selfishness, and lust for power that dwells within the human heart that we're seeing an illustration of in the Middle East today.

Why are we this way? The Bible says it's because we're alienated from God. The Koran teaches that. The Bible teaches that. God created us. He loves us. But we've lived our lives neglecting him. And when Mohammed was going to do his meditations, he was searching for the faith of Abraham. And the faith of Abraham was the same faith that the other parts of the world were searching for. And it's the faith we need today, the faith of total submission to God. And that is what the Bible means when it says that we are sinners. It doesn't mean that all are terrible people. It simply means we've left God out of our lives. And we've paid a price because we've substituted something or someone instead of God.

Jesus said, in this world you will have trouble. But he also said, in me you can have peace. And whether it's your personal situation in your family, with your neighbors, in business, or just something in your life that you don't understand but that drives you to seek counsel from psychologists, psychiatrists and even clergy.

(Laughter.)

Dr. GRAHAM. The world only gives us peace when there are peaceful circumstances. But Christ promises the peace of God in our hearts regardless of the circumstances. And I say to you here today that God can help heal our broken relationships. That is why he sent his Son to the cross to die for our sins. He took humanity by one hand and His Father God by the other and brought us together at the cross.

And you can find that same peace and that same joy that he promises to all of those that put his trust in Him. And it's my prayer today that every single person in this place will leave here and we will be praying. We'll be praying for a prayer of repentance, a prayer of belief and a prayer for a new beginning for America. And that I believe we're in the beginning of that new beginning right now, and that our best days, as we heard the other night, our best days are before us. God bless you.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. Our Old Testament reading will be given to us by another Member of the 96th Congress, a friend who is now Governor of the State of Louisiana, Buddy Roemer.

(Applause.)

Governor ROEMER. Mr. President, thanks, Charlie. I dedicate my remarks this morning to the memory of Laverne Demler of Bossier City, Louisiana, who died on Tuesday of this week after a long and courageous struggle. The Old Testament reading is from First Kings, Chapter 3, Verses 5, 9 and 10.

Now, as usual, Stenholm has given me 180 seconds. So let's see what I can do. The Old Testament is best described by a single word, passion. The New Testament by a single word, others. Jesus lived and died for others, do unto others, always others. Hard to do. But the Old Testament is about personal, private passion. Everything in the Old Testament is the oldest, the youngest, the wettest, the driest, the hottest, the prettiest, the ugliest, the longest, the shortest, the worst, the best passion. Very few wimps on the pages of the Old Testament.

(Laughter.)

Governor ROEMER. Now, my passion is fly fishing. Hey, Mike, how are you? Mike Sullivan, the Governor of Wyoming, I fish there often. It has little to do with the fish. It's about cold mountain water and pine trees and bear and deer and geese and campfires and poker and hearts and laughter and tears. It's about my three kids and a father and his

sons and a father and his daughter and an open spirit. It's about God's vast outdoors and about being humble, and it's about eagles, too.

On August 2 last year—interesting day, August 2—my kids and I and a group of 20 were fly fishing on the Snake River near Jackson Hole, Wyoming. After several unsuccessful hours in a narrow gorge, my guide said, look down river, Buddy. And I did. And 400 yards away, coming up the river at us three foot above the water was a bald eagle. Huge. Four hundred yards, 300 yards, 200 yards, 100 yards. So beautiful it took our breath away. Making not a sound, but drowning out all other noise.

Fifty yards out, the eagle went down into the river and rose out of the river with my trout.

(Laughter.)

Governor ROEMER. It was beautiful, the trout particularly. But I'll never forget the water pouring from the brown, white and black feathers of the bald eagle as he rose to meet the sky, flying right past my open-mouthed face to the nest above the river.

Just when I thought it was over, my guide said, look back again, Buddy, and I did. And there was a baby bald eagle flying the same flight path as his father or mother. Four hundred yards, 300 yards, 200, 100. Fifty yards out he went down into the water and he came up with no fish, but he flew right past us again to the nest.

Learning how to fish, that's the lesson God taught so beautifully to this cowboy that day and the lesson that God teaches to us in the Old Testament. Our job, yours and mine, is to teach our children how to fish. First Kings is such a lesson. It is about Solomon, who was the son of David, King of Israel and Bathsheba. In First Kings, Solomon becomes King of Israel. And God appears to him in Verse 5, and I read the Verse: "The Lord appeared to him in a dream that night and told him to ask for anything he wanted and it would be given to him."

What if you were given that wish this morning? What would you ask for? Health, happiness, wealth, fame, peace, pleasure, purpose, victory? My wish is for our President. May he receive from God what Solomon wished for, Verses 9 and 10. Solomon asked, "Give me an understanding heart so that I can govern your people well and know the difference between what is right and what is wrong. For who, by himself, is able to carry such a heavy responsibility? And the Lord was pleased that Solomon had asked for wisdom."

For you, an understanding heart, Mr. President, wisdom, you are not alone. For the world, peace. Thanks.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. Marcy Kaptur, Representative from the 9th District of Ohio, a gracious lady in every way, a faithful attendee of the House Prayer Breakfast each Thursday morning, and someone I'm proud to call my colleague and my friend. Marcy brings us greetings from the House of Representatives. Marcy?

(Applause.)

Congresswoman KAPTUR. President and Mrs. Bush, people of God, the people's House, which I am honored to represent today, reflects in its membership, the deep and abiding faith of the American people. We are inner-faith and ecumenical. Whether our constituents worship in mosques or in synagogues, in great cathedrals or in roadside chapels, each Member of the House knows that the American people are searching to find God's way, pilgrims all.

American history is synonymous with religious freedom, freedom to worship, but no mandate to worship. Our search has been a movement from the covenant ethos of America as the new Jerusalem, the new chosen people to a larger and more inclusive vision that we Americans, like all people of this world, have need for God's mercy.

I bring you greetings from the Thursday morning House Prayer Breakfast Group. We begin our day with the religious reading given by a Member, at least one hymn sung by all and a presentation by a sitting Member of his or her life history and the relationship of faith to life and work. We end with a prayer and loud amen.

Fellowship is good leavening for the House. That camaraderie often transfers to our daily work in which Member can be pitted against Member on matters of national and global concern. The Prayer Group helps us remain a collegial body.

The president of the Prayer Group this year is Charles Stenholm of Ericksdahl, Texas. Bill Emerson of Cape Girardeau, Missouri, is our vice president. Our official chaplain is the Reverend James Ford, Chaplain of the U.S. House and former chaplain at West Point. Our assistant to the chaplain is Congressman Sonny Montgomery of Meridian, Mississippi, assisted by the able Bob Stump of Arizona.

At each prayer meeting, Congressman Montgomery presents a report to us on sick and wounded Members of Congress and events of importance. We learn of weddings, new babies or the loss of loved ones, illnesses and recoveries. We pray for both Republicans and Democrats.

Now, the assistant to the assistant chaplain is Congressman Tom Bevill of Jasper, Alabama. Because of their seniority, Congressmen Bevill and Montgomery have chairs of honor in the assembly always reserved just for them.

Good memories abound. We've hosted visiting members from foreign parliaments, always members of the House, of course.

Of late, we've reviewed together the religious tenets underlying just causes for war. We've spoken to emerging faith communities from societies that are not free. We've prayed for Congressman Floyd Spence of South Carolina's miraculous recovery, and to congratulate John Myers of Indiana, one proud grandpa on the birth of his first grandchild, Justin Augustus.

We learn from each other. Congressman John Lewis of Atlanta, Georgia, embodies the full meaning of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s beloved community. Of course, what you may not know about John Lewis is that a childhood dream was to own a Sears and Roebuck \$19.95 chicken egg incubator.

Not one of us can forget our yuletide prayer sessions. Congressman Jake Pickle of Texas often wields his 100-year old wheezing foot pedal, bright red organ down for the occasion. And Congressman Leon Panetta of California, the very serious chairman of the Budget Committee, has been known to pound "Away in a Manger" and "Jingle Bells" as Members chime in full tones. The organ is autographed with hundreds of names of those famous in House history, including Speaker Sam Rayburn.

Really, the House Prayer Group presents a most human and compassionate face of the House. It is largely hidden from public view, as it should be. Like all Americans being buffeted daily by the winds of war, we will draw solace and hope, praying together in the days ahead. We know that war is the ultimate abandonment of reason and of love.

But we have as we recall the words of Pope John Paul VI, "If you want peace, work for justice."

At this time, I'd like to ask all the Members of the House of Representatives, former Members as well, to stand up and join me in greeting those of you in attendance in saying to you, may the love and peace of God go with you, the United States of America and the world. Thank you. Please stand up, Members of the House. Thank you.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. Thank you, Marcy.

One of the things which has made our nation great from its beginning is the freedom granted to worship God in whatever way an individual finds appropriate. While he may not be comfortable in a high vaulted cathedral, the American cowboy has always had a special relationship with the Creator. Wandering across the vast lands of the West, working with God's creatures, the cowboy often has a very personal but very real relationship with the almighty God. Here to bring us the cowboy's prayer is Red Steagall, a constituent, a cowboy and a poet from West Texas. Red?

(Applause.)

Mr. STEAGALL. Thank you, Charlie, Mr. President and Mrs. Bush. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm deeply honored to be here. And I just wish the boys in the bunkhouse could see me right now.

(Laughter and applause.)

Mr. STEAGALL. The only room they've every seen this big was full of hay.

(Laughter.)

Mr. STEAGALL. They've never seen this many people together at one time except at a George Strait dance.

(Laughter.)

Mr. STEAGALL. I am thrilled to death to be here. And Mr. President, they wanted me to tell you that we all have our best horse staked next to the wagon and we're ready to roll our beds and go anywhere you need us.

(Applause.)

Mr. STEAGALL. Cowboy poetry is a uniquely American art form. It talks about the lives, the beliefs, the philosophies of a group of people whose spirit and dedication of their way of life still has a drastic influence on Americans all over the world. This particular poem was written by Badger Clark somewhere around the turn of the century:

"Oh, Lord, I've never lived where churches grow.

I love creation better as it stood
That day You finished it so long ago
And looked upon Your work and called it good.

I know that others see you in the light
That's sifted down through tinted window panes,

And yet, I seem to feel you near tonight
In this dim, quiet starlight in the plains.

I thank You, Lord, that I am placed so well,
That You have made my freedom so complete;

That I'm no slave of whistle, clock or bell,
No weak-eyed prisoner of wall and street.

Just let me live my life as I have begun
And give me work that's open to the sky;
Make me a partner of the wind and sun
And I won't ask a life that's soft or high.

Let me be easy on the man that's down;
Let me be square and generous with all.
I'm careless sometimes, Lord, when I'm in town,

But never let 'em say I'm weak or small!
Make me as big and open as the plains
As honest as the hawse between my knees

Clean as the wind that blows behind the rains,

Free as the hawk that circles down the breeze!

Forgive me, Lord, if sometimes I forget.
You know about the reasons that are hid.
You understand the things that gall and fret;
You know me better than my mother did.
Just keep an eye on all that's done and said
And right me sometimes, when I turn aside.
And guide me on the long, dim trail ahead
That stretches upward toward the Great Divide.
Amen."

(Applause.)

(End of Side 1, Tape 1.)

Congressman STENHOLM. Well done, Red. If you haven't noticed, there's a copy of that in your program this morning.

Dr. I. King Jordan became deaf at an early age, but recently broke the sound barrier by becoming president of Gallaudet College. Welcome Dr. I. King Jordan.

(Applause.)

Dr. JORDAN. Thank you, Congressman Stenholm. President and Mrs. Bush, ladies and gentlemen, I will read from the New Testament. First from 1st Thessalonians, Chapter 5, Verses 13 and 14:

"Hold one another in highest regard and love because of their work. Live in peace with each other. And we urge you brothers, warn those who are idle, encourage the timid, help the weak, be patient with everyone. Make sure that nobody pays back wrong for wrong. But always try to be kind to each other and to everyone else.

Be joyful always. Pray continually. Give thanks in all circumstances. For this is God's will for you and Christ Jesus."

My second reading is from 1st Peter, Chapter 3, Verses 8 to 18:

"Finally, all of you live in harmony with one another. Be sympathetic. Love as brothers. Be compassionate and humble. Do not repay evil with evil, but with blessing, because to this you were called so that you may inherit a blessing. For whoever would love life and see good days must keep his tongue from evil and his lips from deceitful speech. He must turn from evil and do good. He must seek peace and pursue it.

For the eyes of the Lord are on the righteous. And His ears are attentive to their prayers. But the face of the Lord is against those who do evil.

Who is going to harm you if you do good? But even if you should suffer for what is right, you are blessed. Do not fear what they fear. Do not be frightened. But in your hearts set apart Christ as Lord.

Always be prepared to give the reason for the hope that you have. But do this with gentleness and respect, keeping a clear conscience so that those who speak maliciously against your good behavior may be ashamed of their slander. It is better if it is God's will to suffer for doing good than for doing evil, for Christ died for sins once for all, for the righteous, for the unrighteous to bring you to God."

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. Senator Pete Dominici from New Mexico has a reputation for being hard working, intense, frank, one of the major leaders in the Senate, and the father of eight children. I guess that last accomplishment is the most demanding and the one of which he is the most proud. Pete will now bring us greetings from the United States Senate.

(Applause.)

Senator DOMENICI. Thank you very much, Charlie. Mr. President and Mrs. Bush, distin-

guished guests and friends all, first might I say we are not yet finished and I think we have already had one of the finest National Prayer Breakfasts ever. And I think maybe we ought to in advance thank Charlie. Could you join me in saying thanks?

(Applause.)

Senator DOMENICI. You heard from our distinguished House Member something about how the House Prayer Group conducts themselves. It falls on me of my own choice to talk about the Senate Prayer Group in a slightly different way. In my own way, I'm going to try to tell you very briefly for I, too, have been allotted little time. The only one that did not have any time allotted was the Reverend Billy Graham. I think it was fine that we did it that way, however.

(Laughter.)

Senator DOMENICI. But it falls to me to tell you in my own way briefly why I think the Senate Prayer Group meets, and maybe that might tell us all a little bit about why we're here. But first, let me say that I bring you greetings from them. This is a group made up of many Senators from both parties, and they meet every Wednesday. It is clear to many of us that this meeting fulfills some special need. And it is obvious that it's a need beyond the processes of being a Senator or the Senate, beyond personal power and personal achievement that frequently typifies our lives.

It is a need some of us think is prompted by the demands of our conscience and the conflicts that we sometimes feel between our conscience and that which we are expected to do. In short, I think we meet because we worry about decisions we have to make. And we turn to our God, our Christ, our dear friends in that time of worry. Recent decisions that my colleagues and I have had to make serve as an example of difficult choices. All of us know that there are many famous admonitions by Jesus, but one that he gave to us on the Mount said, "But I say to you who here love your enemies. Be good to those who curse you. Pray for those who mistreat you."

We don't really care for war. And some of us recall the scripture that Paul the Apostle writes in Romans, "Never pay back evil to anyone. Respect what is right in the sight of all men. Be at peace with all men. Never take your own revenge." And so on.

When we considered the events of the Persian Gulf—and obviously our dear President had even more and it was more personal and more focused—but many of us, whether we knew it or not, were recalling some of these passages and they were in our consciences and we worried. We were troubled. Our very consciousness, specific or just there, of the words of Christ compelled us to approach decisions of this type with great care and in all humility. And I believe that for many, because of this, decisions such as the ones we have made don't come easily. And without deep inner struggle, when someone asks me what is the practical difference Jesus Christ has made, especially in the world of Washington, I think of the kinds of decisions that my colleagues and I made earlier. And I think of the struggle within us. I think of the reverence we have for life. I think how good it is that we worry. And knowingly or otherwise recall Christ's words as we make these difficult decisions. I think that it is good that we only reluctantly are willing to commit to any course other than peace, even when the course of conflict seems right. That's why we're here this morning. In a real way, week by week, not in such dramatic issues as this one, that is what compels us to

get together in fellowship and prayer, the awesome consequences of our decisions.

So if I can bring just one thought to you this morning from the Senate Prayer Group, it is this: we worry and we thank God that we do.

And Mr. President, we know you worry. And we know you have a right conscience. And we love you for both.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. Thank you, Pete.

Whether in the United States Congress, the small towns of America or overseas, no thought is more prominent right now than the wish for quickly achieved peace. Our thoughts and prayers have been continuing with the young men and women involved in today's turmoil in Desert Storm and the leaders who make decisions affecting all of us. Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Pacific Command, Admiral Huntington Hardisty, will now lead us in a prayer for peace. Admiral Hardisty.

(Applause.)

Admiral HARDISTY. Let us pray. O God, our hope in ages past, our hope in years to come, our shelter from the stormy bliss, and our eternal home. In the midst of turmoil and strife, we come before You today with praise, with thanksgiving and with the sure knowledge that You have brought us safely through many trying times in the past. We praise You, Almighty God as the Creator of the universe, the author of freedom and justice and the Father of all mankind.

We thank You for all that has been given us, the bounty of this nation and this planet, the company of our friends and our fellow man, the freedom to choose our own destiny and the heritage and the spirit and the indomitable will to do what is right.

We ask for Your guidance, O God, and Your help, especially in these difficult days as we strive to bring freedom to those who are oppressed and peace where now there is war.

God grant strength to those who serve. Still their hearts and steady their hands that they might accomplish their duties without fear for themselves and with the sure knowledge that the welfare of their loved ones at home is foremost in the hearts of all Americans.

God grant solace to those who wait. Calm their thoughts and restore their souls as they meet each day confident in Your help.

God grant peace to those who suffer. Soothe their hurts and ease their pain with the knowledge that our cause is just.

God grant wisdom to those who lead, both here and in the field. Renew their tremendous courage and strengthen their resolve that they may bring the war in the Mideast to a quick and just conclusion.

And finally, God, be our guide and strongest force as we work for the time when the peoples of the earth will foreswear aggression, a day when nation shall not lift up sword against nation anymore; a time in which a truly peaceful and prosperous world can be achieved, and one in which unfortunate and more fortunate nations and peoples work together to foster religious freedom, human rights, economic development, self-sufficiency, representative government and support the democratic principles.

We ask all these things in Your Holy Name, amen.

Congressman STENHOLM. Last Sunday, many of us watched the faces of our military men and women overseas, huddled in their blankets in the middle of the night, cheering wildly for their favorite New York football team. If you felt like I did, that picture

alone was reason enough to make me glad the Super Bowl carried on this year. But we have a man here today who knows a little bit about going to the Super Bowl. And I'm sure he would have rather been there than wherever he was. And I'm not sure how a lifelong Dallas Cowboy fan like me got talked into inviting the coach of the Redskins to be our main speaker today.

(Laughter.)

Congressman STENHOLM. But it happened. In truth, I have respected Joe Gibbs for as long as I have known of him. And I'm very proud to have the chance to introduce him today. He's a man always named as one of the top football coaches in America. And he takes his job as seriously as any man could. And yet he manages to keep his priorities straight. I'm reminded of a Vince Lombardi quote in which that great coach was reported to tell all of his players, if you want to play for me, your priorities are in this order: Your God, your country, your family, the Green Bay Packers and everything else. And I've suspected that that is Joe Gibbs' philosophy by what we see.

Whether it's the way he leads his team, or his commitment to youth for tomorrow—a residential facility for teenage boys he built several years ago—this is a man of God who puts his faith into action. Join me in welcoming Joe Gibbs, head coach of the Washington Redskins.

(Applause.)

Coach GIBBS. Thank you, Charlie. Getting invited by a Dallas Cowboy man, you'll notice that I did not eat my breakfast this morning.

(Laughter.)

Coach GIBBS. I was a little suspicious of that.

Mr. President and Barbara, it is our desire to surround you with prayer, particularly at these times, and to all the other members of the other countries out there and the leaders of the 140 countries or so that are represented here this morning, that is our prayer, to surround you with prayer for wisdom.

To Billy and Ruth Graham, I want to thank you for traipsing all over the world, spreading the name of Jesus Christ. At age 5 my mother and grandmother took me to one of your crusades in Asheville, North Carolina, and I'll tell you what, they made sure I was there. Thanks for all the years of commitment.

(Applause.)

Coach GIBBS. I'm going to speak to you this morning about the only thing I am qualified to speak about and that's my life. Because for some reason, being a football coach and being up here, it seems a lot easier, Mr. President, to decide who to give the ball to on 4th and 1 than made some of the decisions you have to make.

(Laughter.)

Coach GIBBS. I'm going to share a little bit about my life. And it has been as a football coach and it's been working with people. Basically, my whole life has been involved with recruiting and trying to put together a team. Buddy, as you mentioned, I guess you could say my life has been one of trying to decide who the wimps are and not getting them.

(Laughter.)

Coach GIBBS. Because they just don't seem to do well out there, you know?

(Laughter.)

Coach GIBBS. I'm going to share some things about my personal life. And my hope is that by me opening up my life and Pat's life, that we can share some things that would maybe help some of you this morning.

In 1963, I graduated from San Diego State, the Harvard of the West—

(Laughter.)

Coach GIBBS. I stepped out like many of you and I think that my desire was this, it was simply this: I wanted to be successful, and I wanted to be happy. And as I embarked on that at 23 years old, I jumped out in the world and I really started looking at what does the world say that would make me happy and successful? And basically the world was telling me this: It said that I needed to make money, I needed to gain position, or obtain a position of power. And, of course, in my case, it was to win football games.

The second thing that the world was telling me was that it was my friend, that it would be with me, and it was going to be kind of right there by my side.

The third thing the world was really kind of telling me at that point of my life was that I only had one life to live, and once I had lived that life on this earth, that it was over. And so I needed to do my own thing.

And so I embarked, I spent about nine years of my life trying to accomplish those things that the world told me would make me happy. Nine years later in 1972, I found myself at the University of Arkansas, and you know what happened to me? Every time I accomplished something I thought was really important, winning football games or any other thing, I found an emptiness in my life. In 1972 I think God surrounded me with some Christian people, and I started looking at their lives and I started adding up the things that I had tried for in the last nine years. There was a young man who was recruiting in Pasadena, Texas, as a matter of fact, who made a big impression upon me, because Pat and I had just had our first son, and I was trying to make up my mind as to what kind of a father I was going to be. As I looked at this young man and the life that he and his parents had, I thought, that's the kind of relationship that I want to have. It was six months into that recruiting process before I found out that he was an adopted son.

I was around another assistant coach, a friend of mine, Don Breaux. I was with Don two years before that, and I had seen a miraculous change in his life. In two years, his outlook toward his wife had changed, his language had changed, and the moral direction of his life had changed. I was looking at this guy thinking, what has caused this, what has caused this change in his life?

I was also around a Sunday school teacher, George Tharel, who really became my spiritual father. He was teaching that little Sunday school class there in Fayetteville, Arkansas and being faithful to God. And I took a look at all those guys and I started to discover something. I discovered that, really, the world had been telling me a lie.

Let me illustrate that by saying this. In 1983 we had just won a big football game here in Washington, and I was all cranked up on myself. We had just won a big game and we were going to play in Dallas the next week for the division championship. I came home that night and was all excited about myself. I got up the next morning and—you know, God puts those women there for us, doesn't he, guys—and I remember charging around that house and thinking to myself, boy, this is something this week, I've really got something important here and what an important guy I am. And I remember Pat telling me, "Joe, pick up your socks and your bathrobe and put them back. I'm telling you for the last time."

(Laughter.)

Coach GIBBS. Pat started to share something with me about one of our boys, and I

can remember thinking, why would she spend time this morning bothering me with something about one of my sons? This important guy is getting ready to go out and coach this football game and my wife is bothering about these things. So, I kind of slammed the door and kind of huffed off like I do sometimes in the morning.

I had a little prayer time in the car on the way to work and I don't think I'll ever forget the reality that struck me. When I got to work, I called Pat on the phone and this is what I said, "Pat, I want to tell you something. What you're taking care of at home is more important than what I'm taking care of at work."

And, you know, that's what the world tells us, isn't it? It tells us that being a football coach and winning these games or being president of a company is the most important thing in the world. And really, how many times have we heard our mothers say, I'm just a housewife?

The bottom line is this. The world was telling me that my job was the most important thing in my life, and that wasn't the case at all. My wife is taking care of something at home which was far more important than all those football games I was coaching, and that was my children. The most important thing I am going to leave here on earth is going to be my children and the influence I have had on others.

Do you know, when I stop and think about that, it really does grab me and it puts some reality back in my life. The second point, of course, is that the world was telling me at that point that it was my friend and it was really caring for me, and I illustrate this a couple of different ways. When the world tells a football coach it's your friend, you really get those cheers, I'm always reminded, because I know how you fans think every time it's 4th and 1. When I came here and got this job in Washington, the first couple of times it was 4th and 1, I heard all you fans yelling, go for it! I said to myself, these fans want to go for it. And I thought, well, obviously, if these fans want to go for it, I'm going for it. And about the third time we didn't make it, all you fans went, boo—

(Laughter.)

Coach GIBBS. I stopped and thought about that and I thought, from now on I'm not going off of what the fans say, I'm going off of what I say.

I think as a football coach I have been given a unique opportunity to see how the world reacts week to week. With that in mind, I have another illustration. In 1983 we had one of our best teams. We went 14 and 2 and had lost two games by one point. We had an excellent quarterback in Joe Theismann, a big running back in John Riggins, and a great defense. And you know in this town, I came here in '81 and we struggled through 8 and 8. We won the Super Bowl the next year, and the next year we had this fantastic season going. People here were starting to say that I was pretty bright, actually saying things like a genius. And, the worst part of that was that I was beginning to believe it.

(Laughter.)

Coach GIBBS. I come here and I start coaching this football team. And here we are having this great football season. We go to Tampa that year and we are to play the Raiders in the Super Bowl. I'm afraid some of you probably remember that game! But really, the world at that point was saying, hey, Joe Gibbs is a pretty sharp guy. We start this football game, and as some of you probably remember, the first half was one of the worst I've ever experienced. Everything

seemed to go wrong. We got a punt blocked and everything seemed to be falling apart on us. We were going nowhere and the Raiders are going up and down the field, and we're behind. And it came down to a decision in the first half of that game for which I'll probably be remembered forever.

Mr. President, there were 12 seconds to go and I had a choice to make on the sideline. I had to make a decision similar to what you have to make every day, although this wasn't quite that important. Twelve seconds to go. What am I going to do, fall on the football? I thought, hey, what would the fans want to do? Should we fall on this football, run this clock out, or should we take a chance? I know how you fans are, you'd say, take a chance, man, and that's exactly what I thought.

I was standing there and Joe Theismann was yacking on one side and people were yelling and screaming, and bloods flying, and I said, "Hey, shut up!" I thought to myself, the first thing we're going to do here is we're going to take a chance. We're backed up on our own 20, so we're going to throw a safe pass and hopefully pick up here about 25 or 30 yards, (you couldn't reach the end zone with a "Hall Mary" from where we were at 80 yards away). And it makes logic, doesn't it? And I said, "We're going to throw this safe pass, hopefully get about 25, 30 yards, call time out because we have two time outs left, and take a shot at the end zone." That to me sounded very smart.

I'm here to tell you that in football when you're 80 yards away from the goal line with 12 seconds to go, nobody plays man to man—

(Laughter.)

Coach GIBBS. So I called the safe screen pass. Joe Theismann dropped back and turned to his left to dump the ball off to Joe Washington. One linebacker from the Raiders went man to man, picked off the ball and went in the end zone with it.

And I can truthfully tell you this, and this really happened to me, the next day in the "Washington Post" I was called a buffoon.

(Laughter.)

Coach GIBBS. Now you're laughing, but that hurt.

(Laughter.)

Coach GIBBS. But what I'm here to tell you, though, really this morning is this: If you're going to live by the world's standards, then that's the yo-yo that you're going to be on. You're going to have to make the right decision every time. As a football coach, you're going to have to win the game every time. And every time you slip, then the world is going to turn and you're going to get the boos.

Now on the other side of that, though, I discovered that there is something totally different here. There is God's love, and His love is unconditional.

And I want to share a couple of things about that—in my life, Pat and I, in those Super Bowl years of '82 and '83. I had made a decision to get in some investments, and it was over the top of Pat's best advice. You know, you should always listen to your wife. So I got into these investments because I really had not put my security in the Lord. I was putting it in the fact that I had this short-term contract. And I was worried about that and I wanted to make sure that I had enough money to put off to one side. I got into those investments and I thought it was a good idea. Believe me, for the next three years, Pat and I went through one of the toughest times in our lives.

As those investments started to fail, I sat down with attorneys to try and figure out

what had happened. I had gotten into a partnership and every time others signed their names, in essence, they were also signing mine. When things began to fail, everybody else left town and I was the only guy left that the creditors could find. After all, I was the head coach of the Washington Redskins.

During the next three years of our lives, I remember Pat saying to me several times that life wasn't a lot of fun. When the investments turned sour, I found myself on my knees in Oklahoma and I prayed this prayer:

"Lord, for all intents and purposes, I am bankrupt and I am going to have to depend on you. You are the only one that can conceivably get me out of this, but I am ready to go through whatever you have in store for me."

During those times, I learned so many things about my wife, so many things about myself, and so many things about my children, because we went through that period of three years of being tested. You know, when I look back on that, I wouldn't trade that time for anything.

My point is this: When you live for the world, you have to win every time, but when you live for God, and He loves you, His love, as opposed to the world's, is unconditional. He will love you forever. He loves you more in the bad times and the tough times than He does in the good. He's actually working in your life during that process. And certainly, He worked in my life during that time and I wouldn't trade that for anything. Yet the world, looking at that, probably would have said, Joe's a fool, which I was, and would have been booing.

In 1980, I came home from work one night and found Pat crying. I found out that for several weeks at the last part of that season she had hidden from me that she needed surgery for a brain tumor. We went in for surgery on the first day of that year. The tumor was located real close to all the facial nerves, and when my wife came out of that surgery several hours later, she had nerve damage on one side of her face. And, to see your wife, somebody who is absolutely beautiful, with a face that's so symmetrical and beautiful, and to see what happened to her and for us to have to live through that, I can truly tell you this in sharing this with you, that was the toughest time in my life.

But, knowing how she belonged to God and that He loved her no matter what, and that He had promised that everything in our lives was going to wind up for the best in the end, that gave us a great peace. And it doesn't matter whether it is a financial disaster or a physical disaster in our family, I feel that we have a confidence in knowing that we belong to God, and what a great peace that is. In the middle of everything that's happening around us, we can rise above those circumstances, as long as God is leading our lives.

I'm sharing three things with you here—a financial disaster, a physical disaster in our family, and an occupational disaster. As many of you remember, when I came to Washington, we started out 0-5, and to start out 0-5 in Washington, I tell you, you're just looking for a different way home at night.

(Laughter.)

Coach GIBBS. When I think back to that awful start, I know that God was just as real at 0 and 5 as He was in the Super Bowls. You see, whether it's vocationally or whether it's through a sickness or sometimes whether it is a financial disaster or many other ways that God always walks with us, He does what? He loves us more in the adversity than He does when the rest of the world is cheer-

ing us and we're winning. He actually is more evident during those times of adversity.

The third thing that the world was telling me was that I only had one life and I needed to do my own thing, and that is what the world is thinking today. I found out that wasn't the case at all, but that God made us special and He loves us and He put a soul in us. He made us for a personal relationship with Him. And actually we are going to live forever.

Boy, did that gripe me when I discovered that. I wasn't just going to live to a certain point and then die and disappear, but my soul was going to live forever. The point is, we are either going to live with Him or separated from Him, and by me not making a decision to follow Him as my personal savior, I was going to live for the rest of my life separated from Him.

All those things came together in my life in 1972, and I went forward in church that night. Here is what I said:

"God, I know that You have been there, but I haven't been living for You, and I want to invite You into my life tonight. I want to make a personal commitment to You and to invite Jesus to live in my heart for the rest of my life.

I made that commitment to Him and I'm here to tell you that if I had time this morning, I would share with you about the many times that He has led Pat and me over these last 15 years or so that we've been living for Him. I can tell you about a job that I took in San Diego when I was backing up in my own direction and my career. I had a tremendous uneasiness about it. I wound up sitting in an airport picking up a Bible. How many of you have ever seen a Bible in an airport? I thumbed to the first chapter of James. A young guy sitting next to me said, "I've shared that same chapter in my life about six months ago." He relayed a conversation there that really put my whole life and the head coach position in perspective, and the right perspective for me.

Many people will say that that person sitting next to me at that moment was there just by accident. But, I'm here to tell you that time and time again, God has led me in my life. He gave me a peace about my occupation at that point. I went on to San Diego, and the coach whose job I would like to have had in San Diego got another job one week later, and I became the offensive coordinator there. Two years later, I was the head coach of the Washington Redskins.

It is great knowing that God has a purpose for our life, and I have felt Him lead me through different decisions in my life. I'm here really to say this to you: That you were invited to this breakfast this morning in the spirit and name of Jesus Christ. I don't believe it's an accident that you are here this morning, and I stand before you as a testimony that I can do nothing without Christ, and yet, I can do all things with Christ.

I can truthfully stand before you and say this: My life would be nothing if it wasn't for my personal relationship with Jesus Christ. And it is my desire this morning that if you could get anything from what I've said, that everybody out there would have that personal commitment and that relaxing feeling of knowing that you have made a commitment to Christ.

I share that with you and stand before you this morning seeking prayer and guidance for our President and all you others that have those important jobs leading us toward peace. And I do stand before you this morning saying thanks to you, God, for loving us

so much to give us Your Son, Jesus Christ, and thank You for letting me have this personal relationship with You.

Pat and I have shared this personal testimony with you, and it is our hope that each of you will have a personal relationship with our Savior.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. Well done, Coach.

We are taught to respect and revere the office of the President of the United States. That's a good thing. But sometimes in the process we lose sight of the fact that the President is also a human being. This is one President who reminds us of that in many positive ways. Having come from the House of Representatives, President Bush maintains a special relationship with we House Members through personal phone calls, handwritten notes and sometimes a game of racquetball with at least one Member. He is a human being who never has risen to a place where he felt he was too important for the personal touch.

President Bush, we respect you for your office, but we appreciate you for your humility and your caring. And right now, we're riding you awfully hard. But we're not going to put you up wet. Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States.

(Applause.)

President BUSH. Thank you all very much. Please be seated. Thank you, Charlie. Thank you very much for that warm welcome.

Thank you very much for that warm welcome and let me just greet our Prime Minister Henry here and Prime Minister Ratu Mara and President Goncz over here and all the other visitors from overseas. And I want to pay my special respects to the Members of the Senate and House prayer group. I'd also like to single out Doug Coe, who's been such a guiding light in all of this—

(Applause.)

President BUSH. And, of course, our special thanks to Joe Gibbs and to Governor Buddy Roemer for sharing in such a personal way their faith.

My heartfelt thanks goes out to everyone involved in this marvelous event. Dr. Graham was reminding Barbara and me when we came over here of its genesis and how President Eisenhower, he felt, seemed very nervous about whether this would be the right thing to do and whether it would be a fulfilling experience for the people that attended. And I expect Ike would, if he could have attended this one, would have had no doubts whatsoever.

I want to thank everyone for their concern and prayers about Barbara's recent accident. In these days of environmental terrorism, I can—

(Laughter.)

President BUSH [continuing]. I can happily report that the tree is bearing well and so is Barbara Bush doing very well, I might say. And I say that with considerable pride.

(Laughter and applause.)

President BUSH. This is a diverse group. I've never seen anything quite like it, politically or anything else. But we do have one thing in common. We stand together in prayer.

Let me just share a letter, a true letter I received here from a mother who told me a story about her five-year-old son's evening prayers. As he knelt by his bed, this kid was kneeling in prayer and his parents explained that they were going to pray together for President Bush so that he would have the wisdom to get the hostages out of Iraq. And after a minute of deep thinking, the little boy said, "Mom, how is a bush going to get

the people out of the rock and how'd they get there in the first place?"

(Laughter.)

President BUSH. Well, the mother in the wrap-up of the letter said that it was a good thing the Lord knew what the boy was praying for because he sure didn't.

(Laughter.)

President BUSH. But you know the hostages came out of Iraq.

So I believe the Lord does hear our prayers. Joe put it very beautifully here. I know our country is praying for peace. And across this nation, the churches, the synagogues, the mosques are packed, record attendance at services. In fact, the night the war began, Dr. Graham was at the White House and he spoke to us then of the importance of turning to God as a people of faith turning to him in hope. And then the next morning, Dr. Graham went over to Ft. Myer, where we had a lovely service, leading our nation in a beautiful prayer service there, with special emphasis on the troops overseas. So I expect when Barbara and I were there at that prayer service, we were only doing what everyone in America was doing, praying for peace.

You know, America is a nation founded under God. And from our very beginnings we've relied upon His strength and guidance in war and peace. And this is something we must never forget. Just yesterday—you're going to think I do nothing but read the mail—but just yesterday—

(Laughter.)

President BUSH [continuing]. I got a letter from a man who pointed out to me that during the State of the Union, a message that I had neglected to make any mention of God. And I was somewhat defensive about that. So I quickly went back and I did see at the very end, "May God bless America". But then I got to realizing that this man was correct. I have learned what I suppose every President has learned, and that is that one cannot be President of our country without faith in God and without knowing with certainty that we are one nation under God. So I think I should have made that clear, more clear, that God is our rock and salvation and we must trust Him and keep faith in Him.

And so we ask His blessings upon us and upon every member, not just of our armed forces, but of our coalition armed forces (end of side 2, tape 1) that is represented as these 28 countries stand up against aggression.

Today I am asking and designating that Sunday, February 3 be a national day of prayer. And I encourage all people of faith to say a special prayer on that day, a prayer for peace, a prayer for the safety of our troops, a prayer for their families, a prayer for the innocents caught up in this war, and a prayer that God will continue to bless the United States of America.

(Applause.)

Congressman STENHOLM. Well done, Mr. President.

The House Prayer Breakfast Group, unfortunately, has lost its song leader, who now calls the U.S. Senate his home. But this morning we are fortunate to have Senator Danny Akaka of Hawaii to lead us in the hymn, "In Christ There is no East or West". The Senator will sing the first verse, the choir will join in for the second and then we ask the entire audience to rise and to sing along on the final two verses. Please stand now as we sing our final hymn.

(Hymn.)

Congressman STENHOLM. Please be seated. We entered this hall this morning expecting to hear the voice of God and we have not been disappointed. Now that we have been

blessed by this sowing, let us remember our mission now to tend the crops, going into all nations, teaching the word of the Lord.

Our closing prayer will be led by George Gallup, a name which is a household word across America. Following the prayer, the Morehouse Glee Club will dismiss us with a song, "I Can't Tarry". We ask each of you to remain seated until the President and Mrs. Bush have left, and also, briefly give the other heads of state opportunity to leave before you get up and depart.

George Gallup.

Mr. GALLUP. Let us pray. O mighty and merciful God, who is present with us at this moment, and who hears the prayers and supplications of all faithful people, we close today with renewed hope and assurance of Your continuing love, love made known to us through Your Son, Jesus Christ.

We hold up to You our President and all other leaders of government who are so heavily burdened at this time. Grant them, we pray, wisdom and guidance as they seek to balance the need for peace and justice.

Heavenly Father, may this time of deep searching for Your will, a time when growing numbers of people are coming to You in intense and urgent prayer and at a time when people are attending our houses of worship in record numbers. May this be a time when we gain a new sense of Your purpose for our lives, secure in the knowledge that the closer we come to You, the closer we come to each other.

O God, may the light of Your Son continue to shine in the hearts and minds of those present and sustain each one of us in the days to come. Amen.

(Hymn.)

(Applause.)

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO ALLOW TAXPAYERS MORE EQUI- TABLE SYSTEM FOR CHARIT- TABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

HON. ROD CHANDLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, today, Mr. DORGAN and I are introducing legislation to re-establish a fair and equitable system for taxpayers to deduct contributions made to charitable organizations. The current system offers only taxpayers who itemize their deductions an incentive to make donations to charities. This does not properly serve the interests of low-to-middle-income taxpayers who typically do not itemize nor does it properly promote such worthwhile policy as encouraging contributions to charitable organizations. Our bill would allow taxpayers who do not itemize the ability to deduct contributions in excess of \$100.

Congress recognized in 1981 that taxpayers who did not itemize were not receiving a full tax benefit for their contributions to charity. It was also noted that allowing nonitemizers to deduct their contributions would stimulate broader based charitable giving to nonprofit organizations, many of which provide human services that otherwise might have to be provided by the Federal Government. After enactment of this change, gifts to nonprofit organizations surged.

In 1986, however, this policy was abruptly repealed—mainly for revenue reasons. Since that time, charitable deductions have sharply declined. So, too, has Federal Government spending on human service programs. This combination will only hurt one population—those who are served by charitable organizations. I do not think this is the intent of Congress. Therefore, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this measure.

CHARLES R. HADLEY ELEMENTARY RY CELEBRATES UNITY

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, tonight the Charles R. Hadley Elementary School, in Miami, with the support of its Parent Teacher Association, presents their "Unity Ceremony." This event is held to highlight the powerful need for unity beyond racial, religious and national barriers to face our world's problems. Two years ago, the Hadley school's art teacher, Mrs. Maria Guerrero, designed an official school seal which shows hands reaching across the continents of our globe so that together they may support it. The principal, Julio T. Carrera, has developed a theme from this seal emphasizing the role of the parent, teacher, child relationship in promoting tolerance and understanding worldwide.

Mrs. Francis Valdez, the president of the Charles R. Hadley Elementary School PTA, Mr. Carrera, and Carolyn L. McCalla, the assistant principal, have together worked to integrate this theme of global unity into the curriculum and student activities. Mr. Speaker, I commend these educational leaders and the faculty of Charles R. Hadley Elementary School in their effort to pursue teaching excellence and the promotion understanding.

A TRIBUTE TO CLARK BURNETT

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the outstanding contributions and fine public service of Clark Burnett, the outgoing president of the Chino Valley Chamber of Commerce. Clark will be honored for his fine work at a dinner in California in April.

A native Californian, Clark attended Chaffey High School, Chaffey College, and Cal State San Bernardino. For the last 24 years, he has held a number of management positions with the Southern California Edison Co. Clark is presently area manager serving as public relations liaison between the Edison Co. and the communities of Ontario, Montclair, Chino, and the San Bernardino County Dairy Preserve.

Needless to say, Clark is very active with the chambers of commerce in each of these cities. For the last year, he has served as president of the Chino Valley Chamber of

Commerce and as a board member of the Montclair Chamber of Commerce. He has also served on several committees of the Ontario, Montclair, and Chino chambers. In addition, he is a board member of the Ontario-Montclair YMCA and is a member of the Blady View Public/Private Coalition of Governments.

Clark has had tremendous success during his tenure as chamber president and is largely responsible for its positive growth. He is credited with initiating a new division system creating an executive board of president, president-elect, and three vice presidents. This new division, which assigned specific responsibilities to each position, eased the flow of information and improved chamber communications.

Clark was also very supportive of new publication formats during his term and was responsible for the completion of the new city directory. Publications providing up-to-date information to the membership regarding chamber activities reduced production costs. In addition, Clark's commitment to maintaining the chamber's mission statement—namely stimulating a positive quality of life and job development—encouraged greater development of the chamber's economic and legislative action committees. Clark's leadership is also credited with guiding the chamber to an all-time high membership development and communication.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me and our colleagues as we honor the fine achievements of Clark Burnett. He is a fine model of professional and community service and activism. I would like to wish Clark and his family many more years of success as he is recognized by the House today.

PANAMA CANAL IS OF VITAL IMPORTANCE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should seek to negotiate a new base rights agreement with Panama to allow United States troops to remain in Panama beyond December 31, 1999. The resolution also states that under the new agreement, our troops retain the ability to act independently to protect U.S. interests and the operation of the canal.

Under the terms of the 1977 Panama Canal Treaty, the United States is responsible for the operation and defense of the Panama Canal until December 31, 1999, after which the United States relinquishes control of the canal and all United States military personnel must withdraw from Panama.

One cannot overstate the importance of the canal both strategically and economically. The fact that the waterway is still considered a vital choke point in times of crisis is clearly illustrated by the fact that the number of warships to transit the canal since the beginning of the Persian Gulf crisis actually tripled. Without the canal, ships would have to make a 13,000-mile trip around Cape Horn, which takes approximately 3 weeks. The United States also depends a great deal on the Panama Canal

for its international trade. Currently, 15 percent of all U.S. imports and exports pass through the canal annually, and that percentage is on the rise.

Clearly, the Panama Canal is of vital importance to the United States. Its security cannot be jeopardized. While there is no question that Panamanian President Guillermo Endara has demonstrated his determination to restore democracy to Panama, we cannot ignore the fact that Panama has a history of unstable governments. As recently as December 1990, there was a coup attempt in which 100 members of the new police force seized control of police headquarters in Panama City. Had our troops not subdued the uprising, it is possible that Panama would now be controlled by another Noriega-style dictator.

We must take advantage of the friendly relationship which currently exists between the United States and Panama to secure our interests in the Panama Canal Zone. The political situation in Panama has changed dramatically since the signing of the treaty, and as many experts believe that Panamanian attitudes toward continued presence of United States troops in Panama have changed as well. No longer does one witness the fear of Yankee imperialism to the degree that existed many years ago. In fact, many Panamanian Government officials have openly stated that they would be receptive to the idea of negotiating a base rights agreement with the United States to allow our troops to remain in Panama after the 1999 deadline. This resolution simply seeks to move the process ahead.

TRIBUTE TO THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM ON ITS 250TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, this July, we will celebrate the 215th year of our union, the United States of America. But I have the privilege of representing a group of hard working, decent, honorable people who live in a community older than America herself—the city of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, which celebrates its 250th anniversary this year.

Here at this scenic crossroads of American history, culture and industry meet. Diversity and tradition coexist harmoniously. Beginning on June 1 of this year and ending July 4, 1992, the people of Bethlehem will celebrate 2½ centuries of this kind of pride and progress.

Many other communities across the country hold civic anniversaries each year, but Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, is different. It's special. In its history we find examples of the finest ideals of peace-loving, community-minded people. We find a respect for the natural beauty of the Lehigh River and the valley that surrounds it. We find daring entrepreneurs with brilliant foresight and the courage to make their dreams reality. And we find a resiliency and character in the many thousands of laborers who built mighty industries that powered America to world prominence.

The people of Bethlehem have much to celebrate. The 250th anniversary has been designed to serve three distinct but interrelated purposes—to foster a better understanding of the city's past, to assess the vibrancy and diversity of the city today, and to plan an even brighter future by bringing the many elements of the city together in a united effort.

Of course, an undertaking of this magnitude cannot happen overnight. And recognizing that fact has led to yet another very visible sign of the character of Bethlehem's people.

President Bush has a favorite phrase to describe the spirit of volunteerism in America today—he calls it his "Thousand Points of Light." I know that Bethlehem routinely enjoys the brilliance of those points of light, but never more so than in the planning of the city's 250th birthday.

Consider the numbers and be amazed: More than 700 volunteers working on more than 80 committees; more than 80 separate events to take place; more than a year-long celebration; and more than 2 years of planning and preparation.

It all adds up to more than the typical community celebration. Much more. From parades to interfaith services, from celebrations of Hispanic culture to citywide softball tournaments, from campus tours of local universities to a festival observing the role of labor—Bethlehem's 250th Anniversary has something for everyone.

In other words, Bethlehem is planning a community awakening. A community bonding. A community communion to last at least another 250 years.

To understand the spirit of community that exists in the Bethlehem of 1991, one must first understand how Bethlehem evolved from its dramatic birth in 1741.

In the mid 18th Century, a group of Moravians—a German religious sect—escaped the religious intolerance of their homeland to begin missionary work with the Indians in the New World. After some failed attempts at establishing a permanent settlement, they eventually set up a community at the confluence of the Lehigh River and the Monocacy Creek. Their leader and benefactor, the dynamic nobleman Count Nicholas Ludwig Zinzendorf, came from Europe to visit the new, and as yet unnamed, Moravian settlement in December 1741, arriving on the 24th.

At the close of the group's worship service that cold Christmas Eve, Count Zinzendorf led his followers from their Community House to an adjoining stable and began to sing the hymn that named the village so aptly:

"Not Jerusalem, lowly Bethlehem/Twas that gave us Christ to save us/Not Jerusalem, favored Bethlehem/Honored is that name/Thence came Jesus to release us/Favored Bethlehem. . ."

The simple-living Moravians led their beloved Bethlehem for the next century—roughly from the Revolutionary War to the eve of the Civil War—as a communal society, until ultimately the rush of the Industrial Revolution swept Bethlehem into the mainstream of American life.

The age of the entrepreneur greatly benefited Bethlehem and her people, spawning Lehigh University—one of the nation's great centers for the study of engineering and the

sciences—and the Bethlehem Steel Corporation—the “Arsenal of Democracy” that helped build the victorious armies of World Wars I and II and the structural giant that built such enduring American landmarks as the Golden Gate Bridge, the Brooklyn Bridge and the Empire State Building.

Today Bethlehem enjoys the advantages of a truly modern American city. Industries survive and thrive as the business community learns to adapt to shifting markets. Bethlehem's citizens, the people who give the city its heart, keep their sense of pride and shared community in focus.

As the city looks ahead to its future greatness, it sees as its ongoing foundation those things that have enabled it to succeed for the past 250 years:

A bedrock of faith, born in the spirit of religious freedom under the Moravians and now realized in a multitude of faith communities.

A belief in education, nurtured in the closed Moravian society and blossoming with establishment of four colleges and universities that continue today.

A strong work ethic, begun in the agrarian culture of the 18th Century, proven in the Industrial Revolution and still very much alive in the modern, multi-faceted business community.

A strength in diversity, at first shunned by Bethlehem's founders but now the pillar of Bethlehem's civic pride and record of achievement.

So as the gentle sound of church bells begins on the morning of June 1, signaling the start of the 250th anniversary celebration, Americans everywhere can take a lesson from the gentle yet strong, diverse yet united people of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

By building on a solid historic foundation, by demonstrating a remarkable spirit of voluntarism, and by joining hands and hearts to create a better tomorrow, my constituents in Bethlehem celebrate themselves—a proud group of Americans that make America proud.

I have personally savored the quiet graciousness of Bethlehem, its history, its architecture, its quality of life, its people. Whether it's the Bach Choir at Packer Chapel on a warm spring day; or the best community-wide musical extravaganza in America, Musikfest; or the only trout stream in America to flow through an urban area; or the mills, factories, and industrial parks employing men and women with true grit and a work ethic, Bethlehem is a very special and friendly place.

I encourage my colleagues in the Congress and people all over the country, to come see what makes Bethlehem such a unique and commendable collection of people and cultures. It's been that way for 250 years, even longer than our Nation has existed and it gets better all the time.

Mr. Speaker, join with us in celebration. I am proud to represent the people of Bethlehem, and I congratulate them on their city's anniversary.

HOW WEAPONS TRADE EMBOLDENED IRAQ

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a recent article written by Micheal T. Klare, the director of the Five College Program in Peace and World Security Studies. Mr. Klare is an expert on the Middle East, and recently had the pleasure of engaging in a discussion with him when he testified before the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member.

As I have stated time and again, a tremendous problem in the Middle East is the plethora of weapons being dealt to volatile regimes in that region. I would hope that the United States will take the lead in preventing arms sales to these hostile Middle East nations.

The text of Mr. Klare's article follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Aug. 12, 1990]

HOW WEAPONS TRADE EMBOLDENED IRAQ (By Michael T. Klare)

Iraq fought its way into Kuwait with imported weapons—tanks and artillery from the Soviet Union, armored troop carriers from Brazil, missiles and helicopters from France. With all of Iraq's considerable oil wealth at his disposal, Saddam Hussein has been able to shop on the international market for virtually any weapon he has sought. Until now, nothing has stood in the way of Hussein's arms-buying mania. Hence, if we are to derive any benefit from the present crisis, it would be to recognize the importance of imposing multilateral restraints on the global traffic in conventional weapons.

Only once before, in 1977-78, have US leaders attempted to negotiate multilateral curbs on the international arms traffic. Warning that “the virtually unrestrained spread of conventional weaponry threatens stability in every region of the world,” then President Carter invited Soviet leaders to join him in negotiating mutual constraints on superpower arms exports.

Unfortunately, these negotiations—the so-called Conventional Arms Transfer Talks, known as CATT—made only minor headway before a renewal of Cold War tensions led to a breakdown in US-Soviet relations. Since then, there have been no international talks on controlling the arms trade, and avid buyers like Saddam Hussein have encountered little difficulty in obtaining any nonnuclear weapon that they've hungered for. Between 1982-1989 alone, Third World countries spent an estimated \$303 billion on imported arms, ammunition and related equipment. Included in this largesse, according to the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress, were some 10,800 tanks and mobile cannon, 20,000 armored troop carriers, 2,800 supersonic fighter planes, 530 combat vessels and 33,900 surface-to-air missiles.

More important than these numbers, however, is the sophistication of the weapons involved: unhindered by any restrictions on what they could purchase, cash- or credit-rich buyers have been able to acquire the most capable systems in the American, Soviet and European inventories, including modern fighter aircraft, heavy battle tanks, missile-armed warships and advanced communications gear. By 1990, the arsenals of

many Third World nations were virtually indistinguishable from those of the front-line states in NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

While many emerging Third World leaders have participated in this orgy of arms buying, not one has come close to the heights scaled by Saddam Hussein. Between 1983 and 1987, Iraq was the world's leading consumer of imported weapons, accounting for some \$29.9 billion in military purchases, or 16 percent of total Third World arms spending. Major suppliers to the Iraqi military included the Soviet Union (with \$13.9 billion in sales), France (with \$4.8 billion), China (with \$3.3 billion), Brazil, Egypt and Czechoslovakia.

The exact details of the mammoth military purchases made by Hussein during this period are not fully known, but independent agencies such as the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute provide a rough tally of Iraqi acquisitions. Thus, according to the SIPRI Yearbook for 1990, recent Iraqi purchases from Moscow include 1,700 T-62 and T-72 tanks, 350 Scud-B surface-to-surface missiles, and 360 BM-21 multiple rocket launchers. From France, Iraq has acquired some 64 Mirage-1 fighter planes, 734 Exocet antiship missiles (one of which was used to strike the USS Stark in 1987), and 4,800 Milan antitank missiles. Sales by China include 1,300 T-59 and T-69 tanks plus 650 troop carriers, while sales by Brazil include 66 Astros-II multiple rocket launchers and 200 EE-9 Cascavel armored cars.

It goes without saying that these, and other such deliveries, have provided Baghdad with a formidable combat capability, whether for use in further attacks against Arab oil producers or for defense against the US-led multinational strike force. We are not talking here of a shabby, ill-equipped rabble like the Panamanian Defense Force but a powerful army endowed with large quantities of the world's most capable weapons systems—weapons as good as those fielded by the United States, the Soviet Union and their closest allies. It would be terribly ironic, indeed, if the United States and NATO forces now in the Persian Gulf area were forced to defend themselves against these weapons.

One might ask, of course, why the countries named above went on selling arms to Iraq when it became obvious, as early as 1980 (when Iraq invaded Iran), that Saddam Hussein was bent on regional domination. The answers we would receive are predictably varied: fear of an Iranian victory in the Persian Gulf conflict; a desire to establish close ties with an up-and-coming regional superpower; and a craving for Iraqi petrodollars. What it all adds up to, however, was a cynical disregard for the consequences of selling modern weapons to an aspiring regional power and the lack of any international restraints on the traffic in arms.

Would an international ban on military sales to Iraq have prevented the present crisis in the Middle East? No one, of course, can answer this with any degree of certainty. There is no doubt, however, that Hussein's recent arms purchases have greatly enhanced the offensive striking power of the Iraqi army, and given Iraq a significant advantage over other regional powers. More than this, the lurid abandon with which the major arms suppliers satisfied Hussein's military appetite could only have been interpreted by him as quasi-endorsement of his regional ambitions. And while the United States was not one of the nations that sold arms to Iraq, Washington's failure to put any pressure on our allies to stop doing so can only be viewed as a form of implied consent.

Clearly, it is too late to stop Hussein through an arms embargo—he already has all the weapons he needs for a major military crusade. But in coming to terms with all that has occurred over the last few weeks, we should surely recognize the vital importance of international cooperation in controlling the arms traffic. New multilateral constraints are clearly needed to prevent other potential aggressors from following Iraq's example by building up their own military arsenals. Such constraints will take time and effort to negotiate, but, fortunately, unlike the situation in 1978 when the CATT talks were suspended, there are no outstanding political obstacles to such initiatives: The Soviet Union has already agreed to participate in an arms embargo of Iraq and has indicated its willingness to cooperate in broader international moves aimed at curbing the arms trade. Indeed, at no other moment in recent history have conditions been more ripe for such initiatives.

What form would such an arrangement take? The details would naturally have to be left up to the negotiators involved, but what we should be looking for would be something along the lines of the controls discussed at the original CATT talks: a US-Soviet agreement to restrict the numbers and types of high-technology weapons exported to areas of conflict, such as the Middle East. To be truly effective, of course, such an arrangement would eventually have to involve other major suppliers, such as France and China. This will require intense lobbying on the part of the superpowers (and possibly some tradeoffs in terms of compensatory trade agreements), but both Paris and Beijing have joined the embargo of Iraq and thus appear agreeable to international controls of this sort.

The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait has caught most of the world off guard and posed very serious threats to US and global security. We obviously cannot undo all of the damage caused by this assault, but we can respond constructively by taking steps to prevent such catastrophes in the future. An international system for controlling the trade in sophisticated weapons would be one very important step in this direction.

THE BUSINESS ASSISTANCE CENTER: ON THE RISE

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, 1991, the Miami Herald recognized a man who should prove to have a great influence on the business community in my district. The Business Assistance Center [BAC] in Miami has a mission to spur the growth of black businesses by lending the funds which these entrepreneurs need. Ron Frazier, the new chairman of BAC, knows our community and the lives of the people residing in it. It gives me great pleasure to present this article for the RECORD which pays tribute to Mr. Frazier and his mission.

BLACK-ORIENTED LENDER NAMES CHAIRMAN—ASSISTANCE CENTER MUST FIX IMAGE, NEW LEADER SAYS

By Derek-Reveron

The Business Assistance Center's mission is to spur growth of black businesses by lend-

ing them money. But the center has strict loan requirements, and there are few black firms that have been able to meet them.

What's more, the center has developed a negative image among blacks. So how does it expect to fulfill its mission? Enter Ron Frazier, its new chairman and chief executive.

Frazier, who owns an architectural firm in Liberty City, was elected last month. He is the first owner of a small business to head the center. But Frazier is no stranger to the center's inner workings. He has been on the organization's board since it was founded in 1982.

IMAGE A PRIORITY

Frazier, 48, says he wants to dust off the center's "negative image" and make it a "business financing machine." That's a tough assignment, according to other board members and its president, Newall Daughtrey. However, they say, Frazier's drive and single-mindedness are up to the task.

"You always know where you stand with Ron because he's to the point," Daughtrey says. "His attitude is that he wants everybody to help. But if you don't want to help, get out of the way."

Says board member Joseph Alfano, director of the Private Industry Council of South Florida, "Ron is an aggressive and dynamic person."

Frazier on Frazier: "I'm a very focused individual. I extract commitment from people who work with me."

He takes the reins of a private organization that was created in the wake of the 1980 riots and has been financed with private funds from corporate contributors like Ryder System and Knight-Ridder.

KNOWS THE ROUGH ROAD

Frazier knows first-hand the bumpy road to success traveled by small businesses.

He grew up in Houston, and attended segregated public schools.

He enrolled at Howard University in Washington, D.C., and studied architecture. He graduated in 1986 and enrolled at Catholic University, also in Washington, to study for a master's degree in architecture.

After graduating, he moved to Miami. He came to the area because his wife, Regina, who is from South Florida, wanted to return to the area. He was reluctant.

"I didn't see any opportunities for blacks in Miami, especially for architects," he says.

Nevertheless, he landed a job as a planner for the Miami office of Kendree & Shepard, a Philadelphia planning consultant firm. Eventually, he was named director of the firm's Miami office.

In 1972, he left Kendree & Shepard and taught at the University of Miami for a year, while laying plans to start his own business. At first, he was the only employee. Today, the firm has 10 employees. In 1989, it received the first Black Business of the Year award given by the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce.

While Frazier sympathizes with the problems of small businesses, he has no plans to ease the assistance center's lending requirements. They aren't unusually tight, he says. For many loans approved by the agency, the borrower has put up as little as 5 percent to 15 percent of the loan value in equity, compared with a minimum of 25 percent to 30 percent required by most banks, he says.

FIRST MISSION IN SURVIVAL

The assistance center is perceived to have stringent requirements because the overwhelming majority of loan applicants are

turned down, Frazier says. The center tries to run itself like a profitable business, he says. Its first mission is to survive. And it can't do that if it lends funds to businesses simply because they are black-owned, he says.

"When people don't get loans, they say, 'BAC isn't here to help the black community,'" Daughtrey says. That's the primary cause of the center's poor image among blacks, he says.

"The BAC's image is something that we have discussed at many board meetings," says board member Jonathan Mariner, vice president of finance for the Greater Miami Convention and Visitors Bureau. "Clearly, people view the BAC."

Says board member Bill Cullom, president of the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, "Ron needs to make sure that all blacks in Dade know that the BAC is working for them."

Frazier's plan:

Meet with black organizations, such as the Miami-Dade Chamber of Commerce, to explain what the assistance center does.

Have himself, board members and staffers speak at community gatherings.

Shorten the loan approval process.

Streamline the center's internal operations.

His other goals:

Lend funds to black businesses all over Dade. Many have perceived—falsely, Frazier says—that the primary mission of the assistance center is to aid firms in Liberty City.

"There are black businesses all over Dade, and they need help," Frazier says.

Encourage local firms to do business with center clients.

Secure additional funding by encouraging banks to lend money to black businesses.

Told by others it will take longer than a one-year term to complete those goals, he responds: "I plan to be chairman for more than one year—unless they vote me out."

I would like to take this opportunity to personally congratulate Ron Frazier. The black business community in South Florida should be well served by a man of his character.

PHILIPPINE SCOUT RETIREMENT PAY EQUITY

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to redress a longstanding inequity in our treatment of a very important group of veterans whose vital service to our Nation has passed virtually unacknowledged. This bill would equalize retirement pay for former World War II-era Philippine scouts, who fought so bravely as part of the United States Army, and their survivors.

As you may know, the Philippine scouts were not foreign soldiers; they were an integral part of the United States Army. Created in 1901, the scouts were an elite organization with a high esprit de corps. Selection standards were extremely strict and Filipinos considered it an honor to be a member. Never numbering more than 12,000 men, the scouts were to serve a pivotal role in the valiant defense of the Bataan Peninsula.

General MacArthur described the scouts as "excellent troops, completely professional,

loyal, and devoted." When recruiting them, General MacArthur pledged, and I quote:

War is the great equalizer of men. Every member of my command shall receive equal pay and allowances based on the United States Army pay scale, regardless of nationality.

At the onset of war in the Pacific, when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and invaded the Philippine Islands, these soldiers became the key to our entire South Pacific strategy. Against overwhelming odds, faced with superiority in numbers and equipment, devoid of air cover against constant bombings by the Japanese, ravaged by malaria and beri-beri brought on by a diet of only polished rice and a few canned goods per day, these men helped hold the Bataan Peninsula for 98 days. Over 1,000 of them went on to fight another 5 weeks in Corregidor. This determined resistance denied the Japanese an essential base for the projected thrust into the South Pacific. Indeed, by forcing the enemy to retain a large presence in the Philippines, the scouts prevented them from using their resources to attack Allied shipments of men and materials to Australia and New Caledonia.

Despite the valiant services of the Philippinescous who fought and sacrificed side by side with American soldiers and despite the fact that the scouts were a fully incorporated unit of the United States Army, the scouts received only a fraction of the regular pay received by their American counterparts. In fact, while an American private was earning \$30 per month during the war, a Philippine scout with comparable rank who had been serving for the same amount of time was earning only \$9 for his exposure to the same hardships and dangers.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time has come for Congress to redress this longstanding inequity in our Nation's treatment of this very special group of World War II veterans. The legislation which I am introducing today would equate the retirement benefits paid to former scouts or their survivors equal with those which are paid to their American counterparts of the same grade and length of service. Several years ago, the Department of the Army estimated that the cost of adjusting retirement benefits for the remaining living Philippine scouts would be only \$724,000 per year—a small price to pay for a commitment which has been ignored for over 40 years.

While the budgetary impact of this pay equalization is small, the symbolic value is immense. Congressional authorization of adjusted retirement benefits would be a meaningful demonstration of our gratitude for the faithful and gallant service of the scouts during World War II. I again urge my colleagues to support this worthwhile measure.

For the convenience of my colleagues, the text of the bill follows:

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Philippine Scout Retirement Pay Equity Act".

SEC. 2. PHILIPPINE SCOUT RETIRED PAY EQUALIZATION.

The Secretary of the Army shall redetermine the retired pay of each person entitled to retired pay from the Department of Defense for service as a Philippine Scout during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946, as if the rate of basic pay payable to such person at the time of retirement had been the rate of basic pay payable to any other member of the United States Army in the same grade and with the same length of service as such person. The redetermination of retired pay shall apply only for retired pay payable for months beginning on or after the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 3. PHILIPPINE SCOUT SURVIVOR BENEFIT ADJUSTMENT.

The Secretary of the Army shall adjust the base amount used to calculate survivor benefits under subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, for each person entitled to survivor benefits as the survivor of a Philippine Scout who served during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946, to reflect the redetermination of retired pay made for such Philippine Scout under section 2. The adjustment of survivor benefits shall apply only for survivor benefits payable for months beginning on or after the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

A LEGACY OF NEGLECT

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend to my colleagues' attention an excellent but very disturbing report on our Nation's transportation needs written by Mr. Jake West, general president of the International Association of Bridge, Structural, and Ornamental Iron Workers, AFL-CIO. This report, which is entitled a "Legacy of Neglect: America's Decaying Roads and Bridges," very clearly and forcefully discusses the transportation infrastructure crisis facing our Nation and what we in Congress must do to avert catastrophe.

Mr. Speaker, this report calls for a major investment in rebuilding and expanding our Nation's transportation infrastructure. The amount of Federal dollars needed to address this problem is large. However, the Congress must not retreat from its responsibilities. Each year deteriorating and unsafe roads and bridges cause thousands of needless deaths and costs the United States billions of dollars in decreased productivity, higher prices, and lost jobs. And every year we fail to address our infrastructure needs means the cost of solving the problem will increase greatly, as well as the scope of the Nation's infrastructure problem.

This report outlines six recommendations for a comprehensive plan designed to solve our Nation's infrastructure crisis which I believe Congress should give serious consideration: development of a two-tiered Federal funding system; promotion of private initiatives; creation of a National Infrastructure Corporation;

amendments to the Federal and State Tax Codes; an increase in user fees; and, an increase in public awareness of our infrastructure needs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe working together we will be able to solve our infrastructure problems and lead this Nation into a new era of economic productivity and growth. I am confident that under the able leadership of our good friends and colleagues, BOB ROE, the new chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and Norm Mineta, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, we will succeed in this monumental task of rebuilding our Nation's transportation infrastructure. I look forward to working with them and the rest of my colleagues in developing a new national surface transportation program.

Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed knowing Jake West since I came to the Congress 6 years ago. This report will serve as an important starting point in the upcoming infrastructure debate in Congress. I know our colleagues join me in commending him for producing this report. I ask unanimous consent a summary of this report be placed in the RECORD at this point.

LEGACY OF NEGLECT—AMERICA'S DECAYING ROADS AND BRIDGES

(By Jake West)

SUMMARY

The transportation infrastructure crisis will not disappear. By waiting to solve our infrastructure problems, our elected officials are jeopardizing the safety and economic future of all Americans. We must start developing new policies to fund these infrastructure projects now, while there is still time.

I. The Problem

The state of America's roads and bridges is deplorable. The transportation infrastructure system that took three decades to construct, has been crumbling at an accelerating rate. The lack of government commitment to properly maintain America's infrastructure system, combined with budget deficits at all levels of government and the absence of the political will to raise taxes has resulted in the rapid deterioration of our roads and bridges.

Massive underinvestment at a time of increased use has left our nation's transportation infrastructure in a state of appalling disrepair. In June 1989, Secretary of Transportation Samuel Skinner reported to Congress that:

Half of all highways not receiving federal aid, and one-third receiving federal aid are classified as "poor" or "fair" by the U.S. Department of Transportation [DOT].

Of the 577,700 bridges in the United States, 41 percent are either deficient or obsolete!

Included in the 41 percent are 5,186 closed bridges and 102,531 classified as functionally obsolete.

The situation promises to worsen as Americans continue to increase their use of roads and bridges. In 1988, the U.S. Department of Transportation [DOT] recorded that 2.02 trillion vehicle miles were traveled over America's highways and bridges. This is a 14 percent increase over 1985, and a 23 percent increase over 1983. The U.S. Department of Commerce estimates industry alone will increase traffic on the nation's transportation system by an average of 2.6 percent annually over the next five years.

II. Costs of deficient roads and bridges

Without calculating increased use, the cost of rebuilding our transportation infrastructure is phenomenal. The Federal Highway Authority estimates the total cost of fully repairing our roads and bridges is \$750 billion, \$34 billion annually through 2005. This is more than the estimated \$500 billion cost of the savings and loan bailout!

Given the enormous price we will pay for the greed and corruption of wealthy businessmen and politicians, and the swollen state of the deficit, many will ask how the nation can afford to rebuild our transportation infrastructure. The more relevant question is how can we afford not to.

Poor roads and bridges have a devastating impact on the U.S. economy. America's economic boom of the 50's and 60's resulted, in part, from construction of the world's most advanced network of highways and bridges. Their deterioration greatly adds to the cost of moving goods and people, placing our nation at a competitive disadvantage.

Indeed, DOT's Transportation Systems Center estimates that at their present state of decay, by 1995 deficient roads and bridges will cost the U.S. economy a:

- 3.2 percent loss in Gross National Product;
- 8 percent increase in the Consumer Price Index;
- 5.9 percent decrease in disposable income;
- 2.2 percent reduction in employment;
- 2.7 percent reduction in labor productivity in the manufacturing sector; and
- 3.6 percent decrease in labor productivity in non-manufacturing industries.

The human impact of poor roads and bridges is also frightening. Accidents are twice as likely to occur on bad roads than on roads that are well maintained. In 1988 alone, over 47,000 Americans died and over 3.5 million people were injured in traffic accidents, some undoubtedly caused by improperly maintained roads.

In recent years, bridge collapses in Greenwich, Connecticut; Covington, Tennessee; Amsterdam, New York; and Mobile, Alabama have claimed the lives of many innocent victims. These deaths and injuries could have been avoided if the U.S. had adequately funded road and bridge repair projects.

III. Benefits of road and bridge improvements

Reports and studies provide conclusive evidence that investing in infrastructure will benefit the U.S. economy. The DOT has reported that fully repairing our roads and bridges will create over 1.3 million jobs each year due not only to new construction, but also to business expansion spurred by a more efficient transportation system.

A study released by Dr. David Aschauer, senior economist with the Federal Reserve Bank in Chicago, estimates an annual increase of \$25 billion in federal highway spending will:

- Increase productivity for each American worker \$250 annually in the first five years and \$3,200 annually within 20 years;
- Result in a labor productivity growth of 2.75 percent a year early next century, as opposed to the 2.2 percent annual growth rate expected without the investment increases—a 23 percent higher rate of growth;
- Increase profit margins up to 10 percent within 20 years; and

Within 20 years, create a \$35 billion annual increase in private investment above current projections.

IV. Infrastructure policies for the future

Solutions to our infrastructure crisis necessitate a financial commitment on behalf of our elected officials. Creative leadership

from labor, business, and academia is also essential to finding real solutions. Some of the best recommendations developed by various groups have been outlined in this study. They include:

- The development of a two-tiered federal funding system;
- Promotion of private initiatives;
- Creation of a National Infrastructure Corporation;
- Amending federal and state tax codes;
- Increasing user fees; and
- Increasing public awareness regarding critical infrastructure issues.

Americans have worked too hard to let government negligence, incompetence and political paralysis diminish their standard of living and quality of life. Every voter who believes in safe roads and a strong American economy must push his or her elected officials to support policies that will solve our infrastructure crisis. We must act now, before it is too late.

BRING PRO BASEBALL TO SOUTH FLORIDA

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a resident of south Florida for over 20 years, I have had the pleasure of watching the Miami region grow into one of the Nation's largest metropolitan areas.

Miami, according to the newest census, is the 11th largest city in America. The south Florida region is thriving, and it's still growing. We've all heard about the wonderful weather, the fabulous restaurants, and the incredible quality of life that south Florida provides. Every time this Brooklyn-born Floridian gets off the plane in south Florida, I know why I moved down there all those years ago. I know why so many people are making the move to Florida, and I urge all of you to come down and find out.

But today, I did not come to talk about the virtues of south Florida, although sometimes I just cannot help it. I came to talk sports. As you know, the Miami Dolphins football team has long been a mainstay in the National Football League. Consistent sellouts, consistent great management, and consistent great teams; the Dolphins have been incredibly successful, and have served as a model for other NFL franchises to emulate. A few years ago, South Florida joined the National Basketball Association, with the Miami Heat becoming a member of the preeminent basketball league in the world. Although the Heat have yet to develop into the winner we all know they will be, signs of success are evident. First, everyone acknowledges that the patience and smart moves made by management have given the Heat the nucleus to be a winner for years to come; second, the Heat have the most incredible arena in the NBA; third, the fans have come out and consistently supported the team, which is having its most successful season ever. We have the NFL and the NBA in south Florida, and we're doing great with both of them.

Now, baseball is ready to expand, and I am proud to say that Miami is ready to move from

the grapefruit league into the big leagues. South Florida has long been a supporter of spring training for major league teams. We've shown the ability to support two professional sports franchises, and make no mistake, we want to support three.

I, as well as the members of the major league baseball expansion committee, have been extremely impressed by the hard work, dedication, and planning by Wayne Huzienga and the Miami expansion group. I am confident that if south Florida were to receive a franchise, it would follow the excellent examples set by both the NFL's Dolphins and the NBA's Heat.

TRIBUTE TO U.S. ELECTRICAL ENGINEERS AND IEEE

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to welcome home the brave men and women who served in our Armed Forces in the Persian Gulf, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the contributions of another group of valiant men and women: The electrical, electronics, computer, and communications engineers who helped develop the technologies that saved lives and brought the war to a rapid conclusion.

The 250,000 U.S. members of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers [IEEE] are especially proud of their role in ensuring the performance of electronic systems dramatically demonstrated in Operation Desert Storm.

Through these accomplishments, we have shown to ourselves, as well as to the rest of the world, that our technology excels and our young people can be technologically literate. These successes have reaffirmed America's can-do attitude.

But Americans will not be complacent nor lulled into future wars by these achievements. Indeed, the electrical and electronics engineers, who helped put us on the Moon, are typically modest individuals accustomed to looking beyond past successes—and looking forward to new accomplishments. IEEE U.S. members are challenged and inspired to apply their expertise to developing more competitive products for civilian and nonmilitary applications.

In full-page advertisements appearing in the March 7 Wall Street Journal and Washington Post, IEEE U.S. Activities sought the cooperation of the President, the Congress, and the business community to achieve comparable successes in high-technology commercial products and services.

We owe the electrical and electronics engineers a debt of gratitude: Congratulations to IEEE-USA and the entire profession.

A CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, last year, a record number of Soviet Jews received official permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union. Today, I wish to express my support for the hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews who continue to be denied the freedom to emigrate for a variety of unfounded reasons.

Every one of the Soviet refuseniks looks to the United States Congress for strong, unequivocal advocacy and representation. Each one desperately needs the support of the Congress to understand that the high numbers we are witnessing today are a result of our determination to continue the Soviet Jewry movement.

In these uncertain times, it is very important for Congress to stand together and promote principled support for human rights and human freedom. I encourage my colleagues to participate in the call to conscience vigil and enter a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in support of the Soviet Jewry movement. Your support could be the difference between freedom or restraint for an individual.

BORIS ZOLOTAREVSKI—A PRISONER IN HIS OWN LAND**HON. DICK SWETT**

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the Congressional Call to Conscience Vigil. I commend distinguished colleagues LARRY SMITH, CHRIS SMITH and GERRY SIKORSKI, for continuing this fifteen year tradition—a tradition which is invaluable in furthering the cause of Soviet Jews. The Vigil, a weekly series of speeches that brings the plight of refuseniks to the forefront, confronts the problem one person at a time. This effort has poignantly applied pressure on the Soviet Union to allow the free movement of Jews.

At this time I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the plight of Boris Zolotarevski, a man denied the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union. Separated from his daughter, unable to see his newly born grandchild, Boris remains trapped in his own country.

Boris' history in the Soviet Union is not one of shame or disloyalty. Boris fought valiantly in World War II, earning several medals of honor including the Red Star Medal for the Defense of Stalingrad. He graduated from the Moscow Aviation Institute and applied his skills while working at the Scientific Research Institute of Computer Systems in Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, as people do the world over, Boris yearned to practice his religion; his unofficial religious activities began in the early 1980's. However, celebrating Jewish holidays and studying Hebrew put Boris at risk with the authorities. On May 24, 1988, Boris applied for

an exit visa, knowing he could only have complete religious freedom upon leaving his homeland. Eight months later he was refused permission to emigrate based on the fact that 6 years earlier he had been privy to secret information.

Mr. Speaker, it is disheartening for me to have to come before you again on behalf of yet another human being who is being held prisoner in his own land. As a signatory to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Soviet Union has the responsibility to live up to its agreements. Although the number of emigres has increased, thousands still await their freedom." I urge my colleagues to join me in calling upon the leaders of the Soviet Union to free Boris Zolotarevsky and the countless others whom they hold hostage.

THE CORPORATE RAIDER TAX ACT OF 1991**HON. BYRON L. DORGAN**

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I'm introducing the Corporate Raider Tax Act of 1991, legislation to curtail the use of junk bonds that help to drive hostile takeovers. This legislation denies the tax incentives that support these speculative transactions, which have done real damage to the productivity and long-term economic growth in our country.

By now, we've all heard about the virtual collapse of the junk bond market, which has investors scrambling to dump their entire junk bond portfolios. The number of companies being forced into bankruptcy because they played the junk bond game continues to grow because they can't afford to make interest payments on junk bonds.

As the administration and the regulators sat idly by in the 1980's, the number of risky and speculative junk bond transactions skyrocketed to totals over \$200 billion. Repeatedly, Treasury testified before Congress that they didn't think junk bonds and hostile takeovers were a problem. A few of us in Congress saw things much differently.

Since then, we've all now witnessed the detrimental impact that the merger mania had on the Nation's economy. And it's evident that the hostile takeover engine was being fueled by risky junk bonds. Regrettably, many once-strong companies have been completely raped of value and many good folks have been pushed out of their jobs.

We've learned some tough lessons from the hostile takeover boom of the eighties. And it's time for us in public policy to say that we will never again provide tax subsidies for such misguided purposes.

I've introduced this legislation to end the junk bond/hostile takeover connection by denying the interest deduction for junk bond indebtedness that's used to finance hostile takeovers, and by requiring the hostile acquirer to recognize all-corporate level gain of the targeted company where a significant portion of the target's stock was purchased pursuant to a hostile offer.

The legislation would also tighten a provision in the 1989 reconciliation bill which restricts the tax deduction for interest on certain OID junk bonds. The provision was written in an attempt to dampen the speculation in the type of junk bonds that were issued that were called PIK's—payment-in-kind—and Zeros—zero coupons.

These bonds don't actually pay interest when interest is due—they pay more bonds. And yet the issuer gets to deduct the interest as a business expense.

The 1989 act generally defers, under certain conditions, the interest deduction for junk bonds until the interest is actually paid. Congress did that to discourage the use of these junk bonds that derive LBO's and hostile takeovers. We wanted to limit the deductibility on the junk bond debt service until cash payments were actually made. Unfortunately, this provision applies only to junk bonds that have a term of more than 5 years.

When the Ways and Means Committee enacted this provision, I felt that we had been too generous in drawing the line at 5 years. Frankly, I was afraid that some people would come forward and float these risky securities for 4½ years, just under the 5-year limit, and continue to deduct interest payments that they don't actually make. It appears that's what is now happening.

My legislation would limit the interest deduction for these junk bonds with a term of more than 2 years, rather than the current 5 years. Requiring actual cash payments for interest on junk bonds with terms of more than 2 years make sense to me. Why should people get deductions for interest they didn't pay, use those deductions to generate cash refunds and then use that to go out and engage in more hostile takeovers?

We need to take this opportunity to tell the Wall Street crowd that we'll no longer continue to be a party to the junk bond charade by providing tax benefits to these funny-money pushers who float junk bond issues for hostile takeovers, and that's what my legislation is intended to do.

Let me be clear about junk bonds. I don't believe that all bond issues that are below investment grade are bad. Some can be very productive and very important and useful to small- to medium-sized firms that need capital with which to grow. I do, however, think that junk bonds used for hostile takeovers is a terrible practice for this country's economy.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation to curb the use of junk bonds that drive hostile takeovers. Those who have rushed to paper America's financial hallways with junk bonds are now in plenty of trouble. But there is an army of recruits ready to take their place, and we've got to take steps to discourage more hostile takeovers that are clearly unhealthy for the country.

The highlights of the bill are as follows:

Section 2 of the bill denies the interest deduction on junk bond financing—or all acquisition indebtedness—used to purchase 20 percent or more of a company's stock if the acquisition is made pursuant to a "hostile takeover". The term "hostile" is defined as any offer to acquire stock of a corporation if a majority of the independent members of the board of directors of such corporation dis-

approve of such offer. For purposes of this bill, junk bond is defined as a bond that has a below-investment-grade rating from a nationally recognized rating agency.

Section 3 of the bill provides that the deemed sale rules shall apply and require the recognition of all corporate-level gain through a mandatory section 338 election in the case of an acquisition in which a significant portion of the stock was purchased pursuant to a hostile tender offer.

Section 4 of the bill tightens a provision in the 1989 reconciliation bill which restricts the tax deduction for interest on certain OID junk bonds. The 1989 act generally defers, under certain conditions, the interest deduction for junk bonds until the interest is actually paid. However, the provision applies only to junk bonds that have a term of more than 5 years. Section 4 of the bill limits the interest deduction for these junk bonds with a term of more than 2 years, rather than the 5 years that currently exists.

AUDIT OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in 1789 our forefathers created a government "of the People, by the People, and for the People." Now, two centuries later, Americans continue to enjoy the freedoms of democracy and strive to maintain a government beholden to its citizens. One way lawmakers have ensured Government accountability is through GAO audits. While almost every Federal agency undergoes an annual audit, there is one that remains conspicuously immune—the Federal Reserve. Since 1913, the Federal Reserve Board has been "empowered to carry out functions crucial to our system of government and to our nation's economy." It also has been exempt from a full GAO audit. This exemption has been abused, and often it has proved injurious.

In order to protect our economy against dangerous fluctuations in aggregate bank reserves, Congress granted the Federal Reserve complete control over the money supply. Yet rarely in its 78-year history has the Fed fulfilled this mission. In 1929, for example, an inexperienced Fed stood idle while the Nation suffered from a devastating reserve drain. Had the Fed exercised open market operations or activated the discount window, banks would have been forced to increase their capital holdings, and the United States might have avoided what is now known as the Great Depression.

Then in late 1980 and early 1981, the Fed staged a repeat performance. There was an almost universal consensus at the time that little could be done to get inflation quickly under control. So the Reagan administration cut Federal spending and pursued a tax policy dependent upon moderate and predictable monetary growth. This agenda guaranteed long-term economic expansion as long as the Fed continued increasing the money supply at a moderate and predictable rate. The Fed de-

cidied instead to reduce the supply of money. The Fed's decision brought down inflation, but it did so at a high price. Millions of Americans lost their jobs as a result, and the economy tumbled into its worst recession since 1933.

Today the Nation can only wonder how the Fed will respond to an impending recession. And wonder we will, for without a comprehensive audit, Fed operations remain a secret. This secrecy has bred an unhealthy suspicion among American investors. Some years ago, in fact, there were reports of people using voice stress analyzers on a speech given by Chairman Greenspan. The anxious financiers hoped that upcoming Fed decisions might be revealed through the Chairman's vocal patterns. Unfortunately, the only thing their efforts did uncover was the mystery surrounding Fed operations.

One of those operations involves selling Treasury bills to other nations. For three-quarters of a century, the Fed has brokered \$286 billion in U.S. debt to foreign governments, but not one penny of these sales is reported to the American people. Safeguarded from an audit, Chairman Greenspan and his colleagues can issue our debt to whomever they please and then call the transaction classified. Clearly, this privilege elicits legitimate concerns for our national security.

Americans should not depend on mysticism to monitor the Federal Reserve, nor should they be suspicious of its policies. They should benefit instead from a fully accountable central bank. Therefore, I am reintroducing legislation that requires the General Accounting Office to conduct a complete and thorough audit of the Federal Reserve system and banks. The bill would not inhibit the Fed's ability to conduct the Nation's monetary policy. Rather, it would reinstate the agency's accountability and give us a better understanding of the Fed's decisionmaking process.

IN HONOR OF MONTEREY COUNTY PARKS DEPARTMENT 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Monterey County Parks Department on its 25th anniversary as an agency on April 1, 1991.

The Monterey County Parks Department is a diverse parks system that has provided millions of outdoor recreation opportunities to residents of Monterey County, national visitors and international visitors throughout the years. The Monterey County parks system has come to represent the quality life-style that the residents of the 16th Congressional District of California value.

The Parks Department has stood throughout the years to protect the environment, preserve the historical heritage, and promote the outdoor recreational values of the Salinas Valley, Monterey County, and Americans alike. The Monterey County Parks Department system exemplifies the quality environment and the world renown beauty for which Monterey County is famous.

I would like to personally commend the Monterey County Board of Supervisors, the Monterey County Parks Commission, and the professional staff of the Monterey County Parks Department for their development and operation of an outstanding system of regional parks, recreation areas and historical sites for the use and enjoyment of the general public.

On this special occasion, I encourage the Monterey County Parks Department to continue in the coming years to play an active role in preserving the quality life-style, the quality environment, the historical heritage, and the outdoor recreation values of the 16th Congressional District of California and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me now in congratulating the Monterey County Parks Department on the occasion of the celebration of its 25th anniversary. It is with great pride and respect that I pay tribute to its contribution and achievements to the 16th Congressional District of California.

RESOLUTION CALLING FOR A TIME OF REPENTANCE, SACRIFICE, PRAYER AND THANKSGIVING

HON. CHARLES W. STENHOLM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution calling on the President of the United States to declare a time of repentance, sacrifice, prayer and thanksgiving for the salvation and continued blessing of our Nation and for peace in our hearts, in our communities, and in the world.

I do so with excellent precedent before me, because President Abraham Lincoln, in the midst of the Civil War, declared just such a time for our Nation. President Lincoln's proclamation, which is quoted in this resolution I am introducing today, urged the Nation to refrain from arrogance and an illusion of self-sufficiency based on recent successes. His fear was that our country, intoxicated with unbroken success was becoming too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us.

As are so many of this great President's words, his warning rings just as true today as it did more than 100 years ago. Indeed, as Lincoln argued back then, we have grown in numbers, wealth and power as no other nation has ever grown. These successes should not make us feel that God's guidance and protection are no longer necessary. To the contrary, they should make us more humble and more grateful to the God who has guided and protected us for all of these years.

Back during the early stages of the Middle East conflict, when the future still held many uncertainties and as a nation we worried what toll would be taken on young American lives, I dare say our churches were full and the number of prayers being offered to our good Lord were many, as well they should have been. Through His grace, God has offered to bear the burden of our cares and worries in

times when they seem all too great for us to bear alone. But now that our troops have gained unparalleled success and many young men and women already are returning home, I wonder how many Americans are remembering to return to church to offer prayers of thanksgiving.

No one could be prouder of our troops and our military leadership than I. They risked and sacrificed much, and they deserve our heartfelt gratitude. The point of my resolution today is simply to say that while we are celebrating and congratulating and sensing our power as a nation, let us not forget to heed Abe Lincoln's words. Let us, as a nation, acknowledge our dependence on that greater power and express our gratitude to Him.

A TRIBUTE TO HERR WOLF-DIETER SCHMIDT

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the fine and selfless contributions of Herr Wolf-Dieter Schmidt, an extraordinary citizen of Germany and one-time American prisoner of war. This remarkable man has risen as an educator in his own country and, over the years, become a valued friend of the United States. I recently became aware of Herr Schmidt through my acceptance of membership on the Congressional Advisory Board of the American Host Foundation, an honor which I share with a number of my colleagues.

In 1970, Herr Schmidt participated as a guest educator in the American Host Foundation's program of homestays for overseas educators. American Host members are volunteers, ordinary American families in virtually every State of the Union, who offer their hospitality to guest teachers free of charge. Since 1962, this program has made it possible for some 16,000 teachers from overseas to visit America. The program's objective is simply to foster international friendship and understanding. Teachers return to their classrooms with a better understanding of the American way of life, and many form lasting friendships with their hosts.

Since that first visit, Herr Schmidt has widely promoted participation by German educators. In 1978, he was honored for his volunteer work by the U.S. Department of State and by former Vice President Walter Mondale.

I especially want to pay tribute to Herr Schmidt for his effort during 1990 when he played an instrumental role in gaining support from the German Government to help bring a group of 12 East German teachers to the United States to participate in the American Host program shortly after their participation in the bloodless revolution that resulted in the fall of the Berlin Wall. His efforts have inspired the American Host Foundation to extend its program to teachers from these burgeoning democracies in Eastern Europe.

We are all aware of the value of exchange programs such as those offered by the American Host Foundation and its many generous

volunteer hosts. Such programs have been in no small way responsible for the spread of democracy around the globe.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me and our colleagues as we honor the fine and selfless contributions of Herr Wolf-Dieter Schmidt to the ideals of international understanding and friendship. His dedicated work is truly worthy of recognition by the House today.

SOUTH FLORIDA JROTC PAYS TRIBUTE TO THE U.S. ARMED FORCES

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, we sometimes take our military forces for granted. Today, though, we should be recognizing all the selfless acts of bravery our troops display in protecting our country.

On April 4, 1991, the cadets, parents, faculty, and staff at Miami Sunset Senior High School, U.S. Army Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps [JROTC] will be hosting their seventh annual Dade County, FL JROTC Military Ball.

This year's military ball will be dedicated to the men and women who are serving all over the world in the U.S. Armed Forces, especially those directly involved in the Persian Gulf war and its aftermath. This occasion will be a very personal one for the community, as they have approximately 100 persons currently serving in the gulf.

South Florida area Junior ROTC high school programs to be represented at the ball include: Miami Killian Senior High, Miami Northwestern, Miami Coral Park, Miami Sunset Senior High, Miami Southridge Senior High, and Homestead Senior High. In total, over 600 students and their parents are expected to attend the event, which will include a ceremonial military observance.

Special recognition must go to Modesto Colon-Escobar, major, U.S. Army (retired), senior Army instructor for the Sunset Knight JROTC Battalion of Miami Sunset Senior High. He and his staff are credited with preparing what will surely be a splendid occasion, dedicated to a worthwhile cause.

Our men and women who serve in the Reserves are usually the unsung heroes of the military. They are constantly training during wartime and peacetime, dedicating the long hours needed to be ready for any threat that may come our way. Many times, their efforts go unnoticed until it is time to perform, and perform well they do, as was seen in the gulf crisis.

I congratulate Maj. Colon-Escobar for doing an excellent job in highlighting the importance of the Nation's military to our young people.

GOV. THOMAS LEROY COLLINS

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last week Florida lost one of its greatest Governors. Thomas LeRoy Collins left us a legacy of dedication and justice and set a model of public service for generations to come.

Governor Collins began his public career in 1934 in the Florida State House. He was elected to the State senate in 1940 and the Florida Governorship in 1953 where he served for 6 years.

Those years were tumultuous ones—they were the years of race riots and lunch-counter sit-ins. Governor Collins acted with courage and honor, often contrary to the wishes of his supporters, family and certainly the community at large. Yet in the end we look proudly at the legacy he left and the moral foundation he built.

He was devoted to educational reform and helped guide the State of Florida into the latter half of this century. He sponsored a program to help poor children get a good education, instituted public health reform to combat malarial fever spread by mosquitoes, and helped make community colleges accessible.

Placing moral courage above political expedience is believed to have cost Collins his race for the Senate. During his tenure as Governor, Collins took often unpopular positions on race relations. He was the first southern Governor to call segregation immoral and to point out that protestors were on the side of the Constitution.

Of the participants in lunch-counter sit-ins Collins said: "We can never stop Americans from struggling to be free. We can never stop Americans from hoping and praying that someday, in some way, this ideal that is embedded in our Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal, that will somehow be a reality."

In 1965 President Lyndon Johnson asked Collins to go to Selma, AL and stop what could have become a bloody racial riot. Collins negotiated a compromise between the police and Dr. Martin Luther King who agreed to stop the march, which was scheduled to end well into Montgomery, AL, just across the Pettus Bridge. LeRoy Collins' sympathetic ear and cooperative style probably averted what could have been a tragic riot, no one was hurt. Although Collins' mission for the President was confidential, a picture was taken while he was explaining the terms of the police demands to Dr. King.

Later, during Governor Collins' ill-fated Senate race the picture was attributed with some of the responsibility for his loss. When asked if he regretted it Collins said, "Do I regret having been there with Dr. King? No, sir, no regrets in my life. I'm glad I did everything I did."

The State of Florida, in fact the entire country, has benefited enormously from the leadership of Governor LeRoy Collins. He was a champion of civil rights in the South at a time when that was certainly exceptional. LeRoy Collins did far more than his part to prepare the State of Florida and the United States for

a new age. He set standards that most of us only dream about. We will miss him, but his legacy will live on.

NEW HAMPSHIRE SALUTES ITS VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST WINNER

HON. DICK SWETT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Duane Hayes Kibbee, a senior at Keene High School who won the New Hampshire Veterans of Foreign War's Voice of Democracy broadcast scriptwriting contest.

In addition, Duane distinguished himself in the Voice of Democracy national competition, finishing 12th overall in a field of 138,000 entrants. Duane received the \$1,000 Walter and Doris Marshall Scholarship Award for his efforts.

Duane is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Donald Kibbee, and he was sponsored by VFW Post 799 and its Ladies Auxiliary in Keene, NH.

I was very impressed by the quality of Duane's script. It is encouraging to see high school students like Duane not only demonstrating a great talent for writing, but also showing an interest in the workings of government. I can only hope that other students follow in his footsteps.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues Duane's award winning script on his visit to the Lincoln Memorial.

DEMOCRACY—THE VANGUARD OF FREEDOM

(By Duane Kibbee, New Hampshire winner, 1990-91 VFW Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program)

Step 1 . . . Step 2 . . . Step 3 . . . My great-grandfather told me about this place, but I never thought I'd get to see it. Step 9 . . . Step 10 . . . Step 11 . . . Look at the incredible architecture: the marble, granite and limestone, all formed and carved to make one of America's most patriotic memorials. Step 21 . . . Step 22 . . . Step 23 . . . Look at the columns, 36 in all, each of which represents a state in the Union when America's real inventor of freedom died. Step 53 . . . Step 54 . . . Step 55 . . . Whewwww . . . I finally made it to the top, and there he is, immortalized in a white marble statue whose eyes seem to follow me wherever I move up here. The inscription above him reads: "In this temple, as in the hearts of the people for whom he saved the Union, the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined forever." There is a piece of Abraham Lincoln in every man, woman, and child in the United States today, and across that piece is written the word . . . Freedom. The freedom of speech, the freedom of the press, the freedom of religion, the freedom to go out and help choose who you want to rule you. Not to call democracy "the vanguard of freedom" is like saying Budweiser is not beer. Democracy is the vanguard of freedom. America at first was nothing more than a melting pot, a place where almost everyone was given an equal opportunity to rise to the top: the catch was, we all started with nothing. At least that's what it seemed like, but in all actuality we had an advantage over everyone in China, Russia, even England, and indeed, every-

where else in the world, we had the one thing that helped us rise above the rest. We had a new-found freedom under the world's only true democracy. Where else could you start out being born the son of an uneducated frontiersman and still be able to become the leader of a rising nation? Just think about that statue: he started with nothing and now he is immortalized as the man who guaranteed the young democracy would remain free. "Democracy" is defined as being a government by the people. Many societies have called themselves democracies, from the ancient Athenian Greeks to the Icelandic Vikings. However, they all had one thing in common; not everyone could participate. For example in the Golden Age of Athens in 450 BC, only 40,000 people out of 260,000 could vote, while 120,000 were slaves . . . yet it was called a democracy. By contrast, in America Abraham Lincoln made it so it was truly governed by the people, not just some of the people, but almost all of the people. In the Emancipation Proclamation, he states, "slaves, within any state or designated part of a state . . . then, in rebellion . . . shall be taken, henceforward, and forever free."

True freedom was now a reality, and with that reality the democracy of the United States of America began to flourish, capping with woman's suffrage, which gave the vote to everyone. Under the guidance of democracy and our new-found freedom, we did more in a little over 100 years than most civilizations had ever done for their total existence. We started with nothing more than a democracy and our freedom and turned ourselves into one of the world's biggest superpowers. It is obvious that we, today, are free because of our democratic society. And other countries in the world are finally starting to see that. Walls are coming down, communist parties are starting to diminish, and democracy is shedding a whole new light on many countries who at first laughed at us. It has been shown that history repeats itself, and I believe that these countries want a piece of what we've got, and if history truly does repeat itself, these countries will soon have what they want, and that is freedom. I believe that every family should own a part of the Lincoln Memorial because we all, once in awhile, deserve to be reminded that democracy is indeed the vanguard of freedom.

PROLIFERATION PROFITEERS: PART 6

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, foreign companies are helping Third World countries develop nuclear weapons. These firms are making huge profits selling nuclear equipment, materials, technology, and dual use items—without the proper safeguards—to countries like Iraq and Pakistan. If we leave this issue unaddressed, it's only a matter of time before Syria, Iran, Libya, North Korea, and others have the bomb.

I've recently introduced the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Enforcement Act (H.R. 830). Under this legislation, any foreign firm found furthering the spread of nuclear weapons through these questionable sales would have its goods barred from entering the United States. Twenty-one Members of Congress have cosponsored this bill.

Today, I am placing into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the sixth in a series of 12 case studies on specific foreign companies that have assisted Iraq in its nuclear weapons programs. We must put an end to this proliferation profiteering or face grave threats to our national security in the future.

TWELVE FOREIGN FIRMS REPORTEDLY ENGAGED IN NUCLEAR WEAPONS-RELATED TRADE WITH IRAQ

FIGURE 6: INDUSTRIAS CARDOEN LTDA (CHILE)

Industrias Cardoen Ltda (Cardoen Industries) is a private armaments manufacturing firm specialized in the production of armored vehicles, aircraft bombs, and small explosive infantry weapons. Cardoen has been implicated in the transshipment from Europe to Iraq of sophisticated measuring devices for testing detonators known as oscilloscopes, although the firm has denied this allegation. High speed oscilloscopes are needed for both nuclear weapons and missile-related manufacturing. In October 1990, the Chilean government ordered an "in-depth" investigation into the possible transfer of fuel-air explosives to Iraq through Libya. The company apparently conducted tests of such a device, which is equivalent in explosive impact to a small nuclear weapon, at its desert test range in August 1990. Cardoen has denied this allegation as well.

Cardoen's export peak reached \$120 million in 1987, stimulating its bid into the U.S. arms market.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MINIMUM PAYMENT ADJUSTMENT FOR MEDICAID DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE HOSPITALS BILL

HON. TERRY L. BRUCE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to improve the reimbursement level for Medicaid disproportionate share hospitals, those hospitals which serve a high percentage of America's most vulnerable citizens. These include children's hospitals, many of which provide more than 80 percent of their care and treatment to Medicaid-eligible children. Today, millions of American people are uninsured and more than 12 million children have no access to health care. While most Americans over age 65 are covered by Medicare, Children's Health Care Programs are being cut and fewer employers are providing health insurance.

Health care costs are rising at an annual rate of between 18 and 30 percent, and since 1980, more than 700 hospitals have closed. In my own State of Illinois, 24 hospitals have closed, and nearly 1,000 more nationwide are in trouble.

The American Hospital Association reports serious problems particularly for those hospitals which provide charity care, and care to patients receiving Medicaid funding. Medicaid payments for patient care fall short of costs, and this shortfall is growing quickly. Nine out of 10 hospitals are losing money serving Medicaid patients and Medicaid shortfalls are directly responsible for hospital losses in caring for the poor.

The AHA survey also showed that Medicaid payments were consistently lower than actual costs, and that this gap has been widening since 1985. Between 1980 and 1985, Medicaid paid 90 percent of costs for its beneficiaries. By 1989, payments covered 78 percent of costs. This translates to a loss in 1980 of \$700 million and a loss in 1989 of \$4.3 billion.

Most of these hospitals providing services for Medicaid beneficiaries also provide uncompensated care for millions of Americans who have no access to health care services. These hospitals are struggling to stay afloat, but are finding it difficult to provide good, quality care for people who cannot afford to pay. Uncompensated care cost hospitals \$11.1 billion in 1989, an increase from \$3.9 billion in 1980. This cost is usually absorbed by the hospital or shifted to private payers. For hospitals which provide charity care or treat a disproportionate share of Medicaid patients, no relief is in sight.

The bill I am introducing today is part of a larger package I will be introducing in the coming months. It will provide a partial solution to this growing problem. The bill will improve minimum payments to hospitals which provide care to a disproportionate number of Medicaid patients. This legislation will ensure welcome relief for many hospitals.

The time to act is now. Our health care system is suffering and our children are not getting the care they need. The U.S. ranks 23rd in infant mortality rates. In 1955 it ranked 6th. Hospitals are closing their doors because they can no longer swallow the costs. I hope that all of you will think of the hospitals in your district which have told you they can no longer accept Medicaid beneficiaries, or are closing their doors, eliminating access to health care for millions of Americans. Please join me in supporting this legislation.

H.R. 1544

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

SECTION 1. MINIMUM PAYMENT ADJUSTMENT FOR DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE HOSPITALS UNDER THE MEDICAID PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1923(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-4(c)) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: "Regardless of the formula a State uses to calculate the payment adjustment for a disproportionate share hospital, the amount of such payment adjustment shall equal at least the amount of the payment adjustment that would result if the adjustment were calculated using the formula specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection (as modified, in the case of a children's hospital, by the next sentence)."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 1991.

THE CHARITABLE GIVING TAX EQUITY ACT OF 1991

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. CHANDLER and I are introducing the Charitable Giving Tax Equity Act of 1991 to provide a Federal income tax deduction to taxpayers who make charitable contributions, but who are now prevented from deducting those contributions because they file a short-form tax return. Identical to legislation that we introduced in the 101st Congress, this bill gives nonitemizers the same tax treatment for supporting charitable organizations as already exists for itemizers.

Under current law, only those taxpayers who itemize deductions receive tax incentives for charitable giving. Consequently, only upper income taxpayers, who generally itemize, are encouraged by the tax laws to make charitable contributions. It makes no sense to me that those with low to moderate incomes, who generally are unable to itemize, do not receive the same encouragement to make charitable contributions.

Modest income Americans are among the Nation's most generous contributors giving an estimated 30 percent more of their incomes to charity than average taxpayers. But most modest income contributions are nonitemizers, and therefore, cannot deduct their charitable gifts.

In fact, more than 78 million taxpayers who do not itemize their returns are not told by our Tax Code that their charitable giving is going to be treated less generously than the charitable giving by upper income folks. That doesn't make sense to me.

It's time that Congress reexamined the rationale behind current policy which, in my view, is not in step with our efforts toward establishing a more equitable Tax Code.

I believe a nonitemizer who contributes \$500 to charity should receive the same tax benefit as the itemizer who contributes \$500 to charity. The rationale underlying the deduction applies to all taxpayers, that is—all individuals should be encouraged to make donations by excluding from taxation the income they contribute for a public purpose.

Allowing a deduction for nonitemizers will stimulate more charitable giving which will provide more funding for worthwhile nonprofit organizations, many of which provide services that otherwise might have to be provided by the Federal Government. Studies demonstrate that lower income households—nonitemizers—have historically contributed a higher percentage of household income to charity than higher income households. Further, nonitemizers tend to give to causes that serve low- and middle-income individuals. These important social obligations require and deserve the same encouragement from tax policy as causes supported by upper income individuals.

Some argue that the standard deduction which is allowed nonitemizers already takes into account charitable contributions. But it is not clear how much, if any, attribution for char-

itable deductions is assumed in the standard deduction. And even if one would accept the proposition that a portion of the standard deduction includes charitable giving, a lower bracket taxpayer's charitable deduction represents significantly less value than the same deduction afforded upper bracket taxpayers. This legislation addresses any concern about double benefits by limiting a nonitemizers deduction to that amount exceeding \$100 of their charitable contributions. The \$100 floor will also help reduce IRS compliance concerns by reducing the number of potential returns for filing.

The point is, lower income Americans should be afforded the same opportunity under our tax laws to give to charities of their choice by allowing them the same charitable deduction available to upper income bracket taxpayers, and we should change our tax laws to provide for that.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Charitable Giving Tax Equity Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. DIRECT CHARITABLE DEDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to charitable, etc., contributions and gifts) is amended by redesignating subsection (m) as subsection (n) and by inserting after subsection (1) the following new subsection:

"(m) RULE FOR NONITEMIZATION OF DEDUCTIONS.—In the case of an individual who does not itemize his deductions for the taxable year, the excess of the amount allowable under subsection (a) for the taxable year over \$100 shall be taken into account as a direct charitable deduction under section 63."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (b) of section 63 of such Code is amended by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting ", and", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) the direct charitable deduction."

(2) Subsection (d) of section 63 of such Code is amended by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting ", and", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) the direct charitable deduction."

(3) Subsection (h) of section 63 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(h) DIRECT CHARITABLE DEDUCTION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'direct charitable deduction' means that portion of the amount allowable under section 170(a) which is taken as a direct charitable deduction for the taxable year under section 170(m)."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

COLIN LUTHER POWELL; HIS
EARLY DAYS AS AN OFFICER

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues an article about the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Colin Luther Powell. His career in the U.S. Armed Forces exemplifies that of a dedicated individual who succeeded against all odds to become America's highest-ranking military officer.

The article, which appeared in *The Washington Post* on February 25th, 1991, follows:

[From *The Washington Post*, Feb. 25, 1991]

COLIN POWELL, BEFORE HISTORY TAPPED—IN
HIS EARLY DAYS AS AN OFFICER, LUGGING
RIFLES AND FORGING FRIENDSHIPS

(By Jacqueline Trescott)

It was a bitterly cold November in 1958 and the young soldiers had just finished eight weeks of a grueling Ranger course. They had climbed rocks, established a perimeter defense, chased chickens for dinner, and showed their superiors they had the grit for the Army. A camera caught them as they were boarding their H-4 helicopter back to Fort Benning, Ga., in a moment of youthful exhaustion and relieved accomplishment.

They looked very young with their proud smiles and their filthy fatigues and the rifles slung casually at their sides. They were just another group of second lieutenants going through a rite of military manhood, untested in real battle. But in their ranks were two future three-star generals and two future four-star generals. And standing in the rear row was Colin Luther Powell, now chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the country's highest-ranking military officer. Then he was lugging around a .30-caliber machine gun because he was one of the biggest guys in the patrol.

Gen. Powell is part of our collective psyche now, a looming figure in medals or fatigues, a constant and authoritative voice in the Persian Gulf War. The men he served with in 1958—and later, in an infantry course in 1964—are scattered around the country in retirement or posted around the world on active duty. They watch their old colleague on television and recall when they huddled in their ponchos with only a candle for warmth in the Chattahoochee National Forest.

These men remember those years with fondness. They speak of the Powell they knew then as an outstanding leader who still was a regular guy, yet with a healthy quotient of intelligence, charisma and spunk. He was further set apart, remember some, by his bearing, his candor and his friendliness. Maj. Gen. William A. Roosma, now deputy commanding general at Fort Bragg, N.C., recalls arriving at Fort Benning a day before class started, newly minted from West Point, and sitting alone on his bed. "It seems like yesterday. Colin looked in the door, introduced himself and we have been friends ever since," says Roosma.

Many of these men knew the Army would be their lives. Not so Powell. A native of New York City, he was 21 years old in August 1958 when he reported to Fort Benning. He had a bachelor's degree in geology from the City University of New York and joined the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) when the Pershing Rifles Club caught his atten-

tion. "At that time I never even thought seriously about staying in the Army. My parents expected that, like most young men going in the Army, I would serve for two years . . . and then come home and get a real job," he has said.

In these years before the buildup for the Vietnam War, Fort Benning was a massive, hectic place. And there was a universal outlook and look among the 186 soldiers reporting for basic. "We had a white name tag, black and yellow 'U.S. Army' over your heart, the golden cross rifles and second lieutenant bars, all starched and spiffy," says Harold Van Meter, one of the flattops in the Ranger photo and now a management consultant in Buena Vista, Ga.

Yet there were some differences for Powell. He was one of the few blacks, and the Deep South provided many contrasts to the South Bronx. He had spent his teen years in an industrious neighborhood that was a polyglot of racial groups; he had even learned Yiddish, which he can still reel off today. "I was stationed at Fort Benning before I ever saw what is referred to as a White Anglo-Saxon Protestant," Powell has written.

Also, Georgia held fast to the practices of segregation. When Powell returned to Fort Benning in 1964, he and his wife, Alma, were refused service at Buck's Barbeque, a restaurant on a main road of Columbus, Ga. Now the avenue is named for Martin Luther King Jr. and Powell is a man who advises the president.

William J. McCaffrey, a member of that basic and Ranger course, remembers how bartenders wouldn't serve Powell in Columbus. "We would intimidate the bartender . . . we threatened him—'this is our Ranger partner, you have to serve him.' And they would," recalls McCaffrey, a retired lieutenant colonel and chairman of an insurance brokerage firm in Detroit.

In the infantry group, people stood out for a number of reasons. One was reputation—Peter Dawkins, who was there with Powell but in another section, had been president of the West Point class of 1959, co-captain of the football team, an All-American, winner of the 1958 Heisman Trophy and a Rhodes Scholar. Everyone thought that one day Dawkins would be the Army chief of staff. He did go on to become a decorated paratrooper in Vietnam, a brigadier general and a Pentagon strategist.

Another reason was experience. There was an aura attached to the men who had already been to Vietnam. Powell had been assigned to Europe for two years, Fort Devens, Mass., for two years and then Vietnam from December 1962 to November 1963. "It was like 'they have already been, gosh,'" says retired Lt. Col. Robert A. Smith, a stockbroker with Merrill Lynch in Kingwood, Tex.

The infantry career course required long classroom hours and tough preparation. Powell belonged to a study group with three other men and finished the course in the honors section. He is remembered, not as a star, but as someone who didn't show off. "He wasn't a spring-bud, the one who always wanted to jump up and answer the question. Or, when the rest of us wanted to get out of class, would ask a question," remembers retired Col. Kenneth Montgomery, a defense industry analyst in Huntsville, Ala.

This time at Benning also provided a break from the pressures of the front lines. There were sports teams; Powell played soccer. Families were reunited. Many were started. "It was the kind of place that caused young men to form pretty good friendships," recalls Lt. Gen. Thomas N. Griffin Jr., chief of staff, Allied Forces/Southern Europe.

On the ground floor of Building 4, where they spent most of their time, was a coffee shop, and here Powell and two friends debated the changing world around them. "That fall was the Goldwater-Johnson election. Colin talked about how he and his wife were not able to find a place to stay. And he had particularly strong feelings about Johnson getting elected because he felt that was the best route . . . for civil rights," recalls retired Col. James G. Garvey, now an instructor for Rice Aviation in Phoenix. Garvey laughs, pointing out that he and Powell always paid for the coffee because Tom Griffin always won the coin toss. "And we constantly talked about the war and read the teletype," says Garvey.

Powell has told a story about those days and how out of sync he was with the mindset of the South. Going back to Fort Benning one day, he was driving 70 miles an hour and was stopped by an Alabama patrolman who was handing out "Goldwater for President" stickers. Powell was driving a Volkswagen beetle, equipped with an "All the Way With LBJ" bumper sticker and New York license plates. He told *Ebony* magazine in 1988 that the patrolman "looked at me, the German car, the New York license plate and the LBJ slogan. There was a moment of suspense. He finally said, 'Boy, get out of here. You are not smart enough to hang around.'"

After the infantry course was completed in 1965, retired Lt. Col. Earl Adams of Everett, Wash., chairman of the base's operations committee, asked Powell and another officer to help him revamp a package of instructions. "He has great organizational ability," says Adams. "I have to smile now, the title was 'Unit Readiness.' It embodied tactics, logistics, maintenance. And he had to coordinate with colonels all over the place."

As Powell moved from assignment to assignment, he frequently reunited with the officers of Benning.

His friends say he continued to display a blunt seriousness about soldiering but also had a healthy irreverence for authority. When Joseph Schwar, a retired colonel, now an account executive for IBM in Gaithersburg, was assigned 20 miles from Powell in Vietnam in 1968 and 1969, Schwar heard a report that Robert McNamara had said the war was over. He called Powell and told him the news, and recalls that "Colin said, 'You tell Mr. McNamara to come and see where I am, because someone is shooting at me.'" In his career, Powell was awarded five combat medals, including a Bronze Star and a Soldier's Medal for pulling soldiers out of a burning helicopter, and a Purple Heart after he fell into a trap near the Laotian border and his foot was pierced by a sharpened stick.

In the early '80s, Dawkins and Powell caught up with one another in the Pentagon. Powell was military assistant to the secretary of defense; Dawkins was deputy director of the Army's strategy, plans and policy unit. "As is the reality in a big organization like that, Colin could and did speak for the secretary in some areas. I would meet him in his office and I would feel I had just been to the schoolmaster," says Dawkins. "He displayed the kind of virtuoso mastery of the political complexities of the Pentagon that is rare."

In other ways, as he has risen to the top, Powell has demonstrated that Benning ties are still important. Just a couple of years ago William McCaffrey attended a speech Powell gave to the Detroit Economic Club. "There were all these security people, a mob of folks; 1,000 people were at the lunch. He hugged me and said, 'Mac, how are you?' It

made me feel good. Then we started talking about Ranger Patrol and how the two of us always had to carry the machine gun because we were 6-2 and 6-3."

As Powell's career switched from commanding troops to shaping policy, some of the old friends have wondered if he's happy with that side of the Army. Retired Lt. Gen. Gerald T. Bartlett says that "he has always been in a pressure cooker. The fun of the Army is the tactical units. When he was finally sent over to the V Corps . . . they drug him out again. They couldn't live without him."

Thirty years later Powell is intruding on their lives in a unique way. When the men from his early Army days watch their colleague on television, they are filtering his words through the spectrum of friendship and an intimacy with the military's words and inventory. For example, Bartlett is watching the use of sight units on the Bradley Fighting Vehicle and the goggles worn by the soldiers, all developed when he was at Fort Ord, Calif. The Bradley itself is one of his projects as a program manager for FMC Corp. in Campbell, Calif.

At home in Conyers, Ga., retired Col. Terry Gordy watches for the news of equipment he worked on as an officer and as a civilian. He now works at Rockwell International. And he monitors his friend, thinking, "Go, Go, Go, we are all proud of you, Colin."

Four weeks ago when Powell was urging a skeptical group of reporters, "Trust me. Trust me," Joseph Schwar was walking through Dulles International Airport. He stopped to watch the broadcast. "When he said 'trust me' I said, 'Damn right. I know I can trust you. And as I looked around people were nodding and saying, 'If he says it, I can believe it.' That impressed me."

THE "FUEL EFFICIENT VEHICLE PURCHASE INCENTIVE ACT"

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to introduce the "Fuel Efficient Vehicle Purchase Incentive Act".

This bill will provide consumers with incentives to purchase cleaner, more efficient vehicles by imposing a fee on cars with higher average carbon dioxide emissions and giving consumers who purchase vehicles with lower than average CO₂ emissions a rebate. This bill will not require auto manufacturers to make any changes in their fleet designs nor will it require them to make technological changes. It will simply make cleaner running vehicles more attractive and polluting ones less so. Consumers will purchase more "clean burning, gas sipping" vehicles and fewer "dirty, gas guzzling" vehicles.

The bill sets emission standards for each vehicle category. Cars that fall below the standard for their category will be penalized and those that exceed it will be rewarded. Because the standards are set by categories, this bill will not affect what size vehicle consumers will buy. If a consumer wants a mid-size vehicle he/she can have a mid-size vehicle without having to pay any fee. If a consumer wants a luxury car, he/she can have that luxury car without having to pay a fee.

The bill will only affect choice within size class. A buyer who purchases an efficient, clean running luxury car will receive a rebate. Likewise, a buyer who purchases an inefficient, polluting subcompact will have to pay a fee. That's the beauty of this bill. Consumers will purchase more efficient, cleaner running cars and still be able to get the type of car they want, and they can do so without paying any fee, and maybe even receiving a rebate.

Carbon dioxide, the leading contributor of the global warming phenomena, accounts for 55 percent of greenhouse gas emissions. The United States is responsible for 21 percent of worldwide carbon dioxide emissions. The transportation sector provides us a great opportunity to reduce CO₂ and increase fuel efficiency. Vehicles and light trucks alone are responsible for approximately 20 percent of all carbon dioxide emissions. These vehicles burn nearly 40 percent of the 17 million barrels of oil that we consume daily, nearly half of which is imported. Clearly something must be done to cut down on vehicle emissions and increase efficiency. Fortunately, the two are related. Increasing efficiency will reduce CO₂ emissions and vice versa.

This bill is not a tax; it is revenue neutral and specifically designed to operate that way. The money collected from the inefficient, high polluting vehicles will be returned to those buyers of efficient and more environmentally sound cars. It will provide consumers with incentives to buy cleaner running, more efficient cars. Our air will be cleaner and we will use less fuel. I urge all my colleagues to cosponsor this bill.

REGULATORY RELIEF FOR AGRIBUSINESSES

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join Representative JIM LIGHTFOOT in introducing legislation that would give State governments the authority to waive Federal commercial drivers license [CDL] requirements for vehicles used to transport farm supplies from the retailer to the farm, for vehicles used in custom harvesting, and for vehicles used to transport livestock feed. The measure would extend waiver authority already granted to farm vehicles by the Department of Transportation.

When the Department of Transportation issued regulations in 1988 to implement the Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act, the agency recognized the unique nature of rural transportation and granted States the authority to waive farm vehicles that were controlled and operated by a farmer from the CDL requirements. However, this waiver did not extend to agricultural businesses, who have the same transportation needs as farmers.

In rural farming communities, agribusinesses routinely deliver supplies and equipment to farms, and feedlot operators transport livestock feed. This type of short-haul transportation service is very different from over-the-road trucking or transport serv-

ices in urban areas. These deliveries are generally made over rural roads that are less frequently traveled. Rural areas also have such a small pool of available workers, agribusinesses often utilize students and seasonal workers as drivers. The stringent CDL requirements will pose a significant problem for these small businesses.

This legislation also provides regulatory relief for custom harvesters, who harvest grain for farmers and transport it from the field to market. Most of the driving for these harvesting specialists is done off-pavement by seasonal workers. Custom harvesters have been seeking relief from the CDL regulations. This measure would provide that relief.

A waiver from the CDL program will give States the leeway to exclude agribusinesses, custom harvesters, and feedlot operators from State implementation of the Federal regulations. It will not automatically exempt them. States which have rural agricultural businesses, custom harvest operations, and feedlots, and farmers who depend on them, need the ability to regulate these industries in the best interests of their people and economies.

I urge my colleagues to give careful consideration to this CDL waiver for farm suppliers, custom harvesters, and feedlot operators, and support this legislation.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ALLOW A DEDUCTION FOR FEES FOR SEWER SERVICES

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which will be of enormous benefit to middle-class homeowners across the country. My legislation will allow property owners to deduct, in the same manner as local property taxes, fees for sewer and water services.

Mr. Speaker, across the country, many cities and towns are moving away from property taxes as a method of funding essential governmental services and imposing user fees.

The itemized deduction for property taxes is the most basic of Federal deductions, because it is imposed on the value of a person's home. In my view, sewer and water fees are essentially the same as a tax; typically, they are separately stated from property tax bills principally as a method of dealing with property tax limitations. We must respond to this issue.

My bill does so by allowing homeowners—most especially low- and middle-class homeowners—to deduct fees for sewer and water services to the extent that those fees exceed 1 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income. It is wrong that these fees are not deductible in the same manner as property taxes. In the coming decade, as America meets the challenges of cleaning up our water supply, fees will increase across the Nation. This legislation does something about it, by providing some measure of relief to the middle-class homeowner.

This legislation has been estimated by the Joint Committee on Taxation to result in a loss to the Treasury of less than \$100 million per year. The legislation contains a revenue raiser which I believe will raise more than \$100 million per year, and which is based on sound principles of income tax policy. Moreover, the revenue raiser will further the goal of tax simplification by limiting the need for IRS litigation in one complex area of the law. I urge prompt action on both provisions.

Mr. Speaker, a technical description of my legislation follows:

TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION

SECTION ONE: DEDUCTION FOR SEWER AND WATER FEES

Present law

In computing taxable income, taxpayers may claim itemized deductions. Allowable itemized deductions include a portion of medical expenses, personal residence interest, moving expenses, certain casualty and theft losses, miscellaneous business expenses, and State and local income real property taxes.

For purposes of the deduction for real property taxes, the Internal Revenue Service has defined the term "tax" as "an enforced contribution, enacted pursuant to legislative authority in the exercise of the taxing power, and imposed and collected for the purpose of raising revenue to be used for governmental purposes." (Rev. Rul. 77-29, 1977-1 CB 44).

The Internal Revenue Service has consistently taken the position that fees imposed for sewer and water services are not deductible as local or State real property taxes (see, e.g., Rev. Rul. 79-201, 1979-1 CB 97, Situations 2 and 3; Rev. Rul. 75-346, 1975-2 CB 66; Rev. Rul. 75-455, 1975-2 CB 68).

Explanation of proposal

Under the bill, fees imposed by a State or local government, or the District of Columbia, for sewer and water services would be deductible in the same manner as local real property taxes. The deduction would only be allowed to the extent that the fees exceeded 1% of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income.

Effective date

The proposal would be effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1991.

SECTION TWO: PRO-RATA LIMITATION ON CORPORATE INTEREST EXPENSE DEDUCTION AND ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS OF TAXPAYERS BASED ON TAX-EXEMPT INCOME HELD BY TAXPAYERS

Present law

Tax-Exempt Interest

Interest on obligations of State and local governments used to finance direct governmental activities of those entities is generally exempt from tax under authority of section 103 of the Code. Interest on these obligations, the proceeds of which are used to finance private activities, is taxable unless a specific Code provision excludes the interest from taxation.

Because money is fungible, taxpayers may use income which they received from tax-exempt investments to pay for expenses deductible for income tax purposes. Although the so-called "tax benefit" doctrine requires the inclusion in income of items previously deducted producing a tax benefit to the taxpayer (such as State income tax refunds on tax payments previously deducted), no requirement exists in the Code reducing deductions to the extent of, or on account of, a taxpayer's tax-exempt interest except with borrowing as described below.

Itemized Deductions

As discussed above, taxpayers may claim itemized deductions (subject to certain limitations) for certain nonbusiness expenses incurred during the taxable year. In the case of taxpayers with adjusted gross income generally in excess of \$100,000 (\$50,000, in the case of a married couple filing a separate return), a portion of the taxpayer's itemized deductions are disallowed. Under present law, the amount of the taxpayer's itemized deductions disallowed is equal to 3% of the excess of adjusted gross income over the threshold amounts. In no event can more than 80% of the taxpayer's itemized deductions be disallowed.

Section 265

Code section 265 disallows a deduction for interest on indebtedness incurred to purchase or carry tax-exempt obligations. The intent of section 265 has been described as an attempt to prevent taxpayers "from requiring the United States to finance [their] investments." *Wisconsin Cheeseman v. U.S.*, 388 F.2d 420, 422. (See, also, Rev. Rul. 83-3, 1983-1 CB 72, modified by Rev. Rul. 87-32, 1987-1 CB 131; the purpose of section 265 is to prevent taxpayers from deriving a double tax benefit from an exclusion from income).

Section 265 usually requires an inquiry into the motives of the taxpayer in incurring indebtedness when the taxpayer owns tax-exempt obligations (see, e.g., Rev. Proc. 72-18, 1972-1 CB 740). Rev. Proc. 72-18 provides an administrative safe harbor in the form of a "de minimis" rule which generally provides that absent direct evidence of an intent to incur indebtedness to "purchase or carry" tax-exempt obligations, a non-financial corporation's tax-exempt obligations may consist of less than 2% of its assets, without the corporation's motives in incurring indebtedness being questioned. This de minimis rule does not apply to installment notes of a vendor in the vendor's hands.

Section 265(b) provides a mechanical rule for financial institutions automatically disallowing a portion of the entity's interest deduction in an amount allocable to the tax-exempt obligations held by the institution. For purposes of the rule, tax-exempt obligations do not include tax-exempt 501(c)(3) bonds and bonds issued by small issuers. The 2% "de minimis" rule, discussed above, does not apply to the pro-rata disallowance.

Explanation of proposals

Under the proposal, total itemized deductions would be subject to a tax-exempt interest proportionate disallowance rule. Under the rule, total itemized deductions would be reduced by the percentage of the taxpayer's modified adjusted gross income attributable to tax-exempt interest. In general, modified adjusted gross income is adjusted gross income plus tax-exempt interest income.

The disallowance rule would apply before the limitation on itemized deductions for taxpayers with adjusted gross income in excess of \$100,000 (\$50,000 in the case of married couples filing separate returns).

The operation of the tax-exempt interest proportionate disallowance rule can be demonstrated by the following example. Assume that a married couple has tax-exempt interest of \$10,000, modified adjusted gross income of \$170,000, and itemized deductions of \$25,000. Under the proposal, \$1,470 of the taxpayer's total itemized deductions are disallowed under the tax-exempt interest proportionate disallowance rule (\$10,000/\$170,000) (\$25,000). The taxpayer's itemized deductions would be further reduced by \$1,800 (i.e., 3% of the excess of \$160,000 over \$100,000).

In addition, the financial institution rule of subsection (b) of section 265 would generally be applied to all corporations (including property and casualty insurance companies). Under the bill, as under present law, the 2% de minimis rule of Rev. Proc. 72-18 would not apply to the pro rata disallowance. For purposes of calculating the disallowance amount, tax-exempt obligations would not include (1) short-term governmental debt (i.e., debt with a stated maturity of less than one year) and (2) governmental debt of small governmental units with general taxing powers, both provided that these tax-exempt obligations are less than 0.5 percent of total U.S. assets of the corporation.

Effective date

The legislation is effective for taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of the Act, with respect to bonds issued after the date of enactment.

LEYTE LANDING DAY

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a joint resolution to designate October 20, 1991, as "Leyte Landing Day". This will mark the 47th anniversary of the allied forces' return to Leyte in the Philippines to fulfill a national promise and liberate the Philippine people from Japan. Gen. Douglas MacArthur led the 420 transports, carrying 165,000 men of the U.S. 6th Army, and 157 warships, manned by 50,000 sailors, who fought at Red Beach and represented the largest operation which had been conducted in the Pacific theater up to that point. Through the combined efforts of the Philippine scouts and the Allies, the Japanese were defeated and the direction of World War II was changed.

The events which occurred at Leyte between 1944 and 1945 have not received much deserved recognition. The Leyte landing was as important in the course of World War II as the landing at Normandy on D-Day, and yet, the recognition of the two events has been far from comparable. The Philippine scouts fought bravely alongside the United States Army to defend the vital American military bases in the Pacific and should be recognized for their efforts.

Traditionally, the Leyte landing has been commemorated with ceremonies in various parts of the country, including California. However, I believe it is time for national recognition of this important event in U.S. history. The dedication and sacrifice endured by these men during World War II should not be forgotten. I therefore urge my colleagues to support this legislation to designate a day for national observance of the return to Leyte.

For the convenience of my colleagues, a copy of the resolution is included here:

H.J. RES. —

Whereas October 20, 1991, marks the 47th anniversary of the landing of allied forces on Leyte Island in the Philippines;

Whereas the allies' courageous return to the Philippines fulfilled a solemn national promise to liberate the Philippine people from the Japanese empire;

Whereas the 420 transports, carrying 165,000 men of the United States Sixth Army, and the 157 warships, manned by 50,000 sailors, which fought at Red Beach represented the largest operation yet conducted in the Pacific War; and

Whereas the combined efforts of Philippine Scouts and allied forces resulted in the eventual defeat of the Japanese forces and changed the direction of the war in the Pacific: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 20, 1991, is designated as "Leyte Landing Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

THE EDUCATIONAL EQUITY ACT OF 1991

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, I have been studying the distribution of Federal funds for education. During the 100th Congress, the House approved my amendment to the Primary and Secondary Education Re-authorization Act requiring a study into how Federal education funding is distributed. Last September, the Department of Education released an interim report which showed Utah dead last in 6 out of 11 formulas designed to distribute Federal education dollars to the States. Utah is not alone in this predicament.

Overall, chapter I grants are far above average in the Northeast and well below average in the West. Because chapter I formulas have been proposed to fund new education initiatives in the United States, I believe it is time to start anew the debate over Federal education formulas and fund distribution.

Mr. Speaker, I am today, along with my colleagues from Utah, introducing the Educational Equity Act of 1991 that is intended to spark the debate by proposing modification of the chapter I formula under title I. This bill would alter per-pupil expenditures to more evenly distribute funds.

This bill requires the per-pupil expenditure of chapter I funding be based on the average per-pupil expenditure in the United States instead of the current 80 percent and 120 percent parameters in the formula.

This bill will modify several grants under chapter I funding. These are the basic grant, the concentration grant, the handicapped grant, the migrant program, and the programs for neglected and delinquent students. Under this formula modification, 24 States would receive increased allocations, 21 States would see a decrease, and 5 States would remain the same.

Currently, there are no good measures for determining who is educationally disadvantaged, so instead we measure those who are economically disadvantaged as defined by the poverty formula within the census. However, since the amount spent per pupil under chapter I is the basis for how much money is given

to each State, those States with a higher per-pupil expenditure tend to receive more funding.

Under the current formula, those States with the lowest per-pupil expenditure receive up to 80 percent of the national average and those States with the highest per-pupil expenditure receive 120 percent. However, a State may have a higher per-pupil expenditure based on a declining student population.

The poverty formula, as applied to education, counts the number of children ages 5 to 17, and utilizes this information until the next census. The data from the 1980 census will continue to be used until the official 1990 census figures are released. This allows those States with a declining student population to increase the per-pupil expenditure by spending the same amount of funds among fewer students. Conversely, those States with growing student populations must make do with the same funding levels for growing numbers of students, thereby reducing their per-pupil expenditure over time. Although our bill does not specifically address the need to regularly update the poverty census data to reflect growing or declining student populations, the education formula debate should weigh this issue carefully. This issue does, however, directly influence each State's per-pupil expenditure figures.

Further debate should also analyze each State's effort to pay for education versus the capacity to pay. Many States similar to Utah have little further capacity to raise State taxes for education, yet show a high effort towards funding education. They simply have little flexibility to generate more State funds to increase their per-pupil expenditure.

I ask: "Is it fair that a child of poverty in a wealthy State receive more than a child of poverty in a poor State?" It is time to turn our attention toward our domestic agenda. It is time to debate the Nation's education policies to determine our future within the new world order. Every child deserves a quality education. We must strive to establish an equitable education policy.

The final report analyzing education funding formula distribution will be out this June. I urge my colleagues to carefully scrutinize this information. Educate yourselves so we can effectively determine an education policy course our children deserve.

CONGRESSIONAL ARTS CAUCUS HONORS ACTOR SIDNEY POITIER

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Arts Caucus, I have the singular honor of recognizing one of the true legends of American film. Sidney Poitier—actor, director, and producer—has made an indelible mark on American cinema and culture. Over a career that has spanned four decades, this gentleman of the stage and screen has had a singular effect on American culture. Distinguished, dignified, and universally admired for his work, he is equally admired for his humani-

tarian efforts and for being a voice for America's disadvantaged youth. Through dedication, perseverance, and sheer talent, Sidney has shown that barriers can be broken, that art can many times lead society to a better place and a truer path.

Sidney Poitier began life without a great deal of material comfort. Born in Miami, FL, he moved to the Bahamas where his father owned and worked a tomato farm. Helping with this work until the age of 15, he then returned to the United States, found his way to New York, and enlisted in the Army at 17. Returning to New York after World War II, he worked at a variety of unglamorous jobs and auditioned for the American Negro Theatre. After polishing his language skills with the help of a radio and newspapers and magazines, he worked backstage at this theatre in exchange for acting lessons.

His first professional role was in "Lysistrata" followed by "Freight" and "Anna Lucasta." His performance in "Lysistrata" led to a film test for the film "No Way Out" in which he debuted in 1950. In this film, he starred as a doctor whose sense of justice leads him to painful moral choices. He then went to England for his second film, "Cry the Beloved Country."

What followed has been one of the most brilliant and lasting film and stage careers this country has known. The more than 40 pictures that he either starred in or directed have demonstrated a remarkable diversity and range of character and talent. The New York Times aptly described this gamut of roles as such:

His film characters have run from the streetwise student of "The Blackboard Jungle" to the proper, collected schoolteacher of "To Sir with Love"; from the restless, frustrated Walter Lee Young of "A Raisin in the Sun" to the methodically exact but outspoken detective, Virgil Tibbs, of "In the Heat of the Night."

Many of these roles, particularly the role he created in "A Raisin in the Sun" on Broadway in 1959, will forever remain in the American consciousness.

Sidney Poitier often portrayed the outsider. And, it must be noted, that he was acting at a time in our history when a black actor was treated as an outsider. Despite this, his talent prevailed. He received his first Academy Award nomination in 1958 for "The Defiant Ones." In 1963, he received the Oscar Award for Best Actor for his performance in "Lilies of the Field," becoming the first black male actor to receive this award. I cannot help but note that competition that year was formidable—Paul Newman, Rex Harrison, Albert Finney, and Richard Harris.

But Sidney Poitier overcame more than competition from peers. Because of his talent, he forged a path for generations of young actors. An articulate spokesman, he did not overstate but focused attention on the importance of talent, on the need for roles which would allow every actor to demonstrate his or her talent.

This is exactly what Sidney Poitier has and continues to accomplish. Aside from acting roles in such movies as "Porgy and Bess" and "Guess Who's Coming to Dinner" with Katharine Hepburn and Spencer Tracy, he directed and starred in "Buck and the Preacher" and "Uptown Saturday Night," among others. He

also directed "Stir Crazy" with Richard Pryor and Gene Wilder and "Ghost Dad" with Bill Cosby.

His most recent and impressive undertaking is playing Thurgood Marshall, the first black U.S. Supreme Court Justice, in a 4-hour television miniseries entitled "Separate but Equal." In this ABC production to be aired in April, Mr. Poitier will portray Mr. Marshall when he was chief counsel for the NAACP, arguing desegregation cases.

But what cannot be shown in any simple listing of Mr. Poitier's remarkable artistic achievements is the remarkable humanity which each of these roles convey, or the inspiration and desire for excellence which he has instilled in generations of young people.

Moreover, Sidney Poitier has done more than portray humanity. He is a true humanitarian in action. He has utilized his unique position in American cinema and American society to better this Nation. In addition to leading the fight against race bias in the entertainment industry, he has been the voice—since the beginning of his career—for disadvantaged young people, for, in his words, "youth without a sense of direction, youth with a feeling of worthlessness." An active supporter of civil rights, he has also supported the Children's Defense Fund and has been an effective activist on behalf of blacks in South Africa.

Sidney Poitier continues to inspire, not just because of enormous talent and success, but because of the manner in which he has put his talent to use for a better society. He has been deservedly admired by generations of Americans, and is admired by each of us. The Arts Caucus is proud to honor this artist and gentleman with the Congressional Arts Caucus Award.

EDA SUES LASSEN COUNTY FOR REPAYMENT OF GRANT

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which if enacted would relieve a great financial burden from the already economically stressed Lassen County, CA.

In 1975, Lassen County received an Economic Development Administration [EDA] grant of \$286,768 to add an emergency room wing onto the 28-bed Lassen Memorial Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, the grant agreement with EDA contained a provision that prohibited the county from transferring the hospital during its useful life of 30 years to any transferee which was not "satisfactory to the Federal Government." The regulations which Lassen County received from EDA stated that no approval was required if the property was to be used for its intended purpose under the grant. The property in this case consisted of an emergency room wing of a 28-bed hospital. Lassen County could not conceive of any other possible use for the emergency examining and operating rooms other than for hospital purposes, the intended purpose for the grant.

Lassen County sold the hospital in 1986 to Eskaton Corp., a private nonprofit corporation engaged in the operation of numerous California hospitals. In order to protect the Federal Government's interest in the property, Lassen County had Eskaton execute a service agreement binding it and any of its successors to provide hospital service until the year 2022. Thus Lassen County had a legally enforceable insurance that the property would be used for hospital purposes and qualify for exemption from EDA approval of its transfer.

On June 30, 1986, Eskaton resold the hospital complex to St. Mary's Health Care Corp., a nonprofit hospital management corporation.

In January 1987 Lassen County received a letter from the regional director of EDA stating that he had learned that the hospital had been sold and that he was therefore demanding that the county of Lassen repay the Federal Government \$286,768.

Mr. Speaker, there are three important reasons, I do not believe EDA's position to be fair or equitable toward Lassen County.

First, Lassen County has at all times acted properly and in good faith with the EDA.

Second, Lassen County has not changed the original intent of the grant. What was built to be a hospital wing remains a functioning hospital wing.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, EDA's action places greater economic strain on a county already in a fiscal crisis.

Mr. Speaker, in recent months this issue has taken on new urgency. EDA is now suing Lassen County for repayment of the grant. I urge all of my colleagues to support quick adoption of this legislation.

FLEXIBLE WORK SCHEDULE FOR HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS

HON. TIMOTHY J. PENNY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that was suggested by nurses at St. Mary's Hospital in Rochester, MN, but should assist many other health care professionals. The legislation, which would amend section 7(j) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, allows workers more flexibility in work schedules that are more amenable to the needs of family and child care arrangements.

Health care workers employed by hospitals, nursing homes, and other in-patient facilities are required, by nature of the work, to provide 24-hour, 7-day-a-week staffing of these facilities. The demands of shift work and weekend work, which do not often accommodate personal schedules, have contributed to the current difficulties in recruiting and retaining nurses and other health care professionals. Health care facilities have begun to lengthen work periods—such as expanding an 8-hour shift to 10 or 12 hours of duty—with workers being given compensatory days off. For example, rather than being assigned to work every other weekend, a nurse can be assigned every third weekend and receive additional days off during the week. This type of scheduling is particularly attractive to two-income

families who are attempting to balance work and child care responsibilities.

The problem that has occurred is that under current law, employers are required to adhere strictly to a 40-hour work week, designed around a traditional 8-hour work day and including 5 working days per week. To protect the worker, the law requires that health care facilities pay overtime for work in excess of 8 hours in any work day and in excess of 80 hours in a 14-day period. This precludes the type of scheduling which many health care workers would prefer.

My legislation expands the number of shift hours allowed and the cycle over which the work may be completed while still protecting the rights of the worker. This expansion would be allowed only if the workers and the employer agreed to the change in writing. I believe this bill allows flexibility while still protecting workers' rights.

I am hopeful that this legislation will receive the active consideration of my colleagues, especially those on the Education and Labor Committee, taking into account the needs of health care professionals.

I ask that the text of the bill be printed following this statement.

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7(j) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207(j)) is amended by striking out "and if, for his employment" and inserting in lieu thereof "and if (1) for the employee's employment" and by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", and (2) for the employee's employment—

"(A) in excess of twelve hours in not more than seven days of such fourteen-day period, "(B) in excess of eight hours in the remaining days of such fourteen-day period, and "(C) in excess of two hundred and forty hours in three successive fourteen-day periods,

the employee receives compensation at a rate of not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which the employee is employed. An agreement which calls for a work period described in clause (2) shall be in writing".

TAX INCENTIVES TO PREVENT OIL SPILLS

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, on January 9 of this year, I announced that I planned to introduce legislation to limit tax deductions for oil-spill cleanup costs. I said at that time that the taxpayer shouldn't be subsidizing oilspills.

Now, on the eve of the second anniversary of the Exxon Valdez spill, I rise to introduce such legislation that will establish tax incentives to promote greater care in the transportation and handling of oil on our waterways and to encourage the cleanup of hazardous waste. This legislation does so by denying an automatic business deduction for the costs of cleaning up an oilspill and for the value of the product lost as a result. It also denies an auto-

matic business deduction for the costs and damages associated with cleaning up a hazardous waste site.

OILSPILLS

The 101st Congress enacted the Oil Pollution Liability and Compensation Act, largely in response to the *Exxon Valdez* spill. This law establishes prevention and cleanup requirements, liability standards, and a fund for compensation. The intention was to prompt quick cleanup and mitigation in order to minimize the environmental damage resulting from the spill.

Although this legislation was a good first step, more needs to be done. For example, the new law delays the requirements for double hulls on all oil tankers and barges and fails to establish strict liability for oilspills. Consequently, we can expect this problem to continue to grow.

Everyone knows about the magnitude of the *Exxon Valdez* spill, which could end up costing as much as \$3 billion, and the recent record settlement for \$1.1 billion. But the problem is much deeper than just one spectacular spill. In 1986, the Department of Transportation reported 2,819 spills involving 3.4 million gallons of oil in U.S. coastal waters. In 1985, there were fewer spills, but 15 million gallons of oil were lost.

In my home State of New Jersey, over 1 million gallons of oil were emptied in 10 different spills into the Arthur Kill and Kill Van Kull last year. At Bayonne City Park, in the worst example, an oilspill over 1 year ago dumped as many as 500,000 gallons of fuel oil from a pipeline leak into the Arthur Kill Waterway. After many months of negotiation, Exxon has agreed to settle this case for \$15 million. But the bulk of the oil in New Jersey waters is carried in barges, which will not be required to have double hulls until 2015. If we cannot mandate such safe carriage, we have to put in place economic incentives sufficient to ensure the most prudent and careful behavior on the part of those who carry oil on our waterways.

While both the *Exxon Valdez* and the Arthur Kill Waterway spills have been settled for substantial sums of money, under current law, our strapped Treasury will still end up subsidizing the polluter for its wrongdoing. Those substantial sums of money are fully deductible as a business expense so long as they are not called criminal fines.

According to analyses by House Budget Committee staff and the Congressional Research Service, the Government's \$1.1 billion settlement of the *Exxon Valdez* case is worth far less to the Government. The \$900 million in civil damages are fully deductible from Exxon's Federal and State taxes. The deductions currently allowed will net the Government only about \$500 million under the terms of the settlement. Taking account of the present values of the money, the 10-year payout in the agreement further erodes the real cost of the settlement to Exxon to approximately \$440 million. While our Government is scrambling for ways to pay for such programs as health care and education, this generous taxpayer subsidy will go to a company with over \$100 billion in annual revenue.

Worse, according to a report in yesterday's *Washington Post*, confidential economic stud-

ies done for the State of Alaska and the Federal Government valued the true economic cost of the spill at \$3 billion. Consequently, although at first blush the settlement appears generous, in real terms, adjusted for inflation, the out-of-pocket cost to Exxon is on the order of 15 percent of the damages that it did to the environment. Put another way, as the *New York Times* today pointed out, the cost to Exxon on an annual basis of its gross negligence is equivalent to drilling two difficult offshore wells.

HAZARDOUS WASTE

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 established the Superfund hazardous waste cleanup program. Under Superfund, the Federal Government may order responsible parties to cleanup contaminated sites, may take short-term actions to cleanup emergency situations, and may take long-term actions to cleanup sites, which may be placed on the National Priority List [NPL]. CERCLA also authorizes the Government to recover its cleanup expenses from responsible parties, thereby keeping as much of the Superfund available as possible for future cleanups.

CERCLA's mandate is truly awesome. According to the General Accounting Office, there may be as many as 425,000 hazardous waste sites in the United States. Only about 1,200 of these sites have been placed on the NPL. As of September 1990, onsite construction work had begun at just 254 sites. Cleanup work had been completed at only 54 sites, of which 29 have been removed from the NPL.

It is abundantly clear that the magnitude of the task is overwhelming; that progress has been exceedingly slow; and that if we are ever to get these sites cleaned up, new approaches must be devised.

Some critics have claimed that EPA's enforcement approach has discouraged polluters from agreeing to settlements to pay for cleanups. However, if a responsible party refuses to comply with an EPA order and the site is cleaned up under Superfund authority, the EPA may choose to seek treble damages. This threat of treble damages is designed to encourage polluters to cooperate with EPA and reach a settlement regarding cleanup. Unfortunately, the possibility of treble damages, while helpful, is not always sufficient to promote quick settlement of these cases.

Clearly, an early resolution of such actions is in everyone's best interest. Cleanup may then begin without the delays and expense of protracted litigation and funds that would have been spent on court battles may instead go towards cleaning up hazardous wastes. The responsible party is also better able to contain its costs through settlement. How, then, to provide further incentives to encourage polluters to settle such cases and begin the cleanup process?

USING THE TAX CODE TO ENCOURAGE PROMPT CLEANUPS

My legislation would encourage prompt cleanups of both oilspills and hazardous waste sites by building on the statutory scheme established by the Oil Pollution Liability and Compensation Act and CERCLA. This legislation does not automatically deny a deduction for cleanup costs in the event of an oilspill or hazardous waste emergency. In fact, as long

as the Oil Pollution Liability and Compensation Act or CERCLA is complied with, a deduction is fully available to those responsible for the oilspill or cleanup of the hazardous substance.

If, however, the responsible party is considered negligent or otherwise subject to unlimited liability under either the Oil Pollution Liability and Compensation Act or CERCLA, not only does the party have unlimited liability for damages, but it will not be able to deduct costs related to the cleanup. To be more specific, removal or cleanup costs would no longer be deductible; nor would any damages, payments, civil fines, or penalties; nor would any legal fees incurred in determining the amount of the taxpayer's liability or any amount lost on account of the oil or hazardous substance released or discharged. In other words, when Exxon pays \$1.1 billion in damages as in the case of the *Exxon Valdez*, it will really be \$1.1 billion, not \$524 million, with taxpayers subsidizing the balance.

This tax policy should provide a powerful incentive both for more careful behavior and prompt settlement of any legal disputes regarding cleanups. However, not everyone shares this view. In testimony last year before the Senate Committee on Finance on the Oil Spill Act, Assistant Secretary of Treasury for Tax Policy Kenneth Gideon argued that denying a deduction for cleanup costs would have a disincentive effect for those who do the most and benefit those who do the least to clean up the oilspill or hazardous substance.

It seems to me that Mr. Gideon's point is debatable. Certainly, a deduction can encourage cleanup efforts. But nondeductibility would presumably create some incentive to prevent the spill entirely. Otherwise, the company will have to bear the entire cost, without benefit of a subsidy from the Treasury.

Nonetheless, I recognize that in some instances a blanket denial of a deduction would send the wrong signal. My legislation avoids this by tying in the allowability of the deduction to the framework established under the Oil Pollution Liability and Compensation Act and CERCLA.

Under these statutes, a responsible party has a complete defense to liability if he proves that the oilspill or release of a hazardous substance was caused by an act of God, an act of war, hostilities, civil war, or insurrection. It is also a complete defense if the responsible party proves that the spill or release was caused by an act or omission of another party other than an employee or agent under his control.

Under my legislation, a responsible party who establishes a complete defense under the Oil Pollution Liability and Compensation Act or CERCLA will still be able to deduct its expenses incurred from a release.

These laws also place limits on liability unless the responsible party fails to meet certain conditions. Unlimited liability results if the spill was caused by (1) gross negligence or willful misconduct; (2) the violation of an applicable Federal safety, construction, or operating regulation by the responsible party; (3) the responsible party fails to report the incident promptly as required by law; (4) fails to provide all reasonable cooperation and assistance requested by officials in charge of cleanup activities; or, (5) without sufficient cause

fails to comply with an order issued under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

If the responsible party fails to meet any of these conditions, the party has unlimited liability for damages caused by an oilspill under the Oil Pollution Liability and Compensation Act or damages resulting from the hazardous waste under CERCLA. Under CERCLA, as with certain violations of antitrust laws, the party may also be subject to treble damages. Much as treble damages under the antitrust laws are not deductible as a business expense, under my legislation, a party who has unlimited liability under these environmental laws would also be precluded from deducting the costs of the cleanup or response and any related damages.

In other words, if the responsible party complies with the provisions of the Oil Pollution Liability and Compensation Act or CERCLA, it will be able to deduct all expenses relating to the cleanup. If the responsible party under either statute has a complete defense, or is entitled to limited liability, and is not liable for damages in addition to the costs of cleanup, the party may take a deduction.

To permit a deduction for those who do not comply with these statutes would create just the wrong type of incentive that Secretary Gideon warned against. Conversely, the possible denial of a deduction will encourage responsible parties to comply with the Oil Pollution Liability and Compensation Act and/or CERCLA, including promptly reporting a spill and cooperating fully in the cleanup efforts.

Indeed, I suspect that the possible loss of a tax deduction for cleanup costs and resulting damages would encourage polluters to settle promptly their cases with the Government and begin cleaning up either the oilspill or the hazardous waste site. Such a tax policy thus complements our efforts to promote careful behavior, prevent the occurrence of oilspills, or accidents involving hazardous substances, and encourage the settlement of litigation designed to make responsible parties pay for the cleanup of our environment.

**THE GENEROSITY OF
AMBASSADOR KIMELMAN**

HON. RON de LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. DE LUGO. I am proud to make a statement today in praise of an outstanding member of the Virgin Islands community, Henry Kimelman.

A successful businessman, Henry Kimelman is no stranger to community service. He has served as the Virgin Islands Commissioner of Commerce and as the U.S. Ambassador to Haiti. Through the years he has donated generously to countless public service organizations, government institutions, and non-profit agencies, including schools and hospitals.

Now, Ambassador Kimelman has made two remarkable achievements for the islands he loves: he has created a Virgin Islands foundation to develop a financial resource pool to provide continuing contributions to the community. Secondly, he has donated a half a million dollars seed money to begin the foundation.

These are examples of his generosity, and his vision. Community foundations are among the leading methods of philanthropy today. They encourage additional investment as well as combine and focus resources. The Ambassador hopes the foundation will grow as high as \$10 million in the next few years. The interest alone on these funds will help support countless numbers of deserving community activities.

I also salute Ambassador Kimelman's wife, Charlotte, a member of the board of the Community Foundation of the Virgin Islands, Inc., for her generosity and commitment to the people of the islands.

There is no end to the good works that this new community foundation can achieve. And I am sure there will be no end to the appreciation the people of the Virgin Islands have, as I have, for the generosity, the vision, and the commitment of Ambassador Henry Kimelman.

**DEMOCRACY—THE VANGUARD OF
FREEDOM**

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that one of my young constituents, Jason Buczek, of North Plainfield, NJ, has won ninth place honors in this year's Voice of Democracy Contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Jason is a senior at North Plainfield High School. His participation in the scholarship contest was sponsored by VFW Post 10122 and its ladies auxiliary in Scotch Plains, NJ. I am pleased to share Jason's award-winning essay with my colleagues.

DEMOCRACY—THE VANGUARD OF FREEDOM

(By Jason E. Buczek, New Jersey winner, 1990-91 VFW Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program)

America: the land of the free and the home of the brave! Freedom is flowing through the veins of America—pulsating in her heart! Throughout America, people are making choices such as what schools to attend, what career to pursue, who to marry, and where to live. Isn't freedom wonderful? Are we not fortunate to be residents of the land of the free? That we are! However, the scenario is quite different in other nations of the world where our brothers and sisters do not enjoy these same freedoms. There are countries where the lives are controlled by a small number of people in power. This insignificant number of self-appointed rulers who govern by fear actually decides the fate of the majority—who will attend school and where, what job each individual is suited for, where and how each person will live, and in some cases, even what people will be allowed to think.

Consider for a moment what life would be like without the freedom to make choices and decisions for yourself. Image what would happen if, one morning, you turned on your radio and heard this: "Attention . . . Attention . . . America is now under marshal law! All constitutional rights have been suspended! Stay in your homes! Do not attempt to contact friends, relatives, or loved ones! Do not attempt to

think or depression may occur! Curfew is at 7:00 p.m. sharp after work! Anyone caught outside of their homes after curfew will be executed on the spot! No more than two people can gather anywhere without permission! Obey all orders without question! Anyone who disobeys orders will be executed at once!" Now, although this may sound a bit far-fetched, this nightmare could become a reality without that one enduring strength that keeps us free. We have been blessed by something so powerful that it has held our nation together for 200 plus years. It is the foundation upon which our nation was built and it is the valiant spirit which has proudly protected and defended our Constitution throughout these past two centuries. It is Democracy—the Vanguard of Our Freedom.

Democracy is defined as a government ruled by the people. That includes all of the people, even you, even me. Think to yourself for a moment, how can you be a part of democracy? Ask yourself, how can you strive to protect our freedom? We, as citizens of the United States are guaranteed the right to vote, the right to elect the officials who will govern our nation. Failure to exercise this right is a deliberate abdication of democracy, and consequently, freedom. And yet, sadly enough, we see such complacency around us at election time.

Democracy demands that we strive to enrich our nation, where differences among cultures and peoples are respected, appreciated, and celebrated. Democracy not only protects our freedom but is the cement that bonds our people together as one. The strength of that cement lies in the quality of its collective ingredients. What you get out of democracy depends upon what you put into it. Our unified commitment and our willing embrace of responsibility has the power to move our nation and the world to a brighter, better future.

Perhaps, one way to move ahead is to reflect upon the past. Think back upon those days when the flag was a sacred symbol; when college kids swallowed goldfish, not drugs; when people knew what the Fourth of July stood for; when politicians proclaimed their patriotism and meant it; when government stood up for Americans anywhere in the world. Things surely were not perfect, but you never expected them to be. America was a land resplendant with brave, proud, confident, hard-working people who were quick to say, "This IS the best country in the world!"

Although sometimes the strength and commitment of yesterday seems to be lacking in the attitudes of today, I believe these strengths are simply lying dormant and waiting to be reawakened in a new generation of Americans. It is essential that this rebirth occur immediately, as Democracy is struggling to survive and fulfill her true destiny. Democracy begs to be redefined in the decade of the nineties. In essence, Democracy is the traveler's map, the pilot's compass, the soldier's sword, and the strength of character inherent in the youth of America. Its might fills our memory, rules our hearts, and guides our feet. Democracy demands the ultimate commitment from all of us. It will reward the greatest labor and will condemn all who trifle with our God-given rights. For Democracy is truly the Vanguard of Our Freedom!

THE ANCIENT FOREST ACT OF 1991

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Ancient Forest Act of 1991. The purpose of this bill is to provide a comprehensive long-term solution to the old growth forest—northern spotted owl crisis in the Pacific Northwest. For approximately 4 years, the people of the Northwest have been embroiled in a bitter conflict over how much of the remaining old growth forests with all their dependent species and the bio diversity should be preserved and how much should be harvested. The Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service have tried to resolve the dispute on their own and have failed. Because they have focused on only a single species, the northern spotted owl, they have not taken an ecosystem approach which would provide protection for all the species dependent on such old growth forest ecosystems. Other species such as the pine marten, the marbled murrelet and Pacific salmon may soon be added to the threatened and endangered list intensifying the crisis already caused by the listing of the owl. As long as the agencies continue to focus only on single species and not on the entire old growth forest ecosystem, the conflict in the Northwest will continue to rage on with no end in sight for legal appeals, lawsuits, and injunctions.

The administration also has failed to solve the crisis. In fact, it has abdicated its authority by ducking the issue leaving the agencies to flounder on their own. Neither the White House, the Secretary of Agriculture nor the Secretary of the Interior to date have come forward with any programs or any legislative proposals to solve the problem. Their indifference has created a leadership vacuum that is hurting the people of the Northwest. As the national policy remains uncertain without resolution it allows the crisis to continue year after year, the timber industry is weakened by such uncertainty, workers are losing their jobs, rural economies are deteriorating and the last remaining stands of ancient forests with their unique biological diversity continue to be decimated acre by acre. Although workers, communities, and forest ecosystems are suffering right now, the administration has not proposed a single new program to alleviate that suffering. By inaction, both people and forests are hurt.

The Ancient Forest Act of 1991 provides a long-term comprehensive solution to the crisis in the Northwest. It has three key elements.

First, it focuses on the entire old growth forest ecosystem instead of a single species. It would establish a 6.3 million acre ancient forest reserve system in Oregon, Washington, and Northern California where timber harvesting would be prohibited. To ensure that the reserves are based on the best science available on old growth forest ecosystems and the species dependent on them, a scientific committee, instead of Congress, would draw the boundaries. Working through the Scientific Committee, the Forest Service and the Bureau

of Land Management would have 3 years to establish the reserve system for congressional action. During this interim period, approximately 8 million acres of land would receive interim protection to ensure that old growth forest stands of vital importance to the reserve system would not be lost. Importantly part of this area already receive varied forms of protection as wilderness and conservation units of our Nation land use programs. The measure would establish an Ancient Forest Research Program to advance the level of scientific knowledge on the importance of old growth forest ecosystems and would add the protection of these ecosystems to the national multiple use mandates of the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.

Second, the bill would provide certainty and stability for the timber industry enabling it to plan for the future. During the 3-year interim period while the reserve system is being established, the bill would provide the timber industry with at least 2.6 billion board feet of timber per year from region 6 of the Forest Service and 450 million board feet per year from the Bureau of Land Management's O and C lands in Oregon and California. After the reserve system is in place, approximately 50 percent of the remaining old growth forest stands would remain available for commodity uses.

Third, the bill would help workers and communities impacted by declining timber supplies. Approximately one-third of the bill focuses on economic relief programs for rural communities and displaced timberworkers. These programs include:

First, a special fund in the U.S. Treasury to provide assistance for displaced timberworkers anywhere in the Nation to cover expenses for retraining, job searching and relocating. Financed from the Federal share of timber receipts, the fund would make available approximately \$30 million per year for 5 years.

Second, a larger share of timber receipts for counties. For 5 years, the percentage of national forest receipts returned to affected counties would rise from 25 percent to 50 percent; the percentage of BLM receipts returned would rise from 50 percent to 75 percent.

Third, the creation of new timber jobs by directing the Forest Service to develop a special initiative to improve forest productivity on non-Federal lands in the Pacific Northwest. The Forest Service estimates that this initiative would add over 2 billion board feet to the timber supply within 5 years creating over 5,000 direct timber jobs. Over the long term, many more jobs and billions of additional board feet would result from improving the timber stands on these lands.

Fourth, the creation of new forestry related jobs by putting people to work improving the condition of Federal forest lands in the area affected. Within 5 years, over 2,500 jobs could result from projects on our national forests and BLM public lands to rebuild deteriorating recreation facilities, to reconstruct eroding trails, to improve wildlife and fish habitat and to implement new forestry techniques.

Fifth, the establishment of community assistance task forces to help rural communities diversify their economies and to assist workers in retraining and finding new jobs.

Sixth, the designation of a forest assistance community coordinator appointed by the President to coordinate all relief programs designed to help workers and rural communities.

I intend to work with the Northwest delegation and other interested Members of Congress, as well as, the timber industry and environmental organizations and will carefully weigh their suggestions on this legislation. The time for polarization, acrimony, and hand-wringing is over. It is time now for all parties concerned to come together, get to work and move forward with a solution.

OUTLINE—THE ANCIENT FOREST ACT OF 1991
(Introduced by Congressman Bruce F. Vento, Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands)

Section 1. Short Title.

"The Ancient Forest Act of 1991".

Sec. 2. Findings.

Includes the importance of old growth forest ecosystems, the threats to these ecosystems and the species associated with them and the importance of maintaining a stable timber supply for the Northwest economy and of helping rural communities to diversify their economies.

Sec. 3. Purposes.

Includes protecting ecologically significant old growth, ensuring the viability and recovery of northern spotted owl populations, providing a stable supply of federal timber and providing economic assistance to rural communities and displaced workers.

Sec. 4. Definitions.

Defines the terms used in the bill.

Sec. 5. Pacific Northwest Ancient Forest Reserve System.

Directs the Forest and BLM to establish an ancient forest reserve system in the west side national forests and BLM Districts in Oregon, Washington and Northern California. The agencies have 3 years to establish the system. The bill gives the agencies a hard acreage target for the system—5.6 million acres for the Forest Service and 660,000 acres for the BLM and lists criteria for what lands must be included. The bill provides for a scientific committee to make recommendations to the agencies on how and where to draw the boundaries.

Sec. 6. Management of the Pacific Northwest Ancient Reserve System.

Prohibits mining and commercial timber harvesting, but allows hunting and fishing and roads, structures and motorized and non-motorized recreation and access as long as these activities do not prevent the protection of old growth forest ecosystems. Some system lands will be managed to regenerate old growth forests where they once were.

Sec. 7. Old Growth Forest Ecosystems Outside Ancient Forests.

Directs the agencies to use "new forestry" methods in old growth forests that are not included in the reserve system.

Sec. 8. Ancient Forest Research Program.

Directs the Forest Service and BLM to establish an ancient forest research program.

Sec. 9. The Ancient Forest Scientific Committee.

Establishes a permanent 11 person scientific committee to advise the Secretaries on establishing and administering the reserve system, the research program and the new forestry practices.

Sec. 10. Interim Management.

For the 3 year interim period needed to establish the reserve system, interim protection from timber sales is given to Habitat Conservation Areas, old growth areas protected by current BLM and Forest Service

plans and by BLM's agreement with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, and a specific list of ecologically significant old growth areas.

The section also establishes a timber sales program of at least 2.6 billion board feet annually for Region Six of the Forest Service and 450 million board feet for the BLM for the three year interim. The agencies, however, must follow the Interagency Scientific Committee's "50-11-40" rule for canopy closure and tree diameters and must sell first those timber sales that would have the least ecological impact. After 3 years, the planning process will set the sale level.

Sec. 11. Economic Assistance to Rural Communities.

(a) & (b) Raises the receipt formula percentages for counties.

(c) Establishes a Forest Service initiative on nonfederal lands in the Northwest which would increase the timber supply and create new timber related jobs.

(d) Provides jobs through work projects that enhance the management of national forests and BLM lands in the Northwest.

(e) Directs the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to establish community assistance task forces at the national and local levels.

(f) Directs the President to appoint a Forest Community Assistance Coordinator to coordinate all federal programs that help communities and displaced workers.

(g) Directs that unless otherwise specified the programs in this section will terminate in 10 years after enactment.

Sec. 12. Job Training Partnership Funds. Establishes a special fund in the U.S. Treasury from the federal share of timber receipts to be expended by the Secretary of Labor to help displaced timber workers. The fund will provide workers with allowances for retraining, job searches, relocation and other expenses related to finding new jobs.

Sec. 13. Bureau of Land Management Oregon and California Lands.

Directs the BLM to conduct a study on consolidation of its O&C holdings to reduce the current checkerboard ownership.

Sec. 14. Planning. Incorporates the provisions of the bill into the normal BLM and Forest Service planning process.

Sec. 15. National Mandate. Incorporates the protection of old growth forest ecosystems into the national mandates of the Forest Service and BLM and directs the agencies to conduct a nationwide inventory of old growth forests.

Sec. 16. Appropriation Authorization. Authorizes such sums as may be necessary to implement the provisions of the Act.

IN RECOGNITION OF MS. BETHANY ANN CARLISLE'S WINNING SCRIPT IN THE VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCRIPTWRITING CONTEST

HON. MIKE ESPY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts the Voice of Democracy broadcast scriptwriting contest. This year more than 138,000 secondary school students participated in the contest

competing for 14 national scholarships totaling \$62,500, which was distributed among the top 14 winners. I am proud that one of my constituents, Ms. Bethany Ann Carlisle of Grenada, MS, represented Mississippi in this contest.

In recognition of Bethany Ann's accomplishment, and so that others may share and find inspiration from her words, I am submitting her winning script for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

DEMOCRACY—THE VANGUARD OF FREEDOM
(By Bethany Ann Carlisle, Mississippi Winner, 1990-91 VFW Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program)

Conceived in the spirit of love and friendship, I was born in 1875, in a dingy, old workshop in Paris. It took ten long years to mold and shape me into what I am today. Wrapped and bound, I was placed in a wooden crate that was dragged to the harbor. People boarded me onto a large sailing vessel bound for the land called Opportunity, America. Soon after my arrival in America, I was greeted by President Grover Cleveland and crowds of cheering Americans. I stood tall for my country then, and as the vanguard of democracy, I still stand now.

I hold in my hand a date so very important to our freedom. This date is special in the hearts of many Americans. The freedom that we enjoy now would not be possible without this date, July 4, 1776. I hold it in my hand, clutched close to my heart, so as to never forget it or take it for granted. My other hand I have stretched up in triumph, holding a light. Although this light shines through the night and lights up the harbor and the dark sky, that is not its main purpose. This light shines for democracy—the vanguard of freedom. This light shines in the eyes of Americans when they think of their country. This light shines world-wide as a beacon to all oppressed people.

At my feet lies a chain of tyranny. It is a broken chain—broken when American people refused to accept government without representation—broken when Americans died to secure a government for the people and by the people.

On my head I wear a crown. No, I am not a queen, nor am I a god. My crown stands for freedom and for democracy. This crown has seven spikes for the seven seas and for the seven continents, symbolizing freedom that results from the democracy established by my country.

I serve as a reminder to all Americans of the wonderful gift of freedom. Freedom to vote, freedom to have a trial by jury, and freedom of religion. Freedom, yes, that is the key to our beloved country. Freedom that was won by our people so that we could have a government for our people, a democracy.

Would this great country of ours be so great without our freedom? I think not. Though I would not know how America would be without freedom, for I would not be here. I would not have the pleasure of seeing the near two million pride-filled faces look up at me each year. I would not have had the pleasure of seeing millions of immigrants that have huddled at my feet wrapped in their dreams. As their weary eyes searched the coastline, my face—the face of freedom—was their first glimpse of America. They never forgot the hope that soared in their hearts as they reached the land of democracy. Just as all Americans look up at me and remember what I symbolize, they have not forgotten the sacrifices made by bloody soldiers on the battlefield. I represent Amer-

icans who prize their freedom so highly that they are willing to die to give others freedom also. These Americans were on the first waves of Normandy. These Americans ensured freedom in West Germany and Korea and Panama. These Americans have been at the front of every battle fought in the name of freedom, and this vanguard is the reason I stand here today.

I stand here as a result of friendship that stretches across the Atlantic Ocean, and I am here because of a kinship of democratic ideals uniting the American and French people. I stand here as the physical proof that America was the vanguard of democracy inspiring the French. I stand here offering opportunity, opportunity to make your own choice. I stand here offering freedom, freedom of expression, free election, and private organizations. I am a symbol of the vanguard of freedom. I am the Statue of Liberty.

I am merely standing here as a representative of you. You, the people of America, are the keepers of the flame of freedom. I light the way to freedom, not just for America, but for the world. Now, once again, Americans are being asked to stand up—to stand up against aggression—to stand firm in adversity. Across the ocean I send my beam of light, a glimmer of hope to hostages and to oppressed people everywhere. The American people I represent are there, on the hot desert sands of Saudi Arabia. Once again, as in the past, these people, who embody the principles of democracy, are the vanguard of freedom.

DRUG-FREE TRUCK STOPS AMENDMENT

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Drug Free Truck Stop Act of 1991, a bill designed to put the brakes on drug trafficking at truck stops and highway rest areas along our Nation's highways.

Drug use is an epidemic in virtually every sector of our society. The trucking industry is no exception. A survey conducted by the regulatory common carrier conference indicated that over one-third of all truck driver, have on occasion, operated their vehicles under the influence of illegal narcotics. According to the Department of Transportation, 10 percent of all truckers, or approximately 800,000 truck drivers, use drugs.

The locations where it is easiest to distribute drugs to truck drivers are truck stop facilities and highway rest areas. These areas are locations where drivers frequently stop for fuel, vehicle service, relaxation, and rest. The National Association of Truck Stop Operators estimates that drug use or distribution occurs at approximately 50 percent of truck stops.

The Drug Free Truck Stop Act establishes minimum penalties and increases maximum penalties for distribution or possession with intent to distribute illegal drugs at, or within 1,000 feet of, a truck stop or highway rest area.

The Drug Free Truck Stop Act designates truck stops and highway rest areas along our Nation's highways as "drug free zones." Under the legislation, a first-time drug offense

would, for the first time, establish a minimum jail sentence of 1 year. The legislation doubles the maximum sentence for first-time offenses and triples the penalties for second offense sales occurring in the drug-free zone.

For example, no minimum penalty currently exists for conviction of selling less than 50 kilograms of marijuana. The current maximum penalty is 5 years. Under the bill, a first-time drug offense could bring a minimum jail sentence of 1 year and a maximum of 10 years. For a first-time conviction selling under 500 grams of cocaine, the legislation would set a minimum of 1-year jail term and a maximum of 40 years.

The legislation is supported by the National Association of Truck Stop Operators.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation as it winds its way through the legislative process.

MOTOR VOTER PROBLEMS

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, motor voter legislation has been introduced that would place problematic administrative and financial burdens upon the States. The Alabama Department of Public Safety has expressed concerns about this legislation, which I submit for the RECORD:

ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC SAFETY,
Montgomery, AL, March 15, 1991.

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKERSON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. DICKINSON. As the agency charged with statewide driver licensing, the Alabama Department of Public Safety continues to be concerned about the impact of proposed federal legislation that would link voter registration with driver licensing, such as the currently proposed Senate Bill 250.

I echo my predecessor's, Colonel Tom Wells, acceptance of the legislation's intent of increasing participation in the democratic process by increasing voter registration. I reiterate, however, that Public Safety faces grave administrative and fiscal problems if so-called "motor-voter" legislation is enacted. Implementation would require major procedural revisions, retraining, additional personnel, and office space, at an estimated cost of \$2 million initially. Furthermore, we would anticipate longer waiting periods, increased processing time and decreased efficiency in licensing Alabama's drivers. Of primary concern, however, is dilution of the driver licensing function and focus on safe and legal operation of motor vehicles.

I urge you to address less problematic and more economical means of voter registration, and to consider the negative impact on the Alabama Department of Public Safety of currently proposed "motor-voter" legislation.

Sincerely,

NED W. MCHENRY,
Director.

THE COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION TAX ACT OF 1991

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation with Mr. SCHULZE and eight of our colleagues to revitalize and reinvigorate the rehabilitation and low-income housing tax credit programs. Our bill, the Community Revitalization Tax Act of 1991, would increase access to the investment capital required by both the low income housing and rehabilitation credit programs, thus allowing the programs more effectively to meet the needs that prompted Congress to create them.

This bill encourages the preservation of the Nation's historic buildings and the production of low-income housing credits. These credits were created by Congress in an effort to revitalize the aging downtowns and neighborhoods and provide increased access to affordable housing for Americans nationwide. The programs were established to encourage investment in areas and projects that Congress considered desirable, but unlikely to attract capital on their own because of their high risk, high cost, and low projected rate of return. Unfortunately, because of their interaction with the Tax Reform Act of 1986, neither program is currently functioning as intended.

The passive activity rules marked a dramatic change in Federal tax policy. The rules were designed to prevent individual taxpayers from using losses from certain passive activities to shelter income from wages, salaries, and other types of investment income. The rules addressed a significant increase in the use of losses from certain investments stemming from transactions involving heavily leveraged investments in real estate to offset active income. These transactions, often structured as limited partnerships, would allow investors to take advantage of generous depreciation deductions available for real estate as well as deductions for interest expense to create extensive tax losses in the early years of an investment.

The passive activity rules also restrict the use of certain credits, primarily the rehabilitation tax credit and low-income housing credit, as well as passive losses. Under the rules, a taxpayer generally may now use the credits to offset tax liability generated by income from passive activities. Recognizing that the passive activity rules could have a significant negative impact on the rehabilitation and low-income housing credit programs, Congress provided a special exception for both in the 1986 act, permitting taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of less than \$250,000 to use up to \$7,000 of either credit annually to offset tax on nonpassive income. This limited exception phases out as an individual's income exceeds \$200,000, creating two major problems in the financing of low-income housing and rehabilitation projects.

Such projects have traditionally been structured as private placements under the regulation D exception to public offering registration requirements of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Generally, regulation D requires

that all but 35 investors in a project be accredited investors—individuals with annual income of over \$200,000 or net worth over \$1,000,000. Since virtually all such accredited investors do not qualify for the credit exception to the passive activity rules because of the income cap, project sponsors are increasingly hard pressed to find accredited investors who can utilize these incentives in a private placement. The main investment alternative, a registered public offering, requires extensive Federal submission and individual submissions in every State in which the investment is to be marketed. These requirements make such an approach prohibitively expensive for all but the largest rehabilitation projects.

Recently available data demonstrates that the current credit exception to the passive activity provisions has not achieved its purpose. A National Park Service study reveals that historic rehabilitation activity in 1988 declined to the lowest level since the first year of the rehabilitation tax credit program. In fact, the number of approved projects is now running at one-third the pre-Tax Reform Act level—down from 3,117 in fiscal year 1985 to 1,092 in fiscal year 1988. Invested dollars is also down about the same, from \$2.4 billion in fiscal year 1985 to \$866 million in fiscal year 1988. In Connecticut, the number of part 2 historic applications received by the National Park Service declined a whopping 76 percent between fiscal year 1985 and fiscal year 1988. But the decline was even steeper in other States, such as Pennsylvania, 83 percent; Montana, 91 percent; and Louisiana, 94 percent.

Fortunately, Congress took a limited step in 1989 by repealing the income cap for low-income housing credits, but that is not enough. Vitality and viability must be restored to both the rehabilitation and the low-income housing credit programs. Under the Community Revitalization Tax Act of 1991, this would be accomplished by removing the income cap for rehabilitation tax credits, and by increasing the amount of the credit that can be used to offset tax on nonpassive income from \$7,000 to \$20,000.

This would thereby increase the pool of investors eligible to use the rehabilitation credit and expand the number of practical financing mechanisms available to project sponsors. This bill would have the additional benefit of simplifying the tax law since two sets of credit limitations would no longer apply with the two credits are used in the same project.

Mr. Speaker, Congress reaffirmed its commitment to affordable housing and community revitalization by creating the low-income housing credit and preserving the rehabilitation credits in the 1986 Tax Reform Act. These credit programs have been carefully monitored since that time and clearly a steady decline in the effectiveness of the historic rehabilitation tax credit and a disappointing start for the low-income housing credit has occurred. Simply put, if Congress is to make good on its commitment to create housing opportunities for our most needy citizens and revitalize our neighborhoods, we must ensure the vitality of the low-income housing and rehabilitation credits. I am convinced that the Community Revitalization Tax Act of 1991 can meet those goals. I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring and supporting this legislation.

PROTECT THE WHALES

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution today to enhance the protection and conservation of whales and cetaceans.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, which has jurisdiction over global environmental issues, I have conducted extensive hearings on marine mammal issues. The status of whale populations remains highly uncertain, with evidence indicating that many species continue to decline. Their slow reproductive rate, and the unpredictability of their recovery, even when fully protected, compound the difficulty of studying them. The consequences of removing whales from the marine ecosystem is not well understood.

In 1982 the International Whaling Commission [IWC] adopted a moratorium on all commercial whaling, establishing zero catch limits for 11 species of whales. The moratorium took effect in 1986. Unfortunately, approximately 14,000 whales have been killed since the ban in defiance of the IWC's decisions. Adding to the whale's struggle for survival is the increasingly grave environmental threats from nonhunting sources, including pollution, loss of habitat, increased shipping, oil and gas exploration, oil spills, and use of driftnets. Small cetaceans, known as dolphins and porpoises, are also being increasingly subjected to similar global threats as whales. Their long-term status is jeopardized by these dangers.

Whales and cetaceans are truly unique. They are highly intelligent with distinct emotional features. Powerful moral and ethical questions have been raised over killing them for profit. There is widespread support in the United States and the international community for the position that for aesthetic, scientific, and ecological reasons, whales, dolphins, and porpoises should no longer be commercially hunted.

At the annual meeting of the IWC last year very serious efforts by the few remaining whaling countries were made to overturn the moratorium. They were defeated. However, similar attempts are expected again at the 1991 IWC meeting. That is why this resolution is important. It will reaffirm our country's strong opposition to the resumption of commercial whale killing, and strengthen our stand at the IWC session to defeat such proposals. A similar resolution I introduced last year, which was approved without dissent, augmented the U.S. delegation's position. The resolution reads as follows:

H. CON. RES. —

Whereas whales, dolphins, and porpoises (cetaceans) are unique marine resources of great aesthetic and scientific interest and are a vital part of the marine ecosystem;

Whereas the International Whaling Commission adopted in 1982 an indefinite moratorium on commercial whaling, which was scheduled to go into effect in 1986, establishing zero global catch limits for eleven species of whales;

Whereas despite the moratorium on commercial whaling, thousands of whales have

been killed since its inception by the commercial whaling nations;

Whereas there remain great uncertainties as to the true status of whale populations due to the difficulty of studying them, their slow reproductive rate, and the unpredictability of their recovery even when fully protected;

Whereas the consequences of removing whale populations from the marine ecosystem are not understood and cannot be predicted;

Whereas whales are subject to increasingly grave environmental threats for nonhunting causes, such as pollution, loss of habitat, increased shipping, oil and gas exploration, oil spills, and the use of driftnets and other nonselective fishing techniques, which underscore the need for special safeguards for whale protection;

Whereas, in addition, many of the more than 60 species of small cetaceans known as dolphins and porpoises are subject to a variety of increasing global threats, which include escalating direct hunts, incidental takes in purse-seine nets, high seas driftnets, and gear used in local fisheries, and also wide-spread pollution and habitat destruction;

Whereas powerful moral and ethical questions have been raised regarding the killing of whales, dolphins, and porpoises for profit;

Whereas there is significant widespread support in the international community for the view that, for scientific, ecological, and aesthetic reasons, whales, dolphins and porpoises should no longer be commercially hunted;

Whereas efforts made at the 1990 meeting of the International Whaling Commission to overturn the moratorium on commercial whaling were defeated; and

Whereas there is concern that some countries will again press at the 1991 International Whaling Commission meeting for an immediate resumption of commercial whaling on some stocks; Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) United States policy should promote the maximum conservation and protection of whale, dolphin, and porpoise populations;

(2) toward that goal, the United States should work to strengthen and maintain indefinitely the current International Whaling Commission moratorium on the commercial killing of whales;

(3) the United States should work to strengthen the International Whaling Commission by reaffirming its competence to regulate whaling on all species of cetaceans, large and small, and should encourage the Commission to utilize the expertise of its Scientific Committee in relation to small cetaceans, to urgently consider the Committee's recommendations, and, on the basis thereof, to take appropriate action through resolutions and schedule provisions, where needed, to assure global protection for small cetaceans; and

(4) in so promoting the conservation and protection of the world's whale, dolphin, and porpoise populations, the United States should make the fullest use of diplomatic channels, appropriate domestic and international law, and all other available means.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PANAMA CANAL ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1991

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking Republican on the subcommittee with oversight responsibility of the Panama Canal Commission, I am pleased to introduce today the Panama Canal Act Amendments of 1991.

This bill, which is the product of several years of careful deliberations, will make needed improvements in the operation of the Panama Canal and will help ensure that this waterway remains an efficient transportation system during the remaining years of American stewardship.

Mr. Speaker, let me briefly describe the three major provisions of this proposed legislation. First, the bill will require that the President appoint a new Chairman of the Board of Directors not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this measure. Under current law, the Panama Canal Commission's Board of Directors, which oversees the operation of the canal, is comprised of five Americans and four Panamanian representatives. While the Chairman of the Board is formally elected, since its creation in 1979 that position has been filled by the Secretary of the Army or his designated representative. The Chairman, like all board members, is appointed and serves at the pleasure of the President.

Under the Panama Canal Act Amendments of 1991, the Chairman of the Board would continue to be appointed and approved by the U.S. Senate. However, the position would no longer be filled by the Secretary of the Army or his designee. In fact, the position of Chairman would be held by an American who holds no other office or post in the U.S. Government.

In addition, unlike the other Board members, the new Chairman would hold office for 7 years—a term consistent with other Federal Transportation Agencies such as the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation.

This change will send a positive message to the Panamanian Government that we believe there should be civilian, rather than military, leadership of the canal enterprise and that the canal must operate more like a commercial transportation business.

At the same time, it is my hope that this "demilitarization" of the Panama Canal Commission will act as a powerful incentive for Panama to begin its own planning on how it will assume operational control of the canal in the year 2000. While there are only 9 years left in our stewardship of the canal, Panama has yet to begin to lay the groundwork for the canal's transfer. For instance, Panama has not created an agency to succeed the Panama Canal Commission and it has not addressed the issue of how to retain its highly skilled work force.

Mr. Speaker, this proposed legislation will also slightly modify the composition of the Board of Directors, so that the American members, except for the Chairman, will now represent labor, port operations or U.S. shipping, the Department of State, and the Department

of Defense. Each of these four individuals will continue to serve at the pleasure of the President.

Second, the Panama Canal Act Amendments will further streamline the financial operation of the Panama Canal Commission to allow that Agency to respond more efficiently to such things as changing shipping conditions, landslides, or future international conflicts.

It is essential that the Commission have this type of flexibility so that it can continue to provide quality service to its customers. In fact, we have all learned from Operation Desert Storm that shipping patterns can quickly and dramatically change. While the Commission was forecasting a slight increase in traffic this year, the crisis in the Middle East has caused a massive shift in the movement of cargo in international commerce.

During the past 3 months, the number of transits through the canal has significantly increased; as a result, the Commission could earn as much as \$60 million in unanticipated revenues.

While this would not cause any problems for most businesses, regrettably, the Panama Canal Commission is prohibited by law from accumulating a profit. In fact, any profits that it generates must be paid to the Republic of Panama.

In addition, this year Congress has placed additional constraints on the Commission in the form of spending limitations and prohibitions on the amount of money it can obligate in fiscal year 1991.

Mr. Speaker, since the Commission operates at no cost to the U.S. taxpayer, with its funds derived solely from the users of the canal, I think that it is time we allow the Commission to operate the canal without placing them in a financial strait jacket.

During the past 11 years, the Commission has conclusively demonstrated that it can operate the canal in a financially responsible manner. In fact, during that period, it earned \$4,614,800,000 in revenues and it spent \$4,608,600,000. This represents a surplus of only \$6.2 million which is a remarkable level of achievement.

Mr. Speaker, there are few, if any, other Federal agencies which can match this impressive performance. While this legislation will not allow the Commission to generate profits in the future, it will allow it to operate in a more business-like manner and to respond to changing shipping patterns created by events such as Operation Desert Storm. This change is essential.

Finally, this legislation will create a new fund in the U.S. Treasury entitled the Panama Canal Commission Dissolution Fund. This fund, which will be available after October 1, 1998, would pay for the cost of dissolving the Panama Canal Commission and to complete the payment of those bills charged to that Agency prior to December 31, 1999. Since the Commission will continue to operate the canal up to the moment of transfer, there is no way it can fully pay its bills prior to that date. In addition, it is conceivable that a major ship accident could occur in the canal shortly before the transfer date. Since a report and an investigation could not be completed prior to the transfer, there must be some funds available

to compensate the owners of a vessel involved in an accident in the canal. This is the purpose of the Panama Canal Commission Dissolution Fund.

Mr. Speaker, to reiterate, this fund would only be used to pay legitimate bills incurred prior to the transfer of the canal, and it would be financed entirely from tolls and other revenues raised from the users of this waterway.

In summary, this bill will make several important improvements in the operation of the Panama Canal. It will not, however, have any impact whatsoever on American taxpayers, on the Federal budget, or on the Panama Canal Treaties of 1977.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of the Panama Canal Act Amendments of 1991.

Let us send a strong and powerful message to the Government of Panama that we fully expect the canal to operate efficiently after the year 2000. This legislation will help us accomplish this goal.

HONORING PHIL MATSUMURA

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, it is our great pleasure to add our voices to the numerous friends, family and civic leaders who, on Friday evening March 29, will be honoring Phil Matsumura for his many years of devotion to his San Jose, CA community.

Phil has been an active and dedicated member of the Japanese American Citizens League since 1935. Upon his return from forced relocation by the U.S. Government during the Second World War, Phil served as JAACL Executive Secretary. It was his job to assist returnees with housing and employment. Phil served four terms as president of the local JAACL chapter.

Phil has been a committed member of the Buddhist Church-San Jose Betsuin and the San Jose Buddhist Association. He was a church board member from 1950 through 1980, and a board chairman for 3 years. He has been a member of the association since 1953, and served as cabinet chairman and in other cabinet positions.

The senior citizens of our community are indebted to Phil Matsumura for his dedication and involvement with providing housing for seniors. He served on the charter board of directors for the Fuji Towers Retirement Community from 1976 to 1990. He also served on the board of directors from 1976 to 1990.

The young people of our congressional districts have benefitted by Phil's dedication to family values and sporting programs. He was a member of the original steering committee that organized the Japanese American Youth Organization, he has been a member since 1932 of the Japanese American Youth Club Basketball, the San Jose Zebras. He acted as youth advisor and chairman of the Zebra's 50th anniversary reunion. Phil helped to organize the Young Japanese Adults in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, Phil Matsumura and his wife, Sue, are a vital and contributing part of our community. They raised their three children—Philip, Gary, and Shirley—and at the same time reached out to others with concern and dedication. They take great pride and joy in their three grandchildren.

Congratulations Phil. You are to be commended on your years of unselfish service to your community. We are delighted to join your family and friends in paying honor to you as an outstanding citizen and a good friend, and we ask our colleagues in the House to join our good wish to you.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO TRADE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposal for a free trade agreement is a dagger aimed at the heart of our Nation's industrial base. As conceived by the United States Trade Representative, the agreement will encourage United States manufacturers to invest in Mexico and will lower tariff barriers to Mexican goods. That will open the U.S. market to a new flood of imports in direct competition with goods produced in the United States.

Mexico's pathetically low wage levels will prove to be an irresistible invitation for United States employers to relocate their operations in search of lower labor costs. Our experience with the more limited Maquiladora Program shows us what we can expect from a United States-Mexico FTA. Any such agreement will doom many of our manufacturing industries, including textiles and apparel, auto parts, and glass.

I oppose the President's proposal and the fast track procedure that will allow him to railroad the free trade agreement through Congress, without amendment. I cannot understand why we would give the President the power to write our trade laws and deny to ourselves the right to amend and improve a package of statutory changes that could have far-reaching, negative impacts.

As Members review these issues, I recommend to them a very clear analysis of the United States-Mexico free trade agreement written by Tom Donahue, the secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO. The analysis appeared in the Washington Post, and I ask that it be made a part of the RECORD.

CONSPIRACY FOR THE RICH

(By Thomas R. Donahue)

There are always a good many schemes floating around to help the rich get richer and the poor get poorer, but the one currently being considered here—the proposed North American free trade agreement—is in a class by itself.

Its scale is vast—Yukon to Yucatan. It would profoundly disrupt the \$6 trillion North American economy and throw 90 million Mexicans into cutthroat competition with 270 million Canadians and U.S. citizens. In fact, the list of FTA victims in all three nations would be colossal. In this country and Canada it would include hundreds of

thousands of workers whose jobs would be exported to Mexico.

We have a preview of an FTA in the maquiladoras, the U.S.-owned plants that operate south of the border and exploit about 500,000 Mexican workers. Plenty of U.S. employees of Electrolux, Zenith, GE, Ford, AT&T, Chrysler and other companies have seen their jobs vanish, then suddenly reappear among the maquiladoras. Under an FTA, their numbers would mushroom.

How many people in the United States would be hurt by the upheavals? An International Trade Commission report admits that "unskilled workers" would suffer a "slight decline" in real income, but it happily reports that "skilled workers and owners of capital services" would benefit. For millions, the decline would actually be more than "slight"—but the important point here is that people on the bottom economic rungs would lose and those on the top rungs would win.

The commission mysteriously refuses to say whom it counts as "unskilled workers," but it reportedly includes all workers with four years of high school or less. This would mean that a majority of the working population—52.5 percent—would be hurt by an FTA.

Farther up the ladder, large corporations would hit the jackpot. Mexican plants are already a bonanza for them. They can take advantage of the terrible poverty in Mexico and pay workers a small fraction of average U.S. wages, and they don't have to pay for workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, health insurance or other essentials of civilized life.

Would Mexican workers benefit from an FTA? Again, the maquiladoras are a gruesome preview. They pay employees about 60 to 80 cents an hour, hardly enough for subsistence. Workers in many maquiladoras live in shacks made of packing materials. Their drinking water is sometimes in large 50-gallon drums that previously contained toxic materials. The Wall Street Journal noted that the maquiladoras "very success is helping turn much of the border region into a sinkhole of abysmal living conditions and environmental degradation."

When the maquiladoras started, they were supposed to help Mexico join Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan. But years later, northern Mexico remains an environmental, economic and social inferno. Small wonder. The original purpose of maquiladoras—their "comparative advantage" in international trade—was providing multinational corporations with a poor, frightened work force. That's never changed.

An FTA would turn much of Mexico into a huge maquiladoras. Mexico's wealthiest classes would cash in, but most workers would suffer the fate their sisters and brothers along the border have endured for years.

So what keeps the FTA idea going? A glitzy brand name has something to do with it. The "free trade" label has political clout these days, especially with the European Community's 1992 Single Market on the horizon. But using "free trade" to justify an FTA is like using "the sanctity of the family" to justify beating the children.

If the administration wants a continental arrangement to compete with the EC Single Market, it's doing it all wrong. The Single Market includes a Social Charter. It sets out rights to a minimum wage, social assistance, collective bargaining, vocational training and health and safety protection in all of their member countries, partly to discourage runaway plants. Besides, workers have

recourse to such institutions as the European Parliament and Court of Justice.

The FTA's worker protections can be summarized in two words: "Tough luck."

The Europeans have a \$68 billion Regional Development Fund to narrow the gap between rich areas such as western Germany and poor areas such as Portugal. Here, the per-capita income ratio of the United States and Mexico is a staggering 10 to 1—far larger than anything in Western Europe. In a free-trade area, that would be an economic time bomb, but the FTA wouldn't provide a nickel to defuse it.

No matter. The administration has its FTA scenario all worked out. First, Congress will hand it "fast-track authority." In other words, the House and the Senate will forfeit their right to change anything in the final agreement. The administration will be firmly in control of negotiations. In the end, members of Congress will vote only on the full package. They can take it or leave it—but the administration is confident that they will take it.

All this could happen. If it does, a good many of the working people of North America will find themselves on the "fast track" to being either laid off or exploited.

LET'S NOT FORGET

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, in recent days I had the privilege and pleasure of attending a special dinner meeting at which former President Gerald R. Ford was the guest speaker. The President delivered an excellent address and presented very unique and special insights as to a Presidential role during a national crisis. As is customary for President Ford, he could not have been more lavish in his praise of all of those, President George Bush, our military men and women and a host of others, who played major roles in Operation Desert Storm.

What President Ford did not mention was his role and his direct involvement in the Persian Gulf crisis. Fortunately, Hugh Sidney, in Time magazine's March 25 issue, did outline that Ford involvement in an article entitled "Ford's Forgotten Legacy."

It is truly amazing that President Ford's great "knack of picking good people" paid off so handsomely for us. I am certain that the Time article will be of special interest and I commend it to my colleagues' review. It follows:

THE PRESIDENCY: FORD'S FORGOTTEN LEGACY
(by Hugh Sidney)

If the gulf war spectacular had been a movie, the credits could have listed Jimmy Carter as a progenitor of the Tomahawk cruise missile and Ronald Reagan as merchant prince of the huge weapons inventory that crushed the evil foe. But the fellow who may actually have had more to do with authorizing the success story is never mentioned: Jerry Ford.

Jerry Ford? Correct. As might be expected, given his postpresidential flight paths, the former Commander in Chief hauled his golf clubs to the salubrious environs of Rancho Mirage, Calif., during the crisis. But Ford,

like other Americans, lingered in front of the TV screen as the war unfolded. He was also watching his boys perform back in Washington. "They did a terrific job," boasted Ford.

Of the eight men in George Bush's war council, four were brought in directly or shoved along in their journey by Ford. Two others arrived at the fringes of power during Ford's brief tenure, and their talents were allowed full play in the meritocracy that Ford helped nurture.

"I think I had a knack of picking good people," said Ford last week. To start at the apex of what some are calling a "presidential culture": Ford first spotted George Bush in 1966. Ford, then House minority leader, recalls that Bush was a "bright star" running for Congress in Texas. He hurried down to campaign for him, then helped put Bush on the powerful Ways and Means Committee. As President, Ford made Bush U.S. representative to China and later named him to head the CIA.

When he was Vice President, Ford had got to know Lieut. General Brent Scowcroft, deputy head of the National Security Council. In those days Henry Kissinger was not only Secretary of State but also National Security Adviser. Ford did not like the double duty for Kissinger. He did like Scowcroft. As President, Ford in 1975 gave Scowcroft the NSC title and turned the self-effacing general into a recognized player in vital deliberations. And when Bush moved into the Oval Office, he put Scowcroft back in the job Ford had given him 13 years earlier.

When Ford shuffled his Cabinet, he named a promising but largely unknown 34-year-old as the new White House chief of staff: Dick Cheney. After Ford lost the 1976 election, Cheney decided to run for Congress in his home state of Wyoming. Ford's political instincts stirred again. "I went right out to campaign for him," he says. Cheney won and became a respected and powerful Congressman—until Bush made him Secretary of Defense.

Ford's White House antennas had picked up good signals in 1976 about the Commerce Department's No. 2 man, James Baker. Ford tapped him to hunt delegates at the 1976 Republican Convention, then elevated him to national prominence as his campaign manager. Despite the Republican loss that year, Baker continued to rise, serving first in Reagan's Cabinet and then as Secretary of State for his friend Bush.

Colin Powell, current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Bob Gates, now Scowcroft's deputy, were not directly touched by Ford, but his special brotherhood took them in as they moved through the Reagan years. Of the six men named above, one is President, and three others—Baker, Cheney and Powell—are possible successors to Bush. If that does not quite constitute a presidential culture, it stands as an impressive legacy from a man we sometimes forget, Jerry Ford.

A CHANGING WORLD ORDER WILL BIND US: PRESIDENT GAVIRIA'S ADDRESS AT GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, when Colombia's President Cesar Gaviria

was in town, he gave an eloquent speech at Georgetown University. President Gaviria's remarks focused on the fact, although the fight against narcotics trafficking is the major priority of his administration, other issues—such as economic reform, social and economic development, and democratic institution building—are also major priorities.

In his remarks, President Gaviria characterized the 1980's as a decade of political reform and predicted that the 1990's will be an era of economic reform. To remind us of the consequences of economic neglect, he quoted President John F. Kennedy: "No amount of arms and armies can help stabilize those governments which are unable or unwilling to achieve social and economic reform and development. Military pacts cannot help nations whose social injustice and economic chaos invite insurgency and subversion." President Gaviria then went on to say that, "In our new world order, military might will not be the driving force; tomorrow belongs to those who foster economic innovation."

President Gaviria also reminded us of the fact that Colombia is a country of vast resources with a democratic tradition almost as old as our own—yet nearly all it is known for is cocaine.

President Gaviria said that the Colombians realize that the greatest threat to their democratic institutions "is the demand for cocaine and the insidious violence created by the drug trade." That is why they have, at great personal sacrifice, been willing to carry on the struggle. But he also made the point that the Colombians cannot do it alone.

Colombia's successful campaign against the traffickers has not eliminated the problem but pushed it to Ecuador, Bolivia, and Brazil. And until we eliminate the demand for cocaine in the United States and Europe, supply-side efforts will make little difference. The drug war is an international problem that demands an international solution.

I hope my colleagues will gain a deeper appreciation for Colombia's struggle, as have I, through reading the eloquent words of President Gaviria.

ADDRESS OF CESAR GAVIRIA TRUJILLO,
PRESIDENT OF COLOMBIA

I appreciate you all coming here tonight. I know it is difficult in times like these to concentrate on issues other than the war in the Gulf, a conflict that deserves all your attention and prayers. May I extend to all of you, and to the families of those serving in the Gulf, the sincerest wishes of my countrymen for a quick resolution of the war and the safe return of your loved ones.

It is fitting that I should be here, on this historic campus, to explore with all of you the critical choices faced by our two nations. In 1797, on the steps of Old North, George Washington greeted the students of Georgetown. He spoke of the cause of freedom, and knew all too well the sacrifice his Nation endured in its revolt from colonial rule. At that same moment in history, a young man and the liberator of our Nation, Simon Bolivar, began his quest for freedom. The vision and imagination of these great leaders charted the course of our nations—it is that same vision that must guide us today. Washington and Bolivar gave testament to the fact that our New World is bound together by much more than geography. We are bound by

a common history, by common struggles and by common values.

At a moment when the cause of liberty looked bleak, Bolivar wrote: "The veil has been torn asunder. We have already seen the light and it is not our desire to be thrust back into the darkness." Throughout the decade of the 1980s, across the continent of South America, the veil of oppression was torn asunder and dictatorships were thrown off in country after country. Now comes the critical moment of building on these fragile foundations of democracy. Although we are the oldest democracy in Latin America, we have not been separated from those winds of change. We too have seen the light, and will not be thrust back into darkness.

Here then is our challenge. In a rapidly changing world, and in the midst of this information revolution where we are drawn together by the instant communication of events, how will we manage what President Bush calls the new world order? What is Latin America's role in this new order, and what will it mean for my country and for yours?

In Latin America, the 1980s are often referred to as the "lost decade." Although this was a period of profound political change, the new democracies of our region received little note here, as America turned its attention to democratic reform in Eastern Europe. This is, of course, because your foreign policy has for decades been viewed through an East-West prism. Today's new world order, an order that no longer rests on superpower conflict and the clash of ideologies, allows America now to open its vision to a broader view of our collective interests. That view can now be North-South as well as East-West—today we can focus on what binds us and not what divides us.

My view of the new world order rests on a simple premise. The 1980s was a decade of political reform. The 1990s will be an era of economic reform. Although our democracy is nearly as old as yours, we live among these infant democracies and recognize all too well that the political reform of the last decade will not survive without economic reform. We know that the bedrock of democracy is economic progress.

Although your policy toward Latin America may have wavered, your leaders have also recognized this simple reality. Thirty years ago, John F. Kennedy spoke of the "frontiers of freedom." He said, "No amount of arms and armies can help stabilize those governments which are unable or unwilling to achieve social and economic reform and development. Military pacts cannot help nations whose social injustice and economic chaos invite insurgency and subversion."

Those words are just as true today. In our new world order, military might will not be the driving force; tomorrow belongs to those who foster economic innovation. But this new order should not be taken for granted. Random events alone will not shape it; rather, we must work to build it. That order now demands that we turn our full attention to economic and social justice.

Although we have not suffered the debt problems of our neighbors, and have achieved two decades of extraordinary growth, Colombia has now embarked on the most important economic reform of this century. Even in the wake of the most recent setbacks of the Uruguay Round of GATT, we are committed to opening our economy and are looking to the developed world to do the same. We are in the process of negotiating free trade agreements with Chile, Venezuela and Mexico, and two weeks ago, we offered to

unilaterally eliminate import fees on Central American products—from those countries badly injured by the breakdown of the International Coffee Agreement and the lack of energy resources. Only through a real opening of our economies will we bring about true and lasting economic progress.

Now let me turn to our struggle for judicial reform. As you know all too well, the greatest threat to our democratic institutions is the demand for cocaine and the insidious violence created by the drug trade. Sadly, this is, perhaps, all that most of you know about Colombia. For you, Colombia and cocaine have become synonymous.

That is our tragedy—a tragedy indeed for a country the size of France, Spain and Portugal combined, a country with a population greater than Canada, a young and vibrant country where half our population is less than 20 years old. I can imagine your surprise upon arriving in our capital, Bogota—a modern city of nearly 7 million people—or flying over our vast Amazon basin and rainforests now legally protected from development—an area the size of Great Britain. Yes, it is a tragedy that with all our vast resources, with our longstanding democratic heritage, nearly all we are known for is cocaine.

Yet, we have a responsibility—a deep, moral obligation—to confront this menace. It has touched me in a very personal way. I was elected President following the assassination of a good friend and one of our finest young leaders, Luis Carlos Galan. My campaign was waged on the principle that as a Nation we could not afford to retreat in the face of the most powerful, most violent criminal organization the world has ever known. I was elected by a people who share these values, and who, at great personal sacrifice, are willing to carry on this struggle. Let me be clear. Colombia will not rest until the cartels are put out of business.

We are now in a new phase of this struggle, and one that I understand can be easily misinterpreted by those not familiar with the complex situation we face. For over a year, the cartels have been facing an all-out assault by government forces which continues to have great effect. Thousands have been arrested, the property of the narco barons was seized, their laboratories and airstrips destroyed, their supplies and means of transportation intercepted. We are making real advances, progress evidenced by the skyrocketing price of cocaine on America's streets, and by the plummeting price of coca leaf in Andean countries.

Of course, the cartels fought back—and with a vengeance. Bombings became a daily occurrence. Thousands of innocent civilians and policemen and judges and journalists and politicians lost their lives.

In September, we moved to a new phase, one that recognized that more sophisticated tools were needed to combat both narco terrorism and narco trafficking. We have not slowed the pace of law enforcement. In fact, we are seizing more cocaine now than ever before. In the first 45 days of this year, we have seized cocaine at a rate twice as high as last year. What is new is that we have now embarked on a major effort to bring about judicial reform in Colombia. In the end, we know that unless our own judicial system is effective, we can never truly end this struggle.

I want to talk about one specific element of this judicial reform which has received the most attention here in the United States.

This is the issue of extradition. Unfortunately, too many people here see extradition

as a litmus test of our will to continue the war against drugs. This is not only shortsighted, it is plainly wrong. Your own Attorney General and others in the US Government most familiar with our efforts against drug trafficking clearly understand that extradition is but one tool against the cartels—a tool Drug Czar Bennett called “an imperfect second choice.” I have continued to support extradition as one of the tools to fight the cartels. I have also used something very common in your judicial system—what you call “plea bargaining.”

Now that the cartel leaders are literally on the run, I have offered to try them in Colombian courts if they surrender unconditionally. At the same time, I have made it clear that those who do not surrender and are caught will be extradited. Some of the top leaders have already surrendered. This is rather extraordinary and is testimony to how effective our law enforcement efforts have been. Can you imagine how shocked America would have been in the 1920s if Al Capone had walked into a Chicago police station and turned himself in? And these men have far more power and money than Capone ever had.

This process of plea bargaining has often been mistaken in the press for negotiation with the narcotics. It is not. I have said repeatedly that I will not negotiate with common criminals. Application of a judicial process should not be mistaken for a political negotiation. In fact, the cartels have been waging a campaign in Colombia trying to equate their situation to guerrilla groups which have been engaged in a political battle. The cartels have even asked for political treatment, a request I have and will continue to deny.

Let me take a moment to explain judicial reform in a broader context. What happened to our judicial system? For years, it was strong enough to confront our problems. Colombia has a long legal tradition, and has been respected throughout Latin America for its Constitution and respect for the law. But when the drug trade was born, and as consumption exploded in the United States, the criminal organizations that ran the business grew stronger, richer and far more sophisticated. Colombia became a middle point between the producing countries of the Andean region and the consuming nations in the developed world. Nearly two decades of running a nearly four billion dollar annual business in Colombia and a one hundred fifty billion dollar in the U.S. alone created a monster—a monster our legal system could not contain.

When I took office in August of last year, my first priority was to address the fundamental flaws in our judicial system. Mechanisms needed to be established to withstand the bribery and intimidation by the cartels. We established special courts to try narco criminals, and the judges are being protected in military facilities. We call these “invisible judges” because their decisions are identified not by name but by their fingerprints. We are also changing from a Napoleonic system in which the judiciary investigates and prosecutes to a system like you have here where the Executive is responsible for prosecution. And we are building special prisons for these criminals in order to improve security.

As we move to bring the cartels to justice, we have the same fears you have and we have the same objectives you have. In the end, we must do everything possible to stop their trade in illegal narcotics. Even now, we see them moving laboratories to other neighbor-

ing countries. We cannot take solace in this, as it is only further proof that this is a worldwide problem.

You may be asking yourself right now, how can this man, with such an accent, stand before this audience and claim that Colombia will be successful against the cartels? Let me give you a straight answer. Three of the most powerful narcotics, members of the Ochoa family, have turned themselves in.

We know from our own intelligence that all of the leaders are on the run—they are haunted every day by the thought that they will spend the rest of their lives in fear. So, while we know well the strength of our enemy and that the key is halting demand, we still have faith.

When I attend the funerals of my countrymen, or visit the families of policemen who lost their lives, or see crack babies in Harlem Hospital as I did a few days ago, I cannot help but think that we must keep faith. And while I know that this struggle will never end until demand for drugs ends, and while I recognize the strength of the enemy we face, in the end we have no choice but to muster all our resources so that all this suffering will not have been in vain.

Finally, let me make another point that is crucial to understanding Colombia's role in the drug crisis. It is a point that is perhaps better understood here now because of the war in the Persian Gulf. In time of war, the leadership of any democratic country must balance its conviction to respond to threats with its need to maintain a national consensus. Its leadership also has an obligation to seek international consensus and a global commitment to face common threats. In this regard, President Bush must be commended for his leadership here and abroad in forging a consensus on how to respond to the threat posed by Saddam Hussein.

Although your war is being fought far from home, our war against drugs is not different. In fact, I have an even greater responsibility to build consensus, to maintain the political will in Colombia to continue the struggle within our borders. The costs of fighting narcoterrorism in my country have been enormous, and without demonstrated international support, the political will that now exists will be undermined. The world can hardly expect that in the war on drugs, it will fight until the last Colombian is left standing. Narcoterrorism is a unique threat we face in Colombia. Its root cause, narcotrafficking, is a threat we all face together. There must be a concerted global response. And each of you must acknowledge that those who consume cocaine on the streets of Washington, D.C. are as guilty as those terrorists who pull the trigger on the streets of Medellin.

And so I end with this urgent plea. Your generation can bring about an end to this scourge. On this campus, and throughout this nation, send a clear message that drug use is neither fashionable nor harmless.

Help us stop this madness.

Together, we face great opportunities. This is a unique moment in history. We can break down old barriers and promote economic progress for all our people or we can retreat to protectionism and isolationism and set back the cause of social justice. With vision and creativity, we can create a new world order or we can refuse to recognize new realities and fail to move forward. With shared hopes and shared values, let history look back at this time and say we did the right thing.

TRIBUTE TO THE NEW YORK NATIONAL GUARD

HON. GEORGE J. HOCHBRUECKNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the courage and sacrifices made in the Persian Gulf war by members of the US military. We are perhaps less familiar with the vital role which has been played by the National Guard here at home.

The New York National Guard deserves special commendation for the vital services they have provided to our service men and women. I would like to give you examples of how they played an important role in Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

The painful tasks that needed to be done before a mobilized soldier left for active duty were made easier by the New York National Guard. They not only organized military lawyers, but arranged for the New York Bar Associations of Queens, Nassau, Monroe, Onondaga, and Erie Counties to donate pro bono services. The lawyers made themselves available to lecture and provide one-on-one counseling to service personnel and their families.

Some personnel used this service to write their wills. Lawyers helped soldiers with the difficult task of facing their own mortality, often for the first time, while navigating the intricacies of health care proxies, powers of attorney, the right to die, and living wills. One serviceman needed to know if his fiancée's rights would be better protected if they married before he left for active duty.

Lawyers also helped personnel tackle seemingly small, but nonetheless perplexing problems. Due to his mobilization, one man faced missing his Federal test for an interstate vehicle license. The Guard's efforts, however, helped him realize that military law protected his right to take the exam on another day. Another serviceman's spouse needed a lawyer, but she could not speak English. The New York National Guard arranged for a Spanish-speaking attorney to handle the matter on a pro bono basis.

These examples show that lawyers gave very personal service to our service men and women. The New York National Guard was instrumental in organizing those lawyers who had donated their time.

The New York National Guard also assisted with the financial complications encountered by newly activated service personnel. They arranged for special telephone numbers for soldiers and their dependents to call with Internal Revenue Service problems. The National Guard also provided help to make sure reluctant corporations acted in accordance with the 1949 Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act, which provides some fiscal relief by reducing the interest rate in installment contracts to 6 percent for activated military personnel. In several cases it took legal action to make corporations comply with the act's provisions.

The examples I have given here all have a somber tone—financial considerations, wills, even death. The New York National Guard, however, was also able to facilitate happy events. Brig. Gen. Edwin Kassoff had the

pleasure of performing the marriage ceremony of several servicemen before they left for active duty.

The services provided by the New York National Guard have been essential to the morale of our service men and women. I think it is important we acknowledge the role the National Guard has played on the home front. As Brigadier General Kassoff wrote, "we have already received word that some of the tensions and apprehensions of the mobilized soldiers regarding the care of their families and financial affairs, have been alleviated as a result of our operations." Mr. Speaker, we owe the New York National Guard a heartfelt well done.

A NATIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has just emerged victorious from a war which was as just as it was necessary. A brutal madman's aggression was turned and overwhelmingly defeated in rapid time with unexpectedly little loss of American life. While this conflict was not a war primarily about oil, we must recognize that our sensitivity to the Middle East is in large part due to the massive oil reserves which underlie that desert land. Once again, America's energy vulnerability has been exposed. Twice in the past, we ignored the call to reduce our dependence on imported oil. But now, the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, and the resulting necessity of Operation Desert Shield/Storm, has firmly entrenched into the American psyche the need for a comprehensive, long-range, and coherent energy policy. This Nation's spectacular economic growth has been built on a foundation of cheap, plentiful energy, especially in the form of oil. We face a challenge to that foundation because of our overdependency on imported oil. The President has issued his National Energy Strategy [NES]. Now it is the Congress' turn to substantially improve his draft.

America has a contradictory outlook on our energy use, an outlook which has defied our previous attempts to shape an effective solution to our dependency problem. On one hand, we bemoan our massive energy use. On the other hand, we herald our high standard of living made possible by the use of cheap, plentiful energy. Contrary to popular belief, the U.S. has had an energy policy. It was simply to maintain a steady stream of cheap, available oil. And that strategy has worked, if measured by economic growth. While it is clear that this strategy has withered on the vine, how do we now go about reducing our dependency on imported oil, without raising our overall energy costs so as to slow economic growth and pinch our standard of living?

Complicating these questions is the nature of imported oil. The Middle East holds approximately 65 percent of the world's proven oil reserves, of which most can be pumped from the ground for as little as \$2 per barrel. The average wellhead in Saudi Arabia produces

8,400 barrels a day, versus only 12 in the United States. This supply and price advantage means that the large Persian Gulf oil producers can undercut any other energy source at will. These oil producing nations have been careful to retain this ability through the price-setting mechanism of OPEC, with the Saudis enforcing any agreement through their tremendous reserves and pumping capacity. As a nation, we have been as vulnerable to oil price slides as we have been to price shocks. As soon as the price of a gallon of gas falls, we tend to forget our dependency problem. Because OPEC is expected to keep oil relatively cheap, and domestic production is predicted to fall dramatically, our use of imported oil is expected to sharply increase from 45 percent of total fuel use to 60 percent unless dramatic steps are taken to reduce our dependency.

In a free market, cheap energy is an almost irresistible temptation, to both producer and consumer alike. Inexpensive oil means cheap commodities, cheap transportation, and cheap products. Cutting our use of imported oil will necessarily mean higher prices of gasoline. Unless we are willing to accept a higher price for our energy, with the accompanying hardship placed on our lifestyles, we will not reduce our energy dependency. There is an inherent tradeoff between energy self-sufficiency and low oil prices. An effective energy policy will require sacrifices which it seems the American public may not be ready to accept. There are those who, in the name of the environment, decry the search for domestic oil, but only raise the false panacea of conservation and alternative energy sources as complete substitutes. We must be realistic. A decent energy policy will not arbitrarily exclude any energy source.

The President's energy plan asks for very few sacrifices. His NES is based on the assumption of the unrestrained free market, whereby the intervention of the government into any energy decisions is assumed to cause more distortionary, harmful effects than long-run "good." Therefore, it is only natural that, except for providing for some research and development money for alternative energy sources, the President's plan relies primarily on incentives to produce more energy rather than conserving energy or shifting America away from a focus on oil. Yet an unrestrained focus on the free market to solve our energy problem neglects the fact that the free market does not take into account the strategic value of oil and the price we pay to defend its continued availability. An effective energy strategy must not only look to expanding energy supplies, but to reducing consumption. The debate should not be production vs. conservation, but a combination of both. The latter is not something easily done in the presence of low-cost oil.

Conservation is often triumphed as the way to solve our dilemma. There are even energy experts who insist that, if we just start conserving, we would not have to import a barrel of oil. But here again the price problem is paramount. More often than not, conservation can be more expensive than not conserving. The costs of installing more insulation, an efficient heating system, thermal windows, and space heaters can engulf any proposed saving. The heating system alone can cost more

than the proposed savings. The same is true when we look at the idea of increasing Government-mandated mileages standards dramatically on all cars, known as Corporate Average Fuel Economy [CAFE] standards. If every car did get better gas mileage, we would import less oil, but we would also pay more for our cars—gas guzzling engines are cheaper to manufacture—and they would probably be less safe—because the total weight of the car would have to be reduced. Furthermore, why should Government decide for the average consumer what kind of car he or she will drive? Would the imposition of CAFE standards simply give an incentive for people to keep their gas guzzlers longer, thereby keeping average gas mileage down while at the same time increasing air pollution from that level expected if people bought new cars as they ordinarily might do? To date, CAFE has done nothing to decrease our total fuel use, which remains our goal. These questions and possible costs do not mean we should ignore conservation as a cornerstone to any effective energy strategy. With a few sacrifices, we can all curtail our energy use. Government can insist on building standards for local and Federal buildings. Government can give inducements to utilities and their customers to promote energy conservation. These are steps we must take. The collective result of these sacrifices will mean large savings in our energy use. But conservation alone will not solve our energy dependency problem.

Next to conservation, many people point to the expanded use of solar, wind, geothermal, and hydropower as the best way to cut our oil use. But increases in the use of these sources are certainly more expensive than a continued reliance on oil. With today's technology, the cost of a kilowatt/hour of electricity generated by solar, wind, or geothermal power cannot match the lower cost achieved by nuclear, coal, or oil-fired power plants. Hydropower is as cheap as any other power generation means, but there simply are not many more rivers that we can construct dams on. These considerations should not deter us from continuing research into these power sources. The kilowatt/hour costs of these sources has fallen and will continue to fall with further research and development. Government must be active in providing monies and/or extending tax credits for this evolution. The potential is great. For geothermal power generation alone, the United States possesses an estimated 95,000 to 150,000 megawatt potential, yet only produces 2,600 megawatts of geothermal power. This potential must be exploited if we are to reduce our dependence on oil.

The three cheap and proven sources of energy, which the U.S. potentially has plenty of, are nuclear power, coal, and natural gas. The use of nuclear power has stagnated because of safety and waste concerns and environmentalists who fight its very nature. Coal, meanwhile, has the substantial drawback of creating many of the greenhouse gases and acid rain problems which we are desperately trying to move away from. These concerns must not halt these activities. America has an estimated 300 year supply of recoverable coal. The President's plan includes more money for research into clean coal technologies. Ironically, the move to oil as our primary fuel

came about at the expense of King Coal which was considered too environmentally dirty. Funds for clean coal will be well spent. Nuclear power can be made more safe also, with increased reactor design standardization, better licensing procedures, and a comprehensive waste strategy. To reject this power source out of hand dismisses an important contributor to our energy self-sufficiency. Power generated from nuclear fusion is the energy source of the future. Continued research and development funds are vital to keep this technology moving toward a goal of commercial viability. In the meantime, we can increase the use of natural gas, a resource the United States has large reserves of and which emits far fewer greenhouse gases than does oil.

Finally, I come to the subject of oil use itself. Whether we like it or not, the use of oil will continue to dominate the energy picture for the foreseeable future. Therefore, it is incumbent upon this Nation to exploit our domestic reserves. In the last 5 years, we have lost 2 million barrels per day of domestic production and will continue to lose more as the Prudhoe Bay field in Alaska declines. Substantial gains can be made through enhanced recovery methods, but these will not be enough. We cannot arbitrarily put all geographic areas off limits to exploration if we are truly serious about reducing our energy dependency. Unfortunately, the increased potential for the domestic production of oil comes from areas which have also raised environmental fears, primarily the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and the Outer Continental Shelf. I believe many of these areas can be exploited in a manner that is safe and responsible, while preserving the long-term environmental integrity of air, sea, and land.

The transportation sector of our economy is, by far, the largest user of imported oil. Therefore, an effective energy strategy will focus on how to cut oil consumption in our cars and trucks, largely by the increased use of alternative fuels and the aforementioned imposition of CAFE standards. These alternative fuels primarily include methanol and ethanol additives to gasoline, as well as the use of natural gas, hydrogen, and electricity to power cars. The promise of these fuels is great, but mainly because of their long-term potential rather than any short-term gains. Here, too, the costs are higher than that of gasoline while net emissions reductions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases are likely to be only slightly smaller than the emissions generated by gasoline. Other drawbacks of these fuels include range and power limitations. The power needed to generate electricity or refine these fuels will have to come from power plants which most often use fossil fuels. Unless these are nuclear or alternative, greenhouse gases will be produced. Again, these concerns should not dissuade us from fully pursuing these options. Government support with capital costs and providing markets for these fuels is imperative. But we should not be thinking solely in terms of alternative fuels, but instead devote our energies to getting people out of their cars and onto mass transit systems. I have long been a strong supporter of these systems, and will continue to be an advocate in the future.

America has made great improvements in our energy efficiency since the oil shock of 1973. Between 1973 and 1985, U.S. manufacturers increased production by 30 percent, while cutting energy use by 15 percent. Since 1973, the U.S. economy has grown by 51 percent while energy use has only grown by 9 percent. Our economy is 30 percent more energy efficient today than in 1973. These gains have come despite a real price decline in the price of oil since the end of World War II. Nor should the reports that we are running out of oil be believed. Since 1973, proven world reserves have increased from 667 billion barrels to 1002 billion barrels, enough to last another 100 years.

Even with the above statistics in mind, it is incumbent upon us to search and find a more secure energy future. Logically, the only way to reduce oil use would be to raise its price, thereby forcing consumption down and making other energy sources price competitive. The best way to raise this price is through a gas tax. But there has been scant political support for any new taxes of this type. In the absence of that support, I believe we will only meet our goals if we continue to explore all energy options while we make government an active player in energy research, development, conservation, and production efforts. This Nation has enjoyed a standard of living the rest of the world has long envied. If we are to preserve the American way of Life without the need for foreign intervention we must produce a comprehensive energy plan for which the American people will be willing to make sacrifices in the best interests of this Nation. I will work diligently to ensure that the plan which does emerge from this Congress is balanced, fair, and effective.

JAPANESE FAIR TRADE?

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, the Japanese refuse to engage in fair trade practices with the United States and continue to keep their markets closed to American exports. The latest example of Japan's violation of trade agreements and accepted international standards of fair trade occurred last Saturday.

At an international food fair in Tokyo, an American rice exhibit was removed by Japanese authorities for violating their ban on foreign rice. I shudder at the thought of a democratic, free-market oriented society intimidated by a single exhibit. Yet, Japanese officials contend the presence of American rice violated their import laws, and would have eventually resulted in Japanese dependence upon foreign sources of rice. I contend that this is another example of Japanese protectionism and hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, this act is symbolic of Japan's contempt for the notion of free trade and proof of our unbalanced trade relationship with Japan. In my view, the Japanese want to have their rice and eat it too. There is no nation in the world which benefits more from access to American markets than Japan and, yet, few

nations remain as closed to our exports. Japan's unfair trade practices not only hurt our trade deficit and the Japanese consumer, they also cost us jobs. We can no longer accept unfair Japanese trade practices. I urge my colleagues to consider countermeasures in response to Japan's closed markets.

THE CHURCH BENEFITS SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 1990

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today the Church Benefits Simplification Act of 1991—legislation which I also introduced in the 101st Congress. The act provides much needed simplification and clarification of, as well as consistency in, the rules that apply to church retirement plans. In addition, the act resolves significant problems churches face in administering their retirement and welfare benefit programs under current law.

My staff and I have worked closely in developing this important legislation with leaders of the pension boards of 28 Protestant and Jewish denominations whose employee benefit programs are among the oldest in our country. These programs provide retirement and welfare benefits for several hundred thousand ministers, lay workers employed by thousands of churches, and church ministry organizations serving the spiritual needs of over 66 million members. The programs provide benefits for ministers and lay workers employed in all forms of pastoral, healing, teaching, and preaching ministries and missions, including, among others, local churches, seminaries, old-age homes, orphanages, mission societies, hospitals, universities, church camps, and day care centers.

The goal of the act I am introducing is to simplify and clarify the rules that apply to church employee benefit plans. Under current law, these rules are generally lengthy and complex and are, for the most part, designed for for-profit, commercial employers. Unlike for-profit, commercial employers, most denominations are composed of thousands of work units, each having only a few employees, and the budgets of these work units are marginal at best. These organizations rely almost completely on contributions from the offering plate to support their missions, including the salaries and retirement and welfare pensions of their ministers and lay workers. Unlike for-profit business entities, churches cannot pass operating costs on to customers by raising prices.

Churches are also much more loosely structured than most for-profit business organizations, and many denominations cannot impose requirements on their constituent parts. For example, hierarchically organized denominations may be able to control the provision of employee benefits to ministers and lay workers, while in congregational denominations, such control is typically more difficult.

In addition, churches have no need for tax deductions. Churches and church ministry or-

ganizations therefore lack the incentive of for-profit employers to maximize either the amount of the employer's tax deduction or the amount of income which the highly compensated employees who control a for-profit business can shelter from current taxation through plan contributions and tax-free fringe or welfare benefits.

Retirement and employee benefit tax laws do not always take the difference between churches and for-profit employers into account, with the result that churches have had to divert a significant amount of time and resources from their religious missions and ministries in attempting to identify and comply with rules that in many instances are unworkable or simply not needed for church employee benefit plans. This legislation will significantly reduce administrative burdens and related costs now imposed on churches ministry organizations. Unlike the for-profit sector, where cost savings can result in a better bottom line for shareholders, saving in the church sector will find their way into missions and ministries that help people who need assistance.

A study of Independent Sector, a national membership organization composed of over 600 tax-exempt organizations and corporate philanthropy departments, indicated that approximately half the funds contributed to churches is used in service to others. Religious congregations are the primary voluntary service providers for neighborhoods. Ninety-three percent of religious congregations have one or more programs in human services. Four-fifths of all religious congregations offer family counseling, and one-third give meals or shelter to the poor. Some 78 percent donate for international relief or missionary activity, and two-thirds sponsor hospices, health programs, hospitals, or provide for disabled, retarded, or people in crisis. The Independent Sector study indicated that religious congregations made \$8.5 billion in direct grants to other groups and paid \$10.7 billion for education, human services, and health programs. These figures are double the giving of all U.S. foundations and corporations combined.

It is my view that the Congress should do everything possible to ensure that churches can continue to maximize their contributions toward these important missions and ministries, rather than paying for costs of complying with rules that are unworkable, or not needed, for church employee benefits plans.

The cornerstone of the act is a recodification of the rules applicable to church retirement plans so that all of such rules in the Internal Revenue Code are identified, simplified, and separated from the rules that apply to for-profit employers. Retirement plan issues unique to churches will thus not be inadvertently impacted when Congress is considering future Code changes which are applicable to for-profit employers but not appropriate for churches.

The act would also ensure that church retirement plans, whether described in the new section 401A (applicable only to those church section 401(a) plans) or section 403(b), are subject to the same coverage and related rules. In 1986, Congress determined that the section 403(b) plans of churches and so-called qualified church controlled organizations should not be subjected to the expense of

complying with coverage and related rules. The act would extend this same relief to church section 401A plans and would also eliminate the troublesome qualified church controlled organization approach in favor of a provision that only subjects church-related hospitals and universities to applicable coverage and related rules. The act, consistent with the law that now applies to church section 401(a) plans, would also clarify that the coverage rules that will apply to the section 403(b) programs of church-related hospitals and universities are those that were applicable prior to the enactment of the Employee Retirement and Income Security Act of 1974.

The act also would resolve a number of other problems many church pension boards face under current law. For example, under present law there is a question as to whether self-employed ministers or chaplains who work for nonchurch employers are able to participate in their denomination's retirement and welfare benefits programs. The act would make it clear that such ministers may participate in such programs.

In addition, the act would: Restore QVEC's for church plans; solve several church employee aggregation problems; eliminate an administrative problem faced by multiple employer church plans that provide permitted postretirement medical benefits; provide relief that will result in better retirement income for foreign missionaries; simplify the required distribution rules that apply to church retirement plans; eliminate an unworkable requirement under the so-called section 403(b) catch-up contribution rules; and make relief granted under section 457 consistent with coverage relief proposed for church retirement plans.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this vitally important church employee benefits legislation.

THE ALTERNATIVE FUELS INCENTIVE ACT

HON. MICHAEL A. ANDREWS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, two of the greatest problems we must address in the very near future are energy self-sufficiency and protection of the environment. For many years I have advocated the need for increased use of alternative fuels in this country. They are clearly the best way to address these plaguing problems. It is time that the Federal Government acknowledge their value and encourage their use.

To this end, I am introducing today the Alternative Fuels Incentive Act of 1991. This bill will provide the initial support needed to start a large-scale alternative vehicle fuel movement in the United States. Last year, I was glad to be joined by 74 of my colleagues among whom were members of both parties from many different regions of the country.

The Alternative Fuels Incentive Act of 1991 will provide tax incentives to encourage the use of clean-burning alternative fuels in vehicles. The switch to such fuels is absolutely essential to improve our national energy security and clean up our air.

Our country has gone without a comprehensive energy policy for too long. The recent war in the Persian Gulf has made the need for such a policy clearly evident to everyone. Not only is our reliance on foreign oil a threat to our national security, but our domestic oil and gas industry is in shambles and consumers are continually subjected to wild fluctuations in prices.

We simply must encourage further development of our domestic energy resources for the long term. Domestic supplies of clean-burning alternative fuels such as natural gas, ethanol, and methanol are plentiful and have no negative impact on the Nation's trade balance. The Department of Energy estimates that our potential domestic supply of natural gas is 1,188 trillion cubic feet. At present rates of consumption that is a 68-year supply of gas. Methanol is derived from natural gas and coal. Ethanol is derived from corn which is produced in surplus by our farmers every year. I believe it is imperative that we capitalize on these important domestic resources.

In addition to being good energy policy, this legislation has numerous environmental benefits. While much of the environmental debate has focused on ways to reduce stationary source industrial pollution, it has somewhat ignored the fact that nearly half of the ozone pollution problem in many areas like the city of Houston can be attributed to vehicle emissions from the transportation sector. As the number of vehicles on the road increases, so does our air quality problem. This is the problem I have targeted in my bill.

Switching to clean-burning vehicle fuels can greatly reduce smog-forming emissions of reactive hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides. For example, using natural gas instead of gasoline can reduce reactive hydrocarbon emissions by up to 85 percent and nitrogen oxide emissions by up to 65 percent. Alternative fuels are also an effective tool against acid rain and global warming because they reduce carbon dioxide emissions.

The Alternative Fuels Incentive Act of 1991 provides the needed push to start a large-scale clean-burning alternative fuels movement in this country. Clean burning is defined as natural gas, liquefied petroleum gas, liquefied natural gas, electricity, or a fuel which is at least 85-percent methanol, ethanol, other alcohol, or ether.

Specifically it would provide:

A 20-percent tax credit for equipment to convert a vehicle so that it may run on a clean-burning fuel.

A 20-percent credit for refueling station equipment directly related to delivering a clean-burning fuel into the fuel tank of a vehicle, including tanks for liquid fuels and compressor stations for natural gas.

A 20-percent credit for the fuel system of a new vehicle produced to run only on a clean-burning fuel.

Credit equivalent payments to State and local agencies so that they may take advantage of the credit.

The initial effect of this legislation will be to encourage private and public fleet owners to convert their vehicles to run on an alternative fuel, and it would also encourage the development of a badly needed alternative fuels infrastructure in this country.

We have the technology to make alternative fuels a reality today. Only the initial cost of converting to a system of alternative fuels and natural inertia is holding us back. For example, the cost of converting a vehicle to run on natural gas can be over \$1,000. The cost of installing a compressor station for the refueling of natural gas vehicles can run into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. These costs are significant hurdles to the development of an alternative fuels system.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal is an important component of a sound national energy strategy for America. Although people across the country are beginning to recognize the enormous benefits inherent in conversion to alternative fuels, the risks to our national security and our precious environment continue to mount. As Congress works in the coming months to develop a comprehensive energy program, I hope my colleagues will join me in making a serious commitment to the use of alternative fuels.

NATIONAL DOCTORS DAY

HON. MIKE PARKER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, during the 101st Congress, the Congress by Senate Joint Resolution 366 (Public Law 101-473), designated March 30, 1991 a National Doctors Day. On February 21, 1991, the President issued a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

This proclamation shows our appreciation for the role of the physician in caring for the sick, advancing medical knowledge, and promoting improved public health. The local physician plays a vital role in the fabric of life in our communities. From the rural doctor to the most highly trained specialist, physicians touch the lives of our constituents daily.

I ask you to join me in celebrating this day and extending this honor to every doctor throughout this great country.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF PARKER, BERG, SOLDWEDEL & PALERMO

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives the 100th anniversary of the law firm of Parker, Berg, Soldwedel & Palermo in Pasadena, CA.

From its modest beginnings in 1891 to this present date, this fine firm has stressed general civil law and has grown to include probate, trust, estate planning, elder law, taxation, family law, real property law, corporate law, personal injury and civil litigation.

The firm saw its beginning on April 15, 1891, when Judge J.H. Merriam, one of Pasadena's first justices of the peace, opened his law offices at 42 E. Colorado St. In 1917, the firm's name became Merriam, Rinehart & Merriam, when Judge Merriam's son, Ralph T. Merriam, and an outstanding trial lawyer named Jay D. Rinehart, joined the firm.

The firm's partners have contributed much to Pasadena during the past century. Harvey M. Parker joined the firm in 1927 and is currently the oldest living past president of the Pasadena Bar Association. He became "Of Counsel" to the firm in 1987. J. Harold Berg joined the firm in 1940. He is a past president of the Pasadena Bar Association, the Pasadena YMCA and the Y's Men's Club. Fred W. Soldwedel came next, joining the firm in 1964. He is the president-elect of the Pasadena Rotary Club and a past president of the Pasadena Bar Association and the Tournament of Roses Association. Peter R. Palermo followed, joining the firm in 1965. He is a past president of the Pasadena YMCA and the Y's Men's Club. Fred D. Soldwedel became associated with the firm in 1990, completing the firm's second father-son association.

Mr. Speaker, let me once more voice my pleasure in congratulating the oldest law firm in Pasadena, Parker, Berg, Soldwedel & Palermo, on 100 years of faithful legal services to the Pasadena community.

TO OUR CHILDREN

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, the President and the Congress have challenged Americans to welcome home our soldiers coming home from the Gulf. I would like to pay tribute today to one of those citizens who has taken this instruction to heart.

Dan Alfaro, an attorney in Corpus Christi, TX, is a generous man and a former Vietnam veteran who will be hosting a rally for the troops in Corpus Christi on April 7, 1991. He is not asking for personal recognition—rather he is allowing, through his generous efforts, a special tribute for those young men lost by our community and an unique welcome for our troops who are coming back to our homes and our open arms.

Dan Alfaro is a true patriot and he is a poet as well. The following is a poem he wrote for our troops:

TO OUR CHILDREN

Our country's leader had no choice
For tyranny raised its deadly voice.
So he called for gallant Knights
To help out with the Points-of-Light.
To risk their lives for freedom's cause
And not complain about their loss.
Away they marched—our nation's best
Not knowing who'd be laid to rest.
Cold swords attached most human form
Our soldiers fought in Desert Storm.
There was darkness everywhere;
The breath of war is never fair.
But God's light removed the dark
And our Knights could feel his spark.
Evil saw its pillars torn
As world's freedom was reborn.

Our heroes now are being feted
For a mission well completed.

Even those who're with the Light
Smile with us and share delight.

They gave their lives for you and me
So all our Brothers could be free.

Thank you, Comrades, now departed;
You have left us broken hearted.

Having fought your last great fight
Now you're with the King of Light.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE DR. JOHN M. "JACK" HODGES

HON. GEORGE (BUDDY) DARDEN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, one of Marietta, GA's most prominent physicians, Dr. John M. "Jack" Hodges, passed away at age 75 on January 23, 1991. I rise today to honor his memory, and share with my colleagues the story of this honorable citizen and his family.

As a young man, Hodges worked alongside his father as a pharmacist at the family's business, Hodges Drug Store, on the Marietta Square, an historic landmark in our community and then the hub of the Marietta business community. Due to its popular location and reputation for hospitable service, the Hodges' store developed a tremendous clientele of northwest Georgia residents. Accordingly, it was assumed that one day the young Hodges would succeed his father as store manager and carry on the family business. However, Jack Hodges wanted to take his ability to heal, serve, and care for people one step further—he wanted to be a physician.

Dr. Hodges received his undergraduate degree from Emory University, where he was a member of the Kappa Alpha fraternity. He attended the Philadelphia College of Science and graduated with bachelor's and master's degrees in pharmacy. In 1943, he enrolled at the Medical College of Georgia in Augusta, GA. Dr. Hodges served a year's residency at Charity Hospital in Augusta, and a 4-year residency at Piedmont Hospital, where he established the residency program and helped to get it accredited.

He left Piedmont Hospital to return to Marietta and begin his surgical practice. In 1953, he was called to active duty during the Korean war, and served 2 years at Surdea Air Force Base Hospital in Albuquerque, NM. Dr. Hodges returned to Marietta after the war and practiced for 27 years.

Dr. Hodges was a former member of Marietta Rotary Club, a fellow in the Surgeons of America, and served on the Marietta First United Methodist Church board of trustees and board of stewards. He also was associated with the Highlands United Methodist Church of North Carolina.

After retiring in 1980, Dr. Hodges took time to develop unique hobbies—gourmet cooking and collecting rare Oriental rugs. He was a thoughtful, quiet man who gave freely of himself through his work and civic interests in efforts to better Northwest Georgia communities.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Hodges will long be remembered, and truly missed. Our sympathies

are with his wife, Madeline Traylor Hodges; daughter, Madeline Hodges Knox; son, John M. "Mac" Hodges; and other relatives and friends.

THE SIXTH ANNUAL SALUTE TO
PASSAIC SEMI-PRO BASEBALL
REUNION DINNER

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to six great Americans, who will be honored on Friday, April 12, 1991, for their outstanding athletic contributions to the city of Passaic. On that special day, the sixth annual salute to Passaic semi-pro baseball reunion dinner will be held at the Athenia Veterans Hall in the great city of Clifton, in the heart of my Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey.

The weather is getting warmer and spring is in the air. As a nation, we prepare to once again celebrate the annual rite of spring which uniquely binds us together as a society. Of course, I am referring to the great game of baseball, our national pastime.

Mr. Speaker, as I stand here in the well of the House of Representatives, I think back to those halcyon days of yesteryear, when my brother Jim and I would head off to the sandlot, with our bats, balls, and gloves in tow. To be bathed in sunlight, with the smell of freshly cut grass hanging in the air, what a delightful way to spend a Saturday afternoon.

I reminisce about these fond memories as I think about the truly outstanding abilities and achievements of the men who put Passaic semi-pro baseball on the map. Their outstanding talents, which they displayed between the white lines truly made the diamond shine.

Of course, I refer to the following greats of Passaic semi-pro baseball: Edward Dandy, Joe Popek, Frank Kelly Russnak, Henry "Lefty" Zecker, Ralph "Corp" Dilullo, and the late great, John Plavchan. Each and every one of these individuals have made vital contributions to the game that gave them so much pleasure.

Edward Dandy was the long-time player manager for the Passaic Maple Leafs. Joe Popek starred for the Clifton Mystic Rams, the Paterson Uncle Sams, and the Clifton Dodgers. He recently completed his 50th year in baseball. Frank Kelly Russnak is recognized as one of the outstanding pitchers of his time, starring for many years with the Passaic Cubs.

Henry "Lefty" Zecker was an outstanding outfielder who had a long association with clubs from Garfield. Ralph "Corp" Dilullo has had a long and distinguished career in baseball. He has worked as a professional scout for over 38 years, and signed many athletes who played in the major leagues. John Plavchan was a noted first baseman during his playing days in the twenties and thirties.

When these titans of amateur ball played, the quality of semi-professional baseball was of an extremely high caliber. Major league baseball had only eight teams in each league, and had not yet expanded to the west coast.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Semi-professional teams were the pride of their communities, with keen competition between local towns.

RESTORATION OF TSUS TARIFF
SOUGHT FOR ARTHRITIC DRUG

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced H.R. 1501, which will restore the duty assessed on Flurbiprofen to the 6.8 percent originally paid under the TSUS. After the conversion to the Harmonized System of Tariffs [HTSUS] in January 1989, U.S. importers found themselves faced with a 100 percent duty increase on Flurbiprofen to 13.5 percent even though the stated intent of the conversion to HTSUS was to maintain duty neutrality. While that has not always been possible, a 100 percent increase on any product is a stiff penalty.

Flurbiprofen and Ibuprofen were both classified in the same basket item in the TSUS at 6.8 percent—TSUS item 412.22. The two drugs are both nonsteroidal, anti-inflammatory agents. During the conversion to the HTSUS's more complex classification of imported chemicals, Ibuprofen was specifically provided for in the HTSUS—what is now 2916.39.15 of the HTSUS—at the TSUS rate of 6.8 percent. Flurbiprofen was not included in this specific provision, although no one in the administration can give a reason why, other than inadvertence. Since no specific provision was made for Flurbiprofen, Customs, under the new HTSUS, now believes the drug should be classified under 2916.39.30, which is under the same superior heading, but in a basket category carrying a 13.5 percent tariff.

Since there is a chemical relationship between Ibuprofen and Flurbiprofen and since they are used for the same purposes, the HTSUS should clearly indicate that both are assessed the same column 1 rate of duty, as was the case under the TSUS. My bill would add a new subheading for "Flurbiprofen" after "Ibuprofen" in the HTSUS to correct the inadvertence in tariff conversion and to avoid what could be a very lengthy and costly Customs protest and/or court action seeking an alternative classification, which would still not provide specifically for Flurbiprofen. Since this proposed change in HTSUS language takes place at the eight digit—or national—item level, it will not affect the international nature of the Harmonized System, which applies only to the six-digit heading level.

Flurbiprofen is used by the Upjohn Co. to produce ANSAID, which is a nonsteroidal, anti-inflammatory drug that is highly effective in treating arthritis. Most of the company's production occurs in the United States and Puerto Rico, but a small percent comes from its plant in England—less than 5 percent—and is needed to fulfill the increasing United States demand for the product.

I believe that this legislation is warranted in order to resolve the significant inequity that resulted in this instance during the conversion from TSUS to HTSUS.

March 21, 1991

A LOCAL BARRIO SUCCESS STORY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in saluting the Gents, a community-based service group in my congressional district composed of former gang members with deep roots in the San Bernardino area. On Saturday, March 30, the Gents will celebrate its 11th annual installation of officers.

The Gents were considered a gang from 1952 to 1963. Its members grew up and went their separate ways. A reunion in 1973 led to the formation of a chartered, nonprofit community service organization in 1975. Its first president was Pete Ramos. Frank Rodriguez is the current president.

The Gents are well known in the Latino community and throughout the Inland Empire for their fundraising activities. Golf tournaments, menudo cook-offs, and holiday dances have been organized to provide benefits to the community. The Gents have a scholarship program benefiting two high schools with total fund contributions exceeding \$51,000. Approximately \$75,000 has been donated to individuals in need, nonprofit organizations, and community projects since Gents organized in 1975.

But the Gents are also known and respected for the willingness of their members to give personal support to each other and to their community. Besides helping one another with personal counsel and encouragement, the Gents help young gang members to change their lifestyles in a positive direction. The Gents regularly invite young gang members from the barrio to attend meetings, and Gents members speak at local schools against gang violence and drug abuse.

In 1986, CBS Channel 2 recognized the Gents as "Home Town Heroes." I concur in that assessment, and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this outstanding service organization.

MAINE TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL
SOUTH STUDENTS WIN ILLINOIS
STATE CHAMPIONSHIP IN THE
BICENTENNIAL CONSTITUTION
COMPETITION

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to recognize 18 high school students from Maine South High School in Park Ridge, IL. On the last weekend in February, these members of Patton Feichter's advanced placement government class won the Illinois State Championship in the Bicentennial Constitution Competition. I am extremely proud of Karen Bott, Katie Carlson, David Hartwig, Jill Howard, Jason Ichen, Brian James, Katherine Kougiias, Natalie Kuehn, Tom Lin, Margaret Metzinger, Mary Michal, Nathan Myers, Lauren Ofenloch,

Kristi Sigg, Michael Szwed, Albert Tseng, Susan Wiatr and Kim Wiederer, as I know are their peers, parents and teachers. These accomplished students will represent all of Illinois in the national competition here in Washington on April 26-30.

The Bicentennial Constitution Competition is run by the National Bicentennial Commission. Successful competitors must display an in-depth knowledge of U.S. history, the Federalist Papers, Supreme Court decisions and a wide variety of current political and constitutional issues. Since the entire competition is verbal, they must also be able to think on their feet and express themselves in an intelligent and articulate manner.

The success of my young constituents—and Ms. Michal of Representative ANNUNZIO's district—is indeed well-deserved—they worked very hard to advance this far. I will be rooting for them when they come to Washington.

A BILL TO PROHIBIT IMPORTS OF SEMIAUTOMATIC WEAPONS

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, Today I am introducing legislation which would ban the importation of semiautomatic assault weapons, ammunition feeding devices, and certain semiautomatic weapon accessories into the United States.

As you well know, my overriding goal as chairman of the Way and Means Subcommittee on Trade has been to expand international trade and investment by keeping markets open and competitive. I usually oppose trade restrictive actions, but Congress can no longer afford to remain silent on this issue.

Although the Administration has imposed an importation ban on certain semiautomatic rifles, Congress must enact a permanent, statutory ban on imports of these and other semiautomatic weapons.

Specifically, the legislation I am proposing will prohibit importation of designated semiautomatic assault rifles and pistols, large capacity ammunition feeding devices, and certain semiautomatic weapon accessories. [The United States and any State or political subdivision will, of course, be excluded from this import restriction.]

These weapons are not designed for the sporting purposes of hunting game or for recreation. They are instead intended to kill human beings and are being used more and more frequently by Drug Gangs and for other criminal activity throughout this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members of the House of Representatives to assist me in passage of this important bill.

FORMER ASSISTANT POLICE CHIEF JESSE A. BREWER CONGRATULATED

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my warmest congratulations to former Assistant Chief of Police Jesse A. Brewer who retired February 28 from the Los Angeles Police Department [LAPD], after 39 years of dedicated and distinguished service to the force.

Jess Brewer retired as the LAPD's second highest ranking officer and the highest ranking black officer in the history of the department. His ascension to that post might have seemed an unlikely prospect when Brewer left the Chicago Police Department, discouraged by its discriminatory hiring and promotion practices, in 1952. Indeed, Brewer's LAPD career began only after the department rejected his initial application on a technicality—an event Brewer attributes to racism. With the help of future Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley, then an LAPD sergeant, Brewer successfully reapplied to the force. Needless to say, we are all glad that he did.

A native of Dallas, TX, Jess Brewer was born October 21, 1921. Brewer attended Alabama's Tuskegee Institute where he met his wife, the former Odessa Amond, who was also studying at Tuskegee. However, he was obliged to leave Tuskegee in June 1943, when he was called to military service. He would later complete his undergraduate education at Shaw University. Brewer underwent military training at the Officer Candidate School at Fort Benning, GA, and was commissioned as a 2d lieutenant upon his graduation. Serving a total of 33 years of Active and Reserve military service, Brewer retired in January 1976 with the rank of colonel. His decorations include the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, Purple Heart, Combat Infantry Badge and two campaign ribbons. In 1977, he earned a masters degree in public administration from the University of Southern California.

Brewer's many LAPD assignments reflect his broad experience in the department. These assignments have included patrol, vice, traffic, homicide and burglary investigation, and community relations. As a captain, Chief Brewer commanded the Van Nuys, metropolitan, and training divisions. At the rank of commander, Brewer held several other command assignments.

In 1981, Brewer was promoted to deputy chief and served as commanding officer for the area encompassing south-central Los Angeles from 1981 to 1987. In this capacity, he garnered praise for pioneering several law enforcement innovations. Significantly, Brewer implemented new officer deployments, placing more officers in minority neighborhoods, as the gang crisis intensified. Through these efforts, Brewer helped to forge a more positive and constructive relationship between the department and the primarily African-American residents of a south central Los Angeles community plagued by drug- and gang-related violence.

Chief Brewer was promoted to the rank of assistant chief on November 19, 1987. As assistant chief, he directed the activities of the Office of Administrative Services where he was responsible for all support functions of the department. He was widely regarded as an ideal candidate to succeed Chief Darryl Gates as the LAPD's top officer.

Jess Brewer's vast knowledge and expertise with respect to law enforcement were such that he was selected as a technical adviser to the Emmy Award winning television series, "Hill Street Blues"—a series widely praised for its realism and technical accuracy. Over the course of his career, Chief Brewer also served on the board of numerous prestigious public and private organizations, including the President's Commission on Organized Crime and the National Advisory Committee Task Force on Disorder and Terrorism. Most recently, he served as a Governor-appointed member of the board of directors of the California Museum of Science and Industry and as a commissioner of the Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum Commission.

Assistant Chief Brewer has received many honors throughout his law enforcement career. He was the 1988 recipient of the NAACP's Judge Thomas L. Griffith Legal Award and the Ricky Bell Humanitarian Award. Chief Brewer was an honoree at the 1990 National Association of the Black Military Officers' Dinner and is a lifetime member of the NAACP.

Uniformly described as a gentleman and an articulate spokesperson for the department, and dubbed "the Prince" by his colleagues, Jess Brewer has performed his duties with tremendous dignity and distinction, and has served as an inspirational role model for hundreds of minority and other officers in the Los Angeles Police Department. Moreover, by his fine example and by his firm insistence, Brewer has been instrumental in making the Los Angeles Police Department a fairer and more hospitable place for minority police officers.

I ask you to join me, Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute to a fine officer, a true gentleman, and a good friend on the occasion of his well-deserved retirement, and in wishing for Jess and his wife Odessa, their three sons, Jess II, Jonathan, and Kenneth, and their grandchildren, good health and good times in the years to come.

BEAVER FALLS MUNICIPAL AUTHORITY CELEBRATES 50 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today before the U.S. House of Representatives to publically extend congratulations to the Beaver Falls Municipal Authority as it celebrates 50 years of service.

It was more than 120 years ago that the residents of Beaver Falls first received water service from a local spring. The city's water was delivered through lines that were installed by the members of the Economy Society in 1868 and 1870. As Beaver Falls grew, so did

the town's need for adequate water service. Thus, the Beaver Valley Water Co. was born in 1883, which utilized various other springs and wells.

Soon after, the Beaver Falls area became home to thousands of families and hundreds of industrialized businesses, and water service became expansively vital. It was on June 12, 1940 that the city council passed an ordinance authorizing the formation of the Beaver Falls Municipal Authority. The authority purchased the Beaver Valley Water Co. for \$5½ million.

Today, the Beaver Falls Municipal Authority provides 21 communities in my congressional district with excellent water service. Since its inception half a century ago, the authority has nearly doubled its customers, daily consumption, pipe lines and fire hydrants.

So it is with special pride that I praise the commitment of the Beaver Falls Water Authority members and workers as they celebrate 50 years of service.

INFANT MORTALITY AWARENESS DAY

HON. J. ROY ROWLAND

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. ROWLAND. Mr. Speaker, as the most powerful and scientifically advanced country in the world, the United States has no excuse for not reducing the country's chronically high rate of infant mortality.

It's not that we haven't been trying. The Sunbelt Caucus, and the National Commission To Prevent Infant Mortality have been fighting to reduce infant mortality for a number of years. And some progress has been made. For one thing, Federal funding for prenatal care has gradually increased. But we have recognized from the beginning that money alone could not win this fight.

What we need more than anything else is education, public awareness, and community involvement. Many thousands of infants could be saved or spared lifetime physical and mental disabilities if more expectant mothers were told about the care they need and about how to obtain it. Although many positive things are happening, we still have not done all we could to marshal community resources behind this effort.

This is why we, the members of the Sunbelt Caucus Task Force on Infant Mortality, invite our colleagues to join with us in supporting Infant Mortality Awareness Day on Mother's Day, May 12, 1991. It is another effort, Mr. Speaker, to get our churches, businesses, educational systems, health professionals and volunteers, and all citizens to work together to promote healthy births and a lower infant mortality rate.

This is something we can all do for our country.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO PASTOR EDWIN E. CASHMAN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to a man who has served his community with great distinction. I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the outstanding achievements of Pastor Edwin E. Cashman.

Born the son of Reverend Arthur and Iva Cashman, young Edwin had an early exposure to the rich life of religious devotion and leadership. Upon graduating from Bob Jones University in South Carolina, Edwin enrolled in the Grace College and Theological Seminary, where he received a bachelor of arts degree in Divinity. He completed his postgraduate work at the Fuller Seminary in 1955. Mr. Cashman spent the next 6 years as an associate pastor of Grace Brethren Church in Ashland, OH. He then moved west to become the senior pastor of the Grace Brethren Church in Compton, CA. In 1966, Edwin took over as senior pastor of Bellflower Brethren Church, where he has honored this position ever since.

Under Pastor Cashman's leadership, the Bellflower Church boasts an active and spiritually sound congregation. The pastor takes an extremely active role in the instruction and guidance of his flock, typified by his "hands-on" training of 18 young pastors and missionaries. As a legacy to his tutorage, 12 of these are currently involved in full-time Christian ministries throughout the United States and foreign missionary fields. During the course of his ministry at Bellflower, Pastor Cashman has had a direct and positive influence on the lives of many hundreds of members, associates, and friends.

The weekend of April 6 and 7 has been set aside by the Bellflower Brethren Church to honor Pastor Cashman for his 25 years of devoted service to his church and community. These 2 days will be filled with activities designed to entertain the assembled well-wishers, but also to recognize the contributions and achievements of the pastor's long ministry.

Through this congressional salute, my wife Lee and I would like to add our voices to those of Pastor Cashman's six children, and the members, former members, and friends of the Bellflower Brethren Church in paying tribute to Edwin for his leadership, guidance, and most importantly, his cherished friendship. We wish him all the best in the years to come.

ALFRED G. ZANETTI: OUTSTANDING A.I.C. VARSITY CLUB MEMBER

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 23, 1991, the American International College Varsity Club will honor

one of its most distinguished and loyal members, Alfred G. Zanetti. For more than 40 years Fred Zanetti has held every office, chaired every committee, and served the Varsity Club with a commitment and dedication which has allowed this organization to grow and develop into one of the most successful alumni organizations in New England.

Fred Zanetti deserves the honors which his friends and associates will bestow on him this evening, but their recognition reflects only part of the Fred Zanetti story. His loyalty to American International College is well known but his service to the greater Springfield community is even more significant.

Mr. Speaker, every great city needs great leaders and throughout his entire professional career Fred Zanetti has been a leader. His service to the South End Community Center, the Greater Springfield Community Center Agency, the South End Little League, the Hampden County Retarded Children's Association, and the American Junior Red Cross is too extensive to detail in these remarks.

As a teacher, principal, and guest lecturer he has been a pioneer in the field of urban education. Programs which he initiated to provide nutritional and medical programs have now been emulated across this Nation.

Fred Zanetti's service to the greater Springfield community has not gone unnoticed. He has been granted the Boys Club of America Gold Medallion for outstanding devotion to youth. He has been saluted by the Springfield Chamber of Commerce for outstanding service to the city of Springfield and he has been awarded the Beth-El Brotherhood Award for service and devotion to the youth of Springfield.

Fred Zanetti has also been the recipient of Springfield's most prestigious community service award, the William Pyncheon Medal, and in June of 1990 he received his most significant honor when the school to which he had dedicated so much of his life was named the Alfred G. Zanetti School.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the entire American International College community in honoring Fred Zanetti and I am pleased through these remarks to make his record of community service a part of the history of the United States of America.

TRIBUTE TO UKRAINIAN-AMERICAN VETERANS

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Ukrainian-American Veterans of the United States as its members from my 17th Congressional District of Ohio meet in Cleveland for their 44th annual convention.

The members from my district come from all branches of the service. They represent Americans of Ukrainian descent who have defended our country not only through World War II, the Korean war, and the war in Vietnam, but also through times of peace. These members have a longstanding record of veteran fellowship as they keep alive the memory

and appreciation of those who gave their lives for America. They offer aid and comradeship to families of these heroes and recognize the need for continuing community support for all veterans.

The Ukrainian-American Veterans dedicate themselves to the promotion of democratic ideals both for Americans and for Ukrainians. They strive to defend justice, liberty, and goodwill in America while offering encouragement and assistance to the people of the Ukraine. These members hope that the land of their heritage, the Ukraine, will someday achieve sovereignty and enjoy the privileges of democracy its descendants have so valiantly defended in America.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I congratulate the members of the Ukrainian-American Veterans of the United States as they convene in Cleveland to celebrate the 44th year of their fine organization. As strong, caring defenders of the values and freedom Americans hold so dear, the Ukrainian-American Veterans stand as an inspiration to us all. It is truly an honor to represent the members of this distinguished organization.

PHILLIP ANASTOS AND CHRIS FRENCH: AN APPRECIATION

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention today to the extraordinary achievement of two high school students from my congressional district. Phillip Anastos and Chris French, who are now seniors at the Rye Country Day School, are the authors of a moving new book, "Illegal: Seeking the American Dream."

Anastos and French spent part of last summer traveling through the border towns along the Rio Grande River. They met with illegal aliens, border patrol officers, and relief workers whose lives intertwine along the Texas-Mexico border. These meetings led to a better understanding of the lives of these individuals, their problems, and their aspirations. Phillip and Chris also captured what they saw on film, and these poignant photographs form the heart of their work.

I want to congratulate these two young men, who have exhibited a degree of talent, dedication, and professionalism which is exceptional at any age. The product reflects their sensitivity and their remarkable perceptive abilities. They are to be commended for their creativity and for the manner in which they presented this complex problem.

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN V. GIOVENCO

HON. JAMES H. BILBRAY

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding member of the Las Vegas Community. It is a great honor to

serve as vice chair of the committee which will honor John V. Giovenco with the American Jewish Committee's Institute of Human Relations Award. This award will honor John for his outstanding civic and community endeavors and his contribution to fostering intergroup relations.

As a member of the Hilton Corp. executive team, John has been an integral part of the success to the Hilton properties in Nevada. Since coming to Las Vegas in 1972, he has served as treasurer of the Las Vegas Hilton and Flamingo Hilton hotels and presently oversees the Hilton Nevada properties. In addition, he serves on the board of directors of Great Western Financial Corp.

Yet, it has been his civic involvement which has served as a showcase of his love for the community. He is currently a member of the executive board of the Boulder Dam Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America, the board of trustees of the UNLV Foundation, and honorary trustee of the Las Vegas Symphony Orchestra. In these capacities, he has been a patron of the arts, preserved the integrity of our educational system, and fostered the development of our most vital legacy, our children.

John V. Giovenco is not only an outstanding example of the Las Vegas community, but an outstanding example for all citizens. I congratulate him on this well deserved honor, and encourage others to follow his proud example.

CLIFFSIDE HEALTH CARE CENTER GRADUATION

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 29, 1991, the Cliffside Health Care Center in Cliffwood Beach, NJ, will graduate its first class of certified nurse's aides. It is a great honor for me to pay tribute to these dedicated and caring health care workers in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Cliffside Health Care Center has been in operation since 1973. Last March, the facility was acquired by Common Health Care Systems, Inc., which has extensively improved and upgraded the center. In accordance with New Jersey guidelines, the center has administered to its employees the rigorous State test. Their passage of the test enables them to work as a nurse's aides in any health care facility in the State.

The graduates, all residents of the Monmouth County, NJ, area are: Bernadine Robin, Kathleen Rawlinson, Swarn Thakral, Rama Thakar, Linda Milian, Evelyn Burns, Ann Alexander, Mary Cheatum and Annette McCormick. Next Friday's ceremony will also be a source of tremendous pride for Geraldine Crockett, who has long served as the facility's administrator.

FREEDOMS FOUNDATION'S BILL OF RESPONSIBILITIES

HON. RICHARD T. SCHULZE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a joint resolution which acknowledges and extolls the Freedoms Foundation's bill of responsibilities.

Freedoms Foundation is a national patriotic institution devoted exclusively to fostering among the American people an understanding of, and commitment to, the freedoms enjoyed by our citizenry. Freedoms Foundation has, since its inception in 1949, worked to prevent the erosion of the ideals and principles upon which our country was founded. Through programs, seminars, and workshops, Freedoms Foundation seeks to encourage a thorough knowledge of American history, including the creation and adoption of the documents which forged our Nation; to develop, particularly among young Americans, an understanding and appreciation of the nature and benefits of freedom and the institutions of a free society; to promote an understanding of our free enterprise system; and, to teach and motivate responsible citizenship. To this end, Freedoms Foundation has authored a corollary to the bill of rights, a bill of responsibilities.

The Founders of our Nation understood the inseparable union between rights and freedoms and affirmed those beliefs in the creation of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Throughout the history of the American democratic experience there has existed the notion that rights and freedoms must be balanced by a strong sense of individual responsibility. The bill of responsibilities reaffirms the beliefs of our forefathers and proposes practical guidelines for the actions of all American citizens. The preamble to Freedoms Foundation bill of responsibilities aptly describes the inherent relationship that allows our democracy to function most efficiently:

Freedom and responsibility are mutual and inseparable; we can ensure the enjoyment of the one only by exercising the other. Freedom for all of us depends on responsibility by each of us. To secure and expand our liberties, therefore, we accept these responsibilities as individual members of a free society.

The bill of responsibilities is the culmination of nearly 2 years of hard work by scholars, members of Freedoms Foundation Board of Directors, and the National Council of Trustees. The result of their diligence is a paradigm for both the future of the American democratic system and the individuals who comprise it.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in acknowledging and extolling Freedoms Foundation and its bill of responsibilities.

SALUTE TO RABBI JOHN M.
SHERWOOD

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding religious leader in the San Fernando Valley, Rabbi John M. Sherwood, who is marking his 20th anniversary at Temple Emet of Woodland Hills, CA.

Rabbi Sherwood is truly a renaissance man—scholar, teacher, community leader, and photographer—who has given much to his faith and his community.

Born in New York, Rabbi Sherwood attended the University of Chicago and City College of New York before earning his bachelor's degree from California State University, Northridge, with combined majors in psychology, sociology, anthropology, and philosophy.

He began his service as spiritual leader of Temple Shalom in Vancouver, British Columbia, where he was the founding father of Reform Judaism in western Canada. Since assuming his duties at Temple Emet, where he is the senior reform rabbi in the San Fernando Valley, he has served the community in a variety of capacities. Among them are serving as president of the San Fernando Valley Interfaith Council, chaplain for the Los Angeles Police Department, and professor at St. John's Catholic Seminary in Camarillo, CA. He also has been a member of the Northridge Hospital Foundation Human Use and Research Committee, the liaison committee of the West Valley Mental Health Service and the community advisory councils of a number of public schools, and also was an advisor on Jewish affairs to two of my predecessors, Representatives Barry Goldwater, Jr. and Bobbi Fiedler.

Rabbi Sherwood is the primary author of Temple Emet's High Holy Day Prayer Book and several other liturgical works. His passion for photography has enabled him to create a gallery of Judaica from around the world, and his accomplishments have earned him placement in "Who's Who in American Jewry," "Who's Who in World Jewry," and "Who's Who in California," where he is one of only three rabbis listed.

He and his wife, Dolores, a leading realtor for 19 years, have been married for 8 years and have five children between them.

Mr. Speaker, on April 12, Temple Emet will celebrate Rabbi Sherwood's 20th anniversary. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting him for his accomplishments and his service.

INTRODUCTION OF HEART—THE
HEALTH EQUITY AND ACCESS
REFORM TODAY ACT OF 1991

HON. ROD CHANDLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, we have a health care crisis in this country. And that crisis is painfully reflected in statistics that we are all too familiar with—33 million Americans

have no health insurance and the skyrocketing cost of health care now exceeds 11 percent of this country's gross national product [GNP].

The great irony to this crisis is that despite its high cost and obvious shortfalls, the American health system provides a higher quality of health care than virtually any other system in the world—and we do it for the vast majority of citizens.

The great challenge confronting Congress and, in fact, the American public, is how to improve and build upon our current health system; to expand on those things we do well and to correct the problems we all know exist within the current system.

Mr. Speaker, it is with this challenge in mind that I am pleased to join my colleague, Representative NANCY JOHNSON, as an original co-sponsor of her legislation to promote access to quality, affordable health care for all Americans.

Our bill, the Health Equity and Access Reform Today Act of 1991 [HEART], represents an important first step toward removing the obstacles that prevent many Americans from obtaining health insurance; and it does so by building upon the private/public partnership that already exists within our current health care system.

The private side of that partnership, Mr. Speaker, is nearly 152 million Americans who currently receive their health insurance through their place of employment. Clearly, such coverage should be encouraged. Economies of scale, however, often deny small employers access to the same group health products that larger employers enjoy. Unfortunately, this has left nearly 20 million individuals who work in small business without any health insurance. Our HEART bill will help ensure that an affordable, basic health plan is available to these individuals:

By providing States with strong incentives to reform the small group health insurance market;

By exempting low-cost, basic health plans from the expensive burdens of State-mandated benefits and;

By requiring all small employers to simply offer health insurance once States implement small group health insurance reforms.

The public side of our current partnership, Mr. Speaker, is also in need of reform. In recent years, that reform has focused primarily on Medicaid expansions for the poor and elderly. Unfortunately, current fiscal realities dictate that we look elsewhere.

Our Heart bill offers an alternative to Medicaid expansions by providing additional funding for the growth and development of community health centers. In doing so, HEART utilizes a proven means of health care delivery that will expand access, on a cost effective basis, for millions of poor Americans.

Mr. Speaker, our HEART bill will do more than simply expand coverage for the millions of Americans who currently have no health insurance. It also will help to contain the cost of providing such coverage. By providing employers with incentives to include managed care and cost sharing in their health plans, HEART will induce individuals to make more responsible decisions in the selection of their health care. In short, Mr. Speaker, HEART will force

all of us to become better consumers of health care.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, our HEART bill provides for the collection of information and data that is critical to the efficient management of our health care system. Lacking for too long, the development of common medical information will help purchasers of health care make more informed decisions. The result of such decisions will ultimately help drive the quality of our health care up, while driving its cost down.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to portray the Health Equity and Access Reform Today Act as the panacea to all of the problems that plague our current health care system. Clearly, much more needs to be done, including critical reforms to this country's medical liability laws. But it is an important first step toward addressing those problems in a meaningful way. They key is that the HEART bill seeks to provide those solutions within the context of our current health care system.

I urge my colleagues to join Representative JOHNSON and I in taking this important first step toward assuring access to quality and affordable health care for all Americans.

AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RE-
SEARCH ASSOCIATION CELE-
BRATES ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, 75 years ago, eight directors of educational research for urban school systems, got together at the meeting of the Department of Superintendents in Cincinnati, OH, and formed The National Association of Directors of Educational Research. From that inauspicious beginning evolved the American Educational Research Association which is celebrating its 75th anniversary this year. Now with a membership of over 17,000 professionals in universities, school systems, governments, and research institutions, AERA continues to be dedicated to improving education by encouraging scholarly inquiry related to education and by promoting the dissemination and practical application of research results.

AERA has become the most prestigious and prominent international professional organization with the primary goal of advancing educational research and its application. Its publications, training programs, and annual meetings have become major sources of professional development opportunities to the field, improving the capacities of all those whom we policymakers rely on for sound research studies, comprehensive statistical knowledge, evaluation skills, and an understanding of assessment, as they relate to resolution of education challenges and opportunities.

The early years of the organization were dedicated to gatherings to discuss research findings, education policies, statistics, and research methodologies. Early concerns of members included fear for accelerated growth of the organization and the proliferation of interests. Members decried the fact that the

1937 meeting included 20 sessions and that it was necessary to schedule some of them at the same time. The expectation of growth and diversity was well founded: the 1991 annual meeting in Chicago will bring together over 8,000 researchers to address these important topics, and over 1,000 seminars, workshops, and presentations will be provided over a 5-day period.

In 1916, the first association publication was established, *The Education Research Bulletin*. In order to expand its publications in the 1930's, the Association, then a branch of the National Education Association, found it necessary to actively solicit new members to supplement the increased costs of its expanded periodicals. Today, the publications of the American Educational Research Association constitute the primary source of scholarly articles, as well as evaluation and critical reviews, on educational research. Current publications on the Association include: *Educational Research, Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, American Educational Research Journal, Journal of Educational Statistics, and Review of Educational Research*, and numerous occasional reference works like the *Encyclopedia of Educational Research* and the *Handbooks on Research on Teaching and Curriculum*.

The American Educational Research Association has long seen the connection between education problems confronting the Nation and the responsibility of the research community to address them. In taking stock of the organization's first 50 years, Benjamin Bloom, then president of AERA, declared:

The new tasks thrust on education require new approaches, new understandings, and a closer relation between theory, research, and practice than has ever existed before. It is not likely that education will be able to provide all the solutions that are expected of it. However, if solutions are found, they are likely to be based on research and development. Compensatory education for the disadvantaged is a case in point. Educational solutions must be found for these children—solutions which depend on more than the dedicated teacher working by himself. The educational researcher cannot ignore such problems, and he must contribute to the creation of solutions.

The American Educational Research Association and its members have provided a 75-year history of applying the best scientific inquiry to resolution of education problems. As we have no shortage of education problems in America today, I can only applaud and commend the efforts of the Association to date, and to wish AERA continued success and vitality.

HEALTH EQUITY AND ACCESS REFORM TODAY ACT OF 1991

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1991

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has the most advanced system for medical care in the world. Our citizens have access to the highest quality care any-

where. We have the most advanced diagnostic and therapeutic technology and medications, and not only the technology, but the specialized personnel essential to sophisticated care. These specialized personnel are spread more broadly throughout our cities and towns than in any other nation.

Despite these facts, while our health care system works so well for most of us, it fails almost completely to work for others of us.

Mr. Speaker, there are affordable, immediate actions that can and must be taken to address the twin problems in America's health care system: the lack of access to care for 31 million uninsured and spiraling costs which threaten even the insured. Today I am introducing the Health Equity and Access Reform Today Act of 1991—the HEART bill—with my colleague from the House Ways and Means Committee, Representative ROD CHANDLER, to create access for all Americans to affordable, quality health care and to control health care costs.

It is simply unconscionable that millions of women receive no prenatal care, that so many of America's children go uninoculated, that young families are having to drop out of their health care plans because premiums are beyond their reach, and that for many, having Medicaid coverage really means having no access to care outside of hospital emergency rooms.

It is a tragedy that for so many, health care is beyond their reach. It is a tragedy that the Congress must address this session.

The high cost of health care is another issue which cries out for the attention of this Chamber. If we cannot break the health care cost spiral, individuals will be forced out from under today's umbrella of care, small employers will drop current coverage, large employers will become increasingly less competitive internationally, and government will be unable to bear the staggering burden of health care for our poor and our seniors.

We devote 12 percent of gross national product to health care. And frankly we have too many demands on our economy to let any one demand consume that large a percentage of our national resources. Especially in these days, too many of the dollars we are devoting to health care should instead be invested in our future.

And, Mr. Speaker, to make matters worse, we know that without action the cost inflation we are experiencing in health care will continue unabated. Not only are we caught in this inflationary spiral, but, research indicates that much of this annual increase comes with no clear benefit.

There is now sobering, clear evidence that we are not getting appropriate value for our health care dollars.

It is time that this Nation learns to purchase value in its health, to "buy right." A "buy right" strategy will not only save money, but more importantly, it will assure all of us that we receive only appropriate, quality services.

The HEART bill lays the foundation for a health care system that truly provides access to all regardless of income and that guarantees control over costs.

The HEART bill includes provisions which will encourage cost conscious purchasing of

health insurance and health care by employees and their employees.

The HEART bill establishes the guidelines necessary to enable hospitals and physicians to collect the common, computerized information so critical to assuring us value for our health care dollar.

And, our legislation accomplishes its purposes by addressing the problems within the context of the current health care system and preserving its strengths, which have made America the envy of the world.

Currently, Mr. Speaker, 151 million Americans receive their health insurance through the workplace. Employer-based health insurance has served this Nation and its citizens very well.

However, we also know 85 percent of the uninsured are employed or the dependents of those workers. And further, most of these Americans work in small businesses of less than 25 employees.

So, to improve access to health care we need a plan which will enable more small businesses to provide insurance. The plan must directly address the main obstacles which now stand in the way of small business' access to affordable health insurance.

The HEART bill will clear away these obstacles. Through small group market reform, the bill provides incentives for insurers to cut administrative and marketing costs, and sell the insurance that people truly need without the expensive burdens of Government mandated benefits.

The bill also protects the consumers of health insurance by assuring them that affordable insurance, called MEDACCESS, will be available, and by prohibiting such harsh practices as denying coverage for preexisting conditions.

Yet MEDACCESS is not the solution for everyone. Some small employers do not have the wherewithal to afford it and some employees will not be able to purchase it—no matter how affordable it is. Of those without health insurance, 61 percent live at 200 percent of the poverty level or below. These Americans may be the most in need and they should have health care available.

To assist such people, the Congress in the past few years has expanded Medicaid coverage for many at or near the poverty line. These expansions have been made with the best of intentions, but, they have often offered false hope. The fiscal realities of Medicaid make it such a poor payer for care that many recipients have a hard time finding care. Medicaid simply pays too little to hospitals and physicians, and so, many providers find it unaffordable to treat Medicaid recipients. This process of expanding the Medicaid entitlement without ensuring fair reimbursements has made a mockery of the promise Medicaid holds out and has left the poor uncared for.

In the current fiscal environment it is not likely that Medicaid will become a better payer. Resolution of the access problem for the needy must focus on new approaches to delivery, rather than expanding entitlements that in practice do not deliver.

The HEART bill offers a delivery system alternative to the further expansion of entitlements.

The bill would expand the number of community health centers to assure neighborhood access for America's poor and uninsured. These centers would bring quality physician and outpatient care directly to those most in need.

Community health centers work, and through expansion will create a needed neighborhood network that eventually can offer family support services, drug treatment services and access to such important health programs as WIC.

To assure the availability of insurance and community care we must attack the cost problem head on. To accomplish this, we need to "buy right" in the health-care marketplace. This can be accomplished by employer purchase of cost conscious health plans.

The old first dollar employer-purchased coverage promoted overuse of medical services. The HEART bill would have employers, through managed care and cost sharing, pur-

chase plans which send consumers in the direction of more efficient, quality services.

We know managed care can cut cost. Allied Signal saw managed care help it reduce increases in health care costs from 23 to 8 percent. Procter and Gamble's experience saw a reduction in its annual increases from 15 to 6 percent.

The track record is the same for other employers. We must develop such a track record for all consumers.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the HEART bill would call for patient data to be collected in a uniform manner by the year 2000 for all Americans who go to the hospital. Only through better knowledge of what we are doing and its effect, can we guarantee high quality, effective health care and reduce overutilization of services.

For Medicare specifically, the proposal would move quality assurance from focusing on the few "bad actors" among physicians

and hospitals, to helping all providers improve care to their patients.

Common medical information is key to health care decisionmaking and purchasing—this bill would help purchasers determine the best buy, based on greater understanding of the outcomes of care.

Mr. Speaker, the HEART bill provides important steps to improve and reform health care coverage in this Nation. I can assure the Congress, this bill accentuates the best in our system without threatening it. It mobilizes forces that interact dynamically to reduce costs, increase access, and improve quality.

The time to act on health reform is now. We ask you, our colleagues, to join us in taking this responsible, rational approach to assuring access to the quality medical services that all Americans deserve.