

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JEAN
YAWKEY

HON. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the late Jean Yawkey who died of a stroke on February 27. For the past 59 years, Mrs. Yawkey has been the matriarch of the Boston Red Sox. Her involvement with the Sox began in 1933 when her husband Tom bought the team and began building what has become one of the classiest franchises in major league baseball. After her husband's death in 1976, Mrs. Yawkey assumed the position of part owner in the team's front office and carried on the Yawkey legacy of kindness and generosity toward everyone associated with the Red Sox organization. The world of baseball mourns her passing as too does the city of Boston, for she did so much for so many.

Not only did she commit her resources to bring great baseball to Boston but also to many charities in the Boston area. Her long-time association with the Jimmy Fund and the Dana Farber Cancer Institute is legendary. Through her late husband's foundation and her own, millions of dollars have been donated to the Jimmy Fund and other charitable organizations. These donations were just another extension of the Yawkey tradition of benevolence toward others. She was loved by all who knew her, both fans and players alike. An avid fan of the game, Mrs. Yawkey loved her Red Sox. At Fenway Park, she was always a fixture in her box seats keeping score of the game during Red Sox home stands.

From her vantage point in Fenway, she witnessed many great players come and go, Ted Williams, Carl Yazstremski, and Johnny Pesky to name a few. The performances of these players on the field fill our minds with memories of Red Sox triumphs and heartaches. Jean Yawkey was there for all of them, the good times and the bad. She treated all of her players with the respect they deserved and in return received lifelong devotion and admiration. The great ones, Carl Yazstremski and Ted Williams loved her like a mother. Current team members speak of her fondly and pay tribute to her kindness and devotion to the team.

You can be sure that as spring rolls around and the baseball season begins again, that Jean Yawkey will be in the thoughts and hearts of each player.

She never had the chance to see her beloved team win a World Series, but the Red Sox's time will come, and when it does you can bet that Jean Yawkey will be looking down and keeping score, rooting for her Boston Red Sox.

WHAT PRESIDENT BUSH SHOULD
DO AT THIS CRITICAL MOMENT

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as Yogi Berra used to say: "It ain't over 'til it's over." In a few words, that's the import of a thoughtful commentary on the cold war that former President Richard Nixon sent to me recently.

President Nixon has been a leading figure in international politics from virtually the beginning of the post-World War II era until today. He believes that while the Communists may have lost the cold war, the West has not yet won it.

Should President Yeltsin's reforms not succeed, President Nixon believes the West could face a new, more dangerous despotism based on extremist Russian nationalism.

This is a critical moment for world peace, he believes, and America should be doing more to ensure that Yeltsin's reforms succeed. Otherwise we may be forced to engage in a new cold war, losing the ability to focus sufficient time and energies on solving our domestic problems.

President Nixon suggests that we help Yeltsin in six crucial ways, but that we share the burden of foreign aid with other industrialized nations that are better able to afford it.

What America can provide is its world leadership, which he says President Bush brilliantly demonstrated in mobilizing the coalition for the gulf war.

These comments on President Bush's leadership put me in mind of a New York Times op-ed article by former Education Secretary William J. Bennett that appeared today. Bennett argues that President Bush should reclaim foreign policy as an issue in this year's Presidential contest.

That's good advice. Coverage of the 1992 campaign seems to be proceeding on the assumption that the next President will spend all of his waking hours grappling with domestic policy issues. That assumption runs against the experience of every President who has served in the last 50 years.

Here are two thoughtful commentaries that I hope will be carefully read in the White House. The implication of both of these commentaries is that good Government can be good politics, and vice versa. And that a President who is such a gifted world leader would do well to play to his strong suit—for the sake of his Presidency and for the sake of world peace.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the two articles in the RECORD.

HOW TO LOSE THE COLD WAR

While the candidates have addressed scores of significant issues in the presidential campaign, the most important issue since the end of World War II—the fate of the political

and economic reforms in Russia—has been virtually ignored. As a result, the United States and the West risk snatching defeat in the cold war from the jaws of victory.

We have heard repeatedly that the cold war has ended and that the West won it. This is only half true. The Communists have lost the cold war, but the West has not yet won it. Communism collapsed because its ideas failed. Today, the ideas of freedom are on trial. If they fail to produce a better life in Russia and the other former Soviet republics, a new and more dangerous despotism will take power, with the people trading freedom for security and entrusting their future to old hands with new faces.

We are at a watershed moment in history. The historical significance of the democratic revolution in the Soviet Union compares only with events like the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo in 1815, the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919, and the creation of NATO and the Marshall Plan in 1948. A century of stability in Europe, the drift toward World War II in the 1920s and 1930s, and a half century of successful containment of the Soviet Union were all determined by how the statesmen of the major powers responded to these critical moments. While opportunities and dangers on that same order of magnitude face us today, the West has failed so far to seize the moment to shape the history of the next half century.

Russia is the key to success. It is there that the final battle of the cold war will be won or lost. The stakes could not be higher. If freedom succeeds in Russia—if President Yeltsin's economic reforms succeed in creating a successful free-market economy—the future will hold the promise of reduced spending on arms, cooperation in coping with crises around the world, and economic growth through expanded international trade. More important, freedom's success will reverberate in the world's last isolated strongholds of communism—North Korea, Cuba, Vietnam, and China. Their leaders will face irresistible pressures to take the first steps toward political reform.

If Yeltsin fails, the prospects for the next fifty years will turn grim. The Russian people will not turn back to communism. But a new, more dangerous despotism based on extremist Russian nationalism will take power. We must remember that even before communism, Russia had an expansionist tradition dating back seven centuries. The leaders of a new despotism, who have already been organizing themselves to take over in the event that Yeltsin's reforms fail, will stoke nationalist passions and exploit the tendency of the Russian people to turn to the strong hand—even to dictatorship—during times of troubles.

If a new despotism prevails, everything gained in the great peaceful revolution of 1991 will be lost. War could break out in the former Soviet Union as the new despots use force to restore the "historical borders" of Russia. The new East European democracies would be imperiled. China's totalitarians would breathe a sigh of relief. The new Russian regime—whose leaders would cozy up to the Soviet Union's former clients in Iraq, Syria, Libya, and North Korea—would

• 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.

threaten our interests in hot spots around the world. It would sell conventional weapons, ballistic missiles, and nuclear technology to any buyer. A new Russian despotism inspired by imperial nationalism shorn of the baggage of the dying faith of communism would be even more dangerous than Soviet totalitarianism.

If freedom fails in Russia, we will see the tide of freedom that has been sweeping over the world begin to ebb, and dictatorship rather than democracy will be the wave of the future.

In light of the stakes involved, the West must do everything it can to help President Yeltsin succeed. Yeltsin has been maligned by friends of freedom in the West who should have known better. Some say that he is not democratic enough politically, others that he is not smart enough intellectually, and still others that he is not smooth enough socially. A few who dismissed him as a boob in the past now seem to be hoping for his failure so that they can claim to have been proved right. That thinking is not worthy of the world's only superpower.

Like all strong leaders who try to make a difference, Yeltsin is not perfect. He has made serious mistakes. But he is an extraordinary historic figure. He is the first Russian leader in history chosen through free elections. Unlike Gorbachev, he has irrevocably repudiated socialism as well as communism. He risked his life in facing down a gang of card-carrying killers in the coup attempt in August 1991. He recognized the independence of the Baltic states and the other republics of the former Soviet Union. He abandoned the Russian imperial tradition—throwing away the keys of what Lenin called the "jailhouse of nations"—by dissolving the Soviet Union and forging the voluntary Commonwealth of Independent States. He risked his enormous popularity by embarking on painful free-market economic reforms, including the indispensable first step of allowing astronomical price rises. He has moved decisively toward privatization of Soviet enterprises and decollectivization of Soviet agriculture, steps Gorbachev refused even to consider. He has completely cut off the \$15 billion in foreign aid and trade subsidies that Gorbachev in his 1990 budget continued to provide to Cuba and other anti-American Communist losers in the developing world. He has not only matched but exceeded the cuts in nuclear weapons proposed by President Bush.

The bottom line is that Yeltsin is the most pro-Western leader of Russia in history. Moreover, whatever his flaws, the alternative of a new despotism would be infinitely worse.

What has the United States and the West done so far to help Russia's first democratic, free-market oriented, non-expansionist government? We have provided credits for the purchase of agricultural products. We have held a photo-opportunity international conference of fifty-seven foreign secretaries that was long on rhetoric but short on action. We are sending sixty cargo-planes of surplus food and medical supplies leftover from the Persian Gulf War. We have decided to send two hundred Peace Corps volunteers—a generous action if the target of our aid were a small country like Upper Volta but mere tokenism if applied to Russia, a nation of almost 200 million people covering one-seventh of the world's landmass. This is a pathetically inadequate response in light of the opportunities and dangers we face in the crisis in the former Soviet Union.

What is to be done? To meet the moment, the West must step up to the task of helping

President Yeltsin's government in six crucial ways:

We must provide humanitarian food and medical aid to get Russia through the critical months until Yeltsin's reforms have a chance to start working.

We must create a "free enterprise corps" that will send thousands of Western managers to Russia to infuse newly independent enterprises with free-market know-how.

We must reschedule Soviet debt incurred during the Gorbachev era and defer interest payments until the new market economy begins to function.

We must allow greater access to Western markets for Russia's exports.

We must be ready to join with others to provide tens of billions of dollars for currency stabilization through the IMF or other means as soon as Russia reins in the growth of its money supply.

We must create a single Western-led organization to assess Soviet needs and coordinate wide-ranging governmental and private aid projects, as the United States did when embarking on the rebuilding of Western Europe after World War II.

In light of the depth of the Russian economic crisis, there is no time to lose. Those who would put off major action on these fronts until the next international aid conference in July 1992 could find that this is too little and too late.

Can we afford these initiatives? As Herb Stein has pointed out, "The United States is a very rich nation. We are not rich enough to do everything, but we are rich enough to do everything important." Forty-three years ago, the United States alone helped its allies and enemies in Europe and Japan recover from World War II. A strong case can be made that the United States has carried the burden of foreign aid and world leadership for long enough and that it is time for Europe and Japan to assume the major financial burden in helping Russia and the other former Soviet republics. But the United States as the strongest and richest nation in the world must provide the leadership.

At the same time, we must be willing to bear our share of the burden. To play in this game, we must have a seat at the table. To get a seat in the table, we must be ready to put some chips in the pot. The stakes are high, and we are playing as if it were a penny ante game.

It is a tough call politically. Opinion polls indicate that foreign policy rates only in the single digits among issues that voters consider to be important. The American people overwhelmingly oppose all foreign aid because they want to see that money spent on solving our problems at home. But the mark of great political leadership is not simply to support what is popular but to make what is unpopular popular if that serves America's national interest. In addition, what seems politically profitable in the short term may prove costly in the long term. The hot-button issue in the 1950s was, "Who lost China?" If Yeltsin goes down, the question of "who lost Russia" will be an infinitely more devastating issue in the 1990s.

Those who oppose aid argue that charity begins at home. I agree. But aid to Russia and other reformist republics of the former Soviet Union is not charity. We must recognize that what helps us abroad helps us at home. If Yeltsin is replaced by a new aggressive Russian nationalist, we can kiss the peace dividend good-bye. Not only would the world become more dangerous, but our defense and foreign policies would also become far more expensive. Tinkering with the tax

code or launching new domestic initiatives will have little economic significance if a new hostile despotism in Russia forces the West to rearm. On the positive side, if Yeltsin succeeds, a free-market Russia will provide an opportunity for billions of dollars in trade, which will create millions of jobs in the United States. Most important, a democratic Russia would be a non-expansionist Russia, freeing our children and grandchildren in the next century of the fear of armed conflict because democracies do not start wars.

President Bush is uniquely qualified to meet this challenge. The brilliant leadership he demonstrated in mobilizing the coalition abroad and the American people at home to win victory in the Persian Gulf War can ensure that the cold war will end not just with the defeat of communism but also with the victory of freedom.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 5, 1992]

BE PRESIDENTIAL—PUSH FOREIGN POLICY

(By William J. Bennett)

WASHINGTON.—Patrick Buchanan is a thorn in George Bush's side, and he will remain so. In this season of political discontent, the President faces an almost automatic protest vote of 30-something percent.

But he is not the issue. The Administration's political challenge, still, is to find definition and a clear *raison d'être* for a second term. The good news is that what was self-inflicted can be self-corrected.

The President took a step in that direction when he admitted that the 1990 tax increase was a mistake. This was the first move toward re-establishing a broken bond of trust and making a credible case against Congress. The President now needs to follow up. Here are some suggestions:

1. Pursue a Pennsylvania Avenue strategy. George Bush should run an engaged, aggressive strategy up and down Washington's Main Street. The President should, among other things, index capital gains against inflation; exercise the line-item veto; campaign for term limits; veto the House Democratic tax bill; throw the full weight of his office behind radical education reform and school choice, and urge legal reforms and deregulation.

If the President is to seize the domestic initiative, he needs to do so through the force of political conviction. Exerting executive authority through a series of Presidential acts will allow him to regain political ball control, marginalize the Buchanan candidacy, demonstrate that he is serious about governing (and not simply presiding) and win back the confidence of conservatives.

2. Reclaim foreign policy as an issue. International relations is the arena in which George Bush is the most sure-footed and confident.

We face challenges in the wider world, including the turmoil and instability after the implosion of the Soviet empire, continued unrest in the Persian Gulf region, the difficult negotiations between Israel and Arab nations and the ever-increasing threat of the proliferation of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons.

Why did President Bush's strategists decide to throw away his political trump card, foreign policy? Public opinion polls, no doubt. But this President showed how well he could shape public opinion when he led a reluctant nation to war in the gulf.

After prevailing in the twilight struggle against Communism, it is not inevitable that Americans will become indifferent to world

events or succumb to the mindless appeal of "Come Home, America." In that vital national seminar, the President can teach and do so by articulating a coherent case for why an active international presence and responsible defense policy are still in our national—and economic—interest. To these ends, the Administration should:

Push hard to conclude the new round of GATT agreements.

Threaten to veto deeper cuts in defense budget, which is already the smallest military budget as a share of the economy since the 1930's.

Press hard for the development and deployment of a Strategic Defense Initiative.

Recognize the critical American stake in Boris Yeltsin's success in Russia through a greater willingness to offer the essential political and economic support he needs.

Fundamentally change our posture toward Israel, approving the \$10 billion loan guarantees and supporting Israel's security, instead of insisting on territorial concessions.

Entering his final campaign, George Bush would do well to reflect on the words of the historian Teddy White. "The forces that run in American politics in our age are many and varied," he wrote. "Yet one man must make them all clear enough for the American people to vote and express their desire. He is the President . . . what the President of today decides becomes the issue of tomorrow. He calls the dance."

It is still President Bush's dance to call.

TRIBUTE TO PROFESSOR S. SCHOENBAUM

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to pay tribute to S. Schoenbaum, distinguished professor of Renaissance Studies at the University of Maryland, on the occasion of his 65th birthday, March 6, 1992.

Although England claims William Shakespeare as its national poet, no one has more thoroughly and scrupulously presented Shakespeare's life to view than this American scholar. His books, "William Shakespeare: A Documentary Life," "William Shakespeare: Records and Images, Shakespeare's Lives," and "Shakespeare: The Globe and the World" among them, are exemplars of critical scholarship that gain added lustre by appealing to the general reader and erudite reader alike.

In testimony to Professor Schoenbaum's international renown, he was invited to provide the program notes for Sir Peter Hall's production of "The Merchant of Venice," starring Dustin Hoffman: while his soft, New York-accented voice has carried his vast knowledge of Shakespeare and his age to gatherings of scholars around the world.

However, what truly distinguished Professor Schoenbaum is that, in the tradition of Thomas Jefferson, his mind is ever open to new ideas, just as his door is always open to scholars who seek the benefits of his knowledge, counsel, and friendship. It is in recognition of his contributions to our intellectual life and the honor he has brought the United States that I salute him on this occasion.

LASTING MIDDLE-CLASS TAX RELIEF

HON. CHESTER G. ATKINS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Speaker, while I rise today in support of the Democratic tax plan, I must express my concern that the plan does not go far enough to provide true and lasting tax fairness for the middle class.

As it is structured the bill would give wage earners a credit of 20 percent of their Social Security taxes in 1992 and 1993. While it is a step in the right direction, it is a temporary measure only. It is apparent to me that strong lasting reform is desperately needed. While this bill does provide that the wealthy pay their fair share, by raising the top tax rate and instituting a surtax on millionaires, such measures are insufficient to provide lasting relief for those who were squeezed the most by 12 years of Reaganomics. The bill does not provide a long-term plan which ensures equitable tax treatment.

I believe that any true reform bill must include a plan such as the one that has been put forward by Senator MOYNIHAN. Rather than providing a temporary tax credit, that plan would permanently reduce Social Security taxes. It would strengthen the financing of the Social Security Program, stimulate the economy, and provide a fair tax cut to 132 million workers and 6 million employers and self-employed individuals.

Simple fairness demands that the average American worker get a break. In constant 1982 dollars, average weekly earnings actually decreased \$6.00 in the last 31 years from \$261.92 in 1960 to \$255.89 in 1991. Meanwhile, FICA taxes rose steadily during the Reagan/Bush years, dealing another blow to the struggling working class. It was wrong in the 1980's when we cut income taxes for the better off and raised payroll taxes for the low- and middle-class workers.

A Social Security tax cut would address the issue of tax fairness for the middle class in the most direct way. Rising payroll taxes in the 1980's were the cause of this increased tax burden. If we want to ease the middle-class tax burden, it makes the most sense to attack the problem at its source—high payroll taxes. It's time that we take a step toward restoring tax equity for the forgotten average worker. I urge my colleagues to support such strong and lasting reform when the House and Senate meet in conference.

THE TRAGEDY OF BLACK LUNG

HON. ROBERT E. WISE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce for the RECORD a statement written by Mike South, a constituent from Beards Fork, WV. Those who have been exposed to the devastating effects of black lung realize how it affects the lives of victims and their families.

For those who have not been exposed to individuals with black lung, please read Mr. South's account of what it is like to live with this disabling condition. I encourage my colleagues to keep Mr. South's comments in mind as Congress considers important legislation that will affect the lives of thousands of miners across the Nation.

STATEMENT OF MIKE SOUTH

To those who are members of this committee, we, the living and dead victims of Black Lung, appeal to your sense of humanity.

Those who do not suffer from lung disease can in no way know the agony that it puts families through. When you mention a person suffering from lung disease it involves the whole family. The spouse who tries to take over the tasks once done by her husband who once did all the heavy physical chores.

The children who sit and watch their father pant and gasp for breath from such simple tasks as eating or speaking; and the man himself who suffers even more than his family realizes.

He suffers in ways that others may consider foolish, especially his wife and children. He feels that he is no longer an asset to his family. He can no longer provide monetarily for the support of his family. He is nothing! He goes to doctors, but with little or no results, for his lungs worsen with time. He takes his breathing treatments four times a day and stays on oxygen as recommended by his physician but yet he still sees his condition worsen as time goes by.

There are times during the long breathless nights that he lies awake thinking how much longer he has to endure the suffering he is going through. Times when he gasps for breath and is asked if he is all right and he responds "yes". When in truth he often wonders if this might be his last gasp of life.

I would not be afraid to wager that not a person in this room knows what it is like to get up from your bed and walk 10 ft. to your bathroom and be breathless before you get to the toilet. To take a shower and have to rest several times during the procedure. To step out of the shower and into a thick terry cloth robe because you haven't the breath to towel yourself dry. And, when you dress, it seems like it takes forever to pull on your trousers and especially to try to tie your shoes.

The longing to be able to do at least a modicum of the things that you used to do in the past before death took hold of your life. A slow and agonizing death that takes away so many of life's simple pleasures. Not being able to play with your children or pet. The fire and passion that was so much a part of your life has been replaced by sedentary depression.

Many breathless hours are spent trying to do tasks that used to take minutes to accomplish. No more cutting the lawn, because you cannot push, or even less, walk behind the mower. Maintenance on the cars and home is out of the question.

Your life now consists of oxygen tubing and its 50 ft. life line. A line that you curse day after day. Your world consists of a 50 ft. radius in which you drag your life line like an extension cord. A cord that you sometimes wish were attached to the coal company executives and members of the Department of Labor.

If only they could spend 24 hours in your shoes. To get a taste of how worthless and lifeless your existence is. I wonder if then they would change their attitude towards those who suffer from lung disease.

I think not. They sit back and take their apathetic stance hoping the victims will die before any Black Lung claim is settled. And when the victim dies the claim goes with him, for the widow stands no chance to prove the existence of Black Lung in her dead spouse.

The parties involved know the hardships and years that are spent trying to prove that they are the "walking dead".

Some men spend anywhere from eight to sixteen years being shuffled from doctor to doctor trying to obtain evidence that company doctors say does not exist. I often wonder how these physicians can sleep at night, but I guess they just "blanket" themselves with the money given them by the coal companies.

It has to be the love of money and greed that fuels these physicians and companies, for compassion has no part to play. Human suffering (physical) is supposed to be alleviated by the healing compassionate hands of a physician; instead, these hands are stained "green" from the dyes of money and greed.

This stain has put many a miner in an early grave. A stain that has spread and engulfed a whole nation that has turned its back on the suffering that exists in the "death" of a miner. A "death" that means nothing to any one except the miner's family and friends. A nation that has put a man on the moon and won countless wars, yet the suffering still continues for the coal miner. A miner who has helped in all the endeavors this county has put forth. Yet when he is down with failed health, he is spurned by the nation that he helped lead to such greatness. A nation that is complacent in its attitude, that it does not affect me, it does not exist.

To the powers that be; listen I beseech you. Take a walk in my weary shoes and pass HR 1637; for without it countless numbers of deserving men and their families will suffer in the quagmire of red tape involved in the present system. A system established for the behest of big business and not the men, without whom they would not exist.

And, as they reap their enormous profits, they hire lawyers to protect their greed. A greed that does not encompass compassion for the men who die for their dollars. So, in reality, they trade "dollars for death" and think none the less for it. Has the nation become so callous that greed overrides everything that is supposed to be the make-up of human existence? Has common decency and compassion gone by the way of the grave? I would hope not, but from my point of view, it has; for it seems that the plight of the coal miner is forever to exist in poverty and suffering.

Could this distinguished body exist on \$600 a month? I think not. Yet, that is all the monthly benefits that a miner receives from Black Lung. Some gentlemen pay \$600 or more for their suits, yet a miner is asked to survive a month on that amount.

Members of Congress say they cannot sustain their lifestyle on less than \$115 thousand dollars a year.

Slip on my size 8 shoes and live on my yearly income, and then ask for a raise. It comes to mind the words, "I once complained of no new shoes, till I saw the man who had no feet".

So remember, without good lungs you cannot perform your daily tasks, for without them the gift of speech means nothing. Pass HR 1637 and let those who deserve their right to breathe, breathe a little easier. Thank you.

MAKE JAPAN PLAY BY THE RULES

HON. RICHARD T. SCHULZE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, the following March 3, 1992, letter to the editor of the Washington Post, authored by T. Boone Pickens, chairman of Mesa, Inc., and president of Boone Co., sheds valuable light on the recent decision by U.S. Attorney General, William Barr, to use United States antitrust laws to combat Japan's importation of its corporate cartel—or keiretsu—practices into America.

As Mr. Pickens correctly points out, Attorney General Barr's decision is right on track. It states boldly that from this point on the Justice Department is going to enforce the Sherman Antitrust Act, which has already been enforced against United States corporations for over 100 years, against Japanese and, if appropriate, other foreign corporations allegedly violating such act. In other words, all firms operating in the United States, be they American or foreign, will be subject to the same scrutiny under the Sherman Act. That sounds eminently fair to me.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of Mr. Pickens' letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following my remarks, and hope that our colleagues will take the time to read it.

MAKE JAPAN PLAY BY THE RULES

(By Boone Pickens)

I take exception to The Post's Feb. 25 editorial concerning Attorney General William Barr's decision to use the Sherman Antitrust Act against Japanese keiretsus. Why "keep the process of trade negotiations moving along steadily," as The Post suggests, when it's clear that negotiations are at a standstill? Whoever wrote the editorial knows little about Japan. Rhetoric and philosophy, which are what The Post's editorial seems to espouse, have gotten us nowhere so far, and that's not about to change. It's time to level the playing field by backing our words and ideas with tangible actions.

The attorney general's recent decision to begin enforcing the Sherman Anti-Trust Act against Japan's corporate cartels, or keiretsus, is a breath of fresh air in the suffocating world of trade talks. It is increasingly clear that these keiretsus block not only free trade with Japan but also fair competition here at home, where keiretsus have become one of Japan's leading exports.

For the first time in what seems like ever, a high-ranking American official has stated the obvious: Let's demand of Japan the same rules we demand of America. What's wrong with that?

During our more than 200 years as a free market, the United States has adopted a series of laws and regulations guaranteeing that the interests and rights of workers, investors, consumers and competitors are protected and treated fairly. While these rules may not be perfect, they are the rules, and they have for the most part worked.

With the world marketplace becoming more interdependent, isn't it reasonable that the United States insist that everyone play by the same rules? This is not a question of enforcing some American cultural condition in Japan or the rest of the world. Rather, it

is a question of fairness. The American public would never stand idly by if, in the upcoming summer Olympics, some teams were permitted to field seven players in basketball while we only got five.

Some apologists of Japan's cartels have argued that the United States should adopt keiretsu-like structures. "They're efficient," these experts argue. I agree, they are. The keiretsus have efficiently kept most American business out of Japan. They've also efficiently kept prices high for Japanese consumers, dividends meager for shareholders and working conditions horrible for Japanese workers. If efficiency is what everyone wants, I'll be happy to demonstrate how efficiently I could run a monopoly.

With each new political and financial scandal coming out of Japan, it's apparent what this efficient system has wrought—corruption. And if my history is right, that's why Congress more than 100 years ago passed the Sherman Anti-Trust Act—to protect our free markets from the corruption that comes from monopolies and cartels.

I have no fear that the American worker and American business can compete against anybody in the world. All Washington has to do is insist that everyone play by the same rules, and then get out of the way. Attorney General Barr is on the right track.

(The writer is chairman of MESA Inc., a natural gas producer, and president of Boone Co., an investment firm that waged an unsuccessful 2½-year battle to gain representation as the largest shareholder of Japan's Koito Manufacturing.)

BILL LEHMAN'S KINDNESS

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to hear that my dear friend BILL LEHMAN, one of the Nation's most effective legislators, has decided to retire at the end of the year.

Bill has served the people of the 17th District of Florida with skill, compassion, and kindness. His kind become rarer with each passing year, and the House will miss him.

On March 1, Miami Herald political editor Tom Fiedler wrote an eloquent and touching tribute to a man whose humanitarianism should not go unnoticed. I am inserting into the RECORD the column for the benefit of my colleagues.

BILL LEHMAN'S ACTS OF KINDNESS

(By Tom Fiedler)

How do you measure a worthy career in public service? For some in Congress, success might be weighed in the stacks of legislation to which their names are attached, the written legacy of a life's work.

For others, there are the tangible monuments to their ability to break off a piece of the federal budget for the folks back home. They are counted in bridges, highways, federal buildings—often with the sponsor's name attached—that spring up in a congressional district over the course of the lawmaker's tenure.

There is nothing undeserving of such things. And using either measure, Congressman William Lehman of Biscayne Park, whose district slices across northeastern

Dade County, could step down satisfied that his successes would stack up favorably against virtually any member of Congress.

His presence in Washington since 1972 has in many ways transformed the face of Metropolitan Miami with such projects as Metro-rail, the People Mover, the modern bridges over Biscayne Bay, improvements at the Port of Miami and the airports in Miami and Fort Lauderdale, to name a few.

The Coast Guard's evolution as an anti-drug force is largely Lehman's work. And he was at the center of painstaking steps taken over the past two decades to foster a respect for human rights in South and Central America.

But there is yet another way to assess a career that may be of even greater importance. That is, by the acts of personal kindness, often unheralded, that touch the lives of others.

On such a measure, Lehman knows few peers. And I suspect that's precisely the standard against which he judges himself.

Bill Lehman stunned his colleagues, his staff, his friends on Tuesday when he left a subcommittee hearing he had been presiding over, went to the House floor and in a non-sense statement, announced that he would not seek re-election.

At 78 and still struggling against the paralyzing effects of a stroke he suffered more than a year ago, Lehman quietly explained later that he felt he wasn't capable of serving his constituents with the full measure they should expect. It was an act of tremendous public humility and dignity, an act that is all too rare in the political arena.

But then again, we have come to know that Lehman, the former "Alabama Bill" used-car dealer who studied writing at Oxford and Harvard, is a rare human being who never forgot that the first obligation of those in power is to be of service to those who aren't.

"Liberals too often are trying to do things for the masses, rather than for the individual," he once told an interviewer. "That's why I try to help the individual."

The stories of people who benefited from Lehman's quiet acts would run for many pages. Some have been reported; most have not. But all say something about the spirit that guided his service.

John Schelble, Lehman's aide, recalls being with his boss at Parkland Hospital's trauma center in North Miami Beach a few years ago when an emergency-room nurse came up to Lehman and asked if he remembered her.

"No, I'm afraid you'll have to refresh my memory," he said.

She told him that she had been a student of his when he taught English in the 1960s. One day, she said, he came upon her while she was looking quite despondent and he asked what her concern was.

She said she told him that she and her boyfriend couldn't go to the senior prom because her boyfriend had no car. Lehman's solution: Lend them one of his.

To Lehman, it seemed such a natural act that he never gave it a second thought. To the emergency-room nurse many years later, it was an act of generosity she would never forget.

There are the stories, never told, about the destitute and sick people who come to Lehman's office seeking help navigating the federal bureaucracy in the hope of getting benefits that might help them treat their problem. And when Lehman's efforts to assist come to naught, the people find themselves being taken to the congressman's own doctor

or dentist for the care they need—while he foots the bill.

Many already know of the Cuban political prisoners that Lehman, this unremitting liberal, was able to bring back from Havana and of the Cuban families he helped reunite. And we have written about the time that the congressman smuggled a heart valve into the old Soviet Union so a citizen there could have life-saving surgery.

But few stories are as touching as that of Debora Benchoam Rogers, nor as revealing about Lehman's personal warmth. Debora was a 16-year-old high school student in Buenos Aires when, on a winter night in 1977, plainclothes policemen blasted down the door to the family's apartment and, behind a fusillade of bullets, burst into the bedroom where she and her 17-year-old brother had been sleeping.

One of the policemen fired two shots into the boy's body, apparently killing him immediately. The others grabbed Debora, shackled and gagged her, then took her to a police station, a descent into hell. This petite teenager would spend the next 4½ years in various cells, subjected to harassment, interrogation and, of course, robbed of whatever joys her youth may have held.

Debora was a victim of Argentina's "dirty war," the attempt by right-wing elements to eradicate threats to the military-backed government that had toppled Isabel Peron. She was never charged with any crime, however.

In all those years, however, Debora's spirit never cracked. Word of this remarkable girl, who clung to dignity through her Jewish faith, spread outside Argentina and eventually reached Lehman.

He arranged a trip to Argentina as a member of the House Appropriations Committee's subcommittee on foreign operations and, through the Argentine foreign minister, was able to meet with Debora in her cell.

Lehman recalled being captivated by her courage, her sense of humor and perspective. He left intent on getting her out. Months later, following top-level negotiations between the two countries, the Argentine government agreed to release Debora with one condition:

That she leave with Lehman as her legal guardian and go to the United States. They also extracted a promise from Lehman that he wouldn't publicize the case in a way that would embarrass the Argentine government.

Lehman agreed. So in November 1981 the young Argentine woman came with him to Miami where the line between guardian and congressman quickly blurred. She moved into a home that compensated in love what it lacked in language skills.

"Bill is like a second father to me," Debora said several years later.

With Lehman's help, Debora finished high school, graduated from Georgetown University with a degree in political science and is today completing work on a doctoral dissertation at Columbia University. The dissertation, ironically, is on "Creativity as a tool of psychological survival in concentration camps."

I called Debora Thursday night in Buenos Aires, where she has returned to complete work on the paper. She hadn't heard of Lehman's decision to retire.

"Bill is, for me, my family in the United States. And he's still my family," she said.

"Most of my interest in human rights was inspired by him. His values show a lot of humanity all around."

Lehman attributes what political skills he has to having been a used-car salesman. For

some people, that would sound like the setup for a punch line. But not to him.

"When I was selling used cars, I always tried to be on the same level as the person I was trying to sell the car to without being a phony," Lehman said in a 1989 interview.

Over the course of the 20 years he spent in Congress, many people might criticize Lehman for his staunchly liberal voting record. But nobody called him a phony.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF JOINT ACTION COMMUNITY SERVICE, INC.

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, in 1989, we celebrated the 25th anniversary of a great success story—the Job Corps. Today I want to call attention to the 25th anniversary celebration of Joint Action in Community Service, Inc., on Monday, March 9, 1992 at the Ritz-Carlton here in the Nation's Capital.

JACS was formed by a coalition of national religious leaders who represented the National Conference of Catholic Charities, National Catholic Community Service, Society of St. Vincent De Paul, U.S. Catholic Conference, National Council of Churches and the United Methodist Church. National in scope, yet local in force, JACS works in partnership with the Job Corps Training Program.

With a volunteer force representing all 50 States, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, JACS has been and is committed to the key principles of volunteerism and collaboration. Over the years, more than 34,000 volunteers have been recruited and trained by JACS to offer encouragement and to provide critical hometown, individualized assistance to over 500,000 young people when they leave Job Corps and return home to their communities. The Job Corps Program has done and continues to do what we should strive to do better to serve as a link with the private business community together with labor and community leaders to provide young people who are disadvantaged with the education and job skills necessary to enter the work force and become self-sufficient. In thousands of documented cases, this personal one-on-one assistance has meant the difference between success and failure; between a life of poverty and dependence, and one of responsible self-sufficiency for former Job Corps students as they adjust to the transition from Job Corps training back into the community.

Celebrating JACS is celebrating the spirit of volunteerism; people working to help people work. JACS offers self respect necessary to embrace the future. I congratulate JACS for their steadfastness in shaping dreams for those whose worlds are far from the ideal.

I am proud of the work JACS has performed for 25 years. JACS' vision is to continue its commitment to serve those in need through individualized assistance.

JACS works to ensure that the disadvantaged youth served will become responsible, self-reliant, employable members of their communities and through their positive attitude and behaviors, will become inspirations and

role models for others in similar circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues support the Job Corps Program because we know it works. As we take time to celebrate the 25th anniversary of joint action in community service we are reminded that the personal commitment of JACS volunteers is why it works.

PUBLIC HOUSING PROBLEMS FACING THE ELDERLY

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to H.R. 3425, legislation I introduced last September, to insure safe and affordable public housing for the elderly. This is a national problem, and I urge all of my colleagues who are interested in safe and affordable elderly-only housing to cosponsor H.R. 3425. This issue needs immediate attention. I am enclosing for the RECORD two articles from the Wilmington DE News-Journal, on this subject. As one article notes, "The policy must be changed before public housing for the elderly in America has been destroyed."

ACT NOW TO SAVE ELDERLY HOUSING

Doris Bunte, the executive director of the Boston Housing Authority, answers her own phone, so when she picked it up some weeks ago she got the shocking news directly. One of the residents in a public housing residence for the elderly had just had a baby in her apartment.

Doris was relieved that all had turned out well, but after the moment passed, she realized how absurd the situation was.

"Someone had had a baby in one of my elderly developments, and I thought, it can't be an elderly development if some of the residents can still be having babies. This is a real problem," she said.

Doris had just experienced another phenomenon of the "New Elderly Family." The bureaucrats of the department of Housing and Urban Development (and therefore also your local housing authority) have decided that young handicapped people, including those who are mentally ill, are officially "elderly families" and therefore eligible for elderly housing.

Bunte, a former state legislator from the Roxbury section of Boston, has a reputation for being a hard-headed liberal with a heart that encompasses the neediest of the needy. But several months ago she picked up her phone and called U.S. Rep. Brian J. Donnelly, D-Mass. They had a conversation about what brought about the mixing of mentally ill young people and old people in senior housing. By the time it was over, U.S. Rep. Donnelly, (who was one of Doris' colleagues in the Massachusetts House), was embarked on a course that will, hopefully, restore the integrity of public housing for the elderly, a concept that had been a government policy from the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Rep. Donnelly has introduced a bill in Congress to make it legal to have "age specific" public housing.

"I don't think mixing old people and the mentally ill young together in housing is good policy," says Rep. Donnelly.

"Nobody told us this was happening. And I think I understand why. The policy defies all rules of common sense."

Bunte says she has a simple solution: Continue to house handicapped elderly people in elderly housing and begin to house the younger handicapped people in public housing for families.

"There is no argument that these people need housing," she says. "I like to think that someone with good intentions tried to ensure that some people who are helpless had an opportunity for housing. But they screwed it up because they didn't separate them by age group."

"The law as it is now written pits two segments of the needy against one another, and I think that is unfair. They are running the elderly out of their own developments. It is essentially changing the population of elderly housing. And it is happening everywhere. It is a national issue."

Bunte and Donnelly want to reestablish age 62 as the minimum requirement for eligibility to public housing specifically designed for elderly people.

"We don't have a lot of time. Here in Boston, 60 percent of those moving into my elderly developments are younger handicapped people," says Bunte. "At the rate we are going, I'm afraid this problem is not going to get addressed until elderly developments are no longer primarily occupied by the elderly. When that happens—and it already has in some places—elderly who are afraid to live among younger mentally ill people will have no place to go."

How did this strange development occur under the noses of public housing administrators who should have known better?

There was a point several years ago when most elderly public housing had vacancies, partly because HUD had tightened eligibility requirements to guarantee space for the most needy. When advocates for the mentally ill discovered this phenomenon, they began to pressure HUD to allow handicapped people to use the "excess" elderly housing. They succeeded beyond their wildest dreams.

The trickle became a flood about three years ago, but as Bunte says, most housing administrators, being socially conscious, were afraid to speak out in opposition because they didn't want to be seen as being against the mentally ill.

It is now time to speak out. The policy must be changed before public housing for the elderly in America has been destroyed.

TRAGIC GAPS IN MENTAL HEALTH CARE

(By Norman Lockman)

One of the toughest problems facing mental health professionals trying to implement de-hospitalization is finding housing for their clients. And one of the greatest gaps is the one that now exists between reality and what those professionals wish were happening to unstabilized mentally ill people living in the community.

It is true that many, perhaps even a majority, of the mentally ill people being treated in the community are doing fine. It is not they we are worried about. It is the few whose untreated disruptive behavior is impacting lives of people who should not have to bear the burden.

Nowhere is the impact of unstabilized mentally ill people living in the community more sharply drawn than in the Wilmington Housing Authority's four high-rise apartments housing senior citizens. Those four buildings, Crestview Apartments on North Market Street, Baynard Apartments of 18th Street, Lincoln Towers on Gilpin Avenue and Electra Arms on Broom Street have a total of 523 units, almost all of them occupied. Approximately 20 percent of those are occupied

by mentally ill people, including most of the 120 clients who were steered to the housing authority and are still being monitored by the state's Division of Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health.

A few years ago, the federal government ruled that 15 percent of all public housing units had to be set aside for handicapped people. In practice, most of those people are handicapped by mental illness. In Wilmington, a decision was made to place most of the mentally ill people into the high rises designed for senior citizens. Many of them function well, but many do not.

The result is a bizarre mix of terrified senior residents and strange behaving unsupervised mentally ill younger people. It's a mixture that makes no sense except among payroller bureaucrats who wouldn't recognize common sense if it was about to fall on them.

The mental health professionals concentrate on the fact that the majority of "deinstitutionalized" people are doing quite well in such settings. Too many ignore the fact that in such a small world it takes only a few loose cannons to devastate the battle field.

On paper, the system looks good. Division officials try to choose only people who can handle independent living; the housing authority has the power to screen out any they have doubts about; security has been stepped up; an additional social worker has been added; managers are being trained to spot problems among the mentally ill and they are empowered to evict problem residents.

That system isn't working.

The selection procedures, both those of the mental health professionals and the housing authority, don't even come close to weeding out disruptive people. Security is spread too thin. There are only two social workers. Building managers already have their hands full with administrative tasks. Electra Arms wants a full time mental health professional.

The fear among the older residents is palpable. The fear may be exaggerated, as some mental health professionals insist, but the fear is a reality in these people's lives. They are being told that they can protect themselves by organizing "high-rise watches" to keep an eye on each other and to report problems. Most are too scared to participate. And here's some reasons why:

At Crestview a mentally ill resident solicited quarters from the older residents sitting in the lobby by kicking them on the shins. Security discovered it only after the victims had become too afraid to continue to use their favorite sitting area.

At Electra Arms, a young man known for bizarre behavior and dress and feared for his habit of staring fixedly at older residents, tried to poison himself by swallowing a 9-volt battery. He then leaped to his death from the 11th floor one day last June.

Visitation rights are being abused by some mentally ill residents who allow homeless friends, some of whom have been rejected for residency, to sleep in their apartments.

What has happened, good intentions notwithstanding, is that Wilmington's once top-notch public housing for senior citizens is in danger of becoming unlivable because of unsupervised, unstabilized mentally ill residents. The mental health system, faced with a lack of adequate community facilities to make its dehospitalization drive work as fantasized, is burdening yet another system not designed to deal with its clients.

And once again, as with the homeless poor who must compete for resources with unstabilized mentally ill people, another

group of vulnerable citizens, this time old ones, who are suffering.

Strange priorities.

BIOGRAPHY OF OSCEOLA

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, through Public Law 102-188 (S.J. Res. 217, H.J. Res. 342), Congress and the President designated 1992 as the "Year of the American Indian." This law pays tribute to the people who first inhabited the land now known as the continental United States. Although only symbolic, this gesture is important because it shows there is sympathy in the eyes of a majority of both Houses of the Congress for those Indian issues which we as a Congress have been struggling with for over 200 years. In support of the "Year of the American Indian," and as part of my ongoing series this year, I am providing for the consideration of my colleagues a short biography of Osceola of the Seminole Tribe who led the battle against a forced move from Florida. This biography was taken from a U.S. Department of the Interior publication entitled "Famous Indians, A Collection of Short Biographies."

OSCEOLA (CREEK)

In 1832 a few members of the Seminole tribe of Florida signed an agreement with U.S. Government officials which was to become hated among the Seminoles as the Treaty of Payne's Landing.

Under it, within 3 years the entire tribe would surrender all its Florida lands, move to Indian territory (Oklahoma), and there join members of the Creek tribe. These harsh terms became even more hateful with a later declaration that no Negro would be allowed to accompany the tribe west. For more than 20 years the Seminoles had given refuge to the escaped slaves of both Indian and white owners, had in turn enslaved them and intermarried with them. The no-Negro decree would mean the breaking up of many Seminole families.

Most members of the tribe indignantly repudiated the treaty. As time for removal neared, their resistance to it intensified under the leadership of Osceola, a handsome young Indian of Creek and possibly some European ancestry.

Osceola was less than 30 at the time, and not a chief either by election or inheritance, but was acknowledged as the Seminoles' strong man. He had fully demonstrated his courage and intelligence as a warrior during fights against General Jackson and his men in the First Seminole War (1819). Osceola expressed open contempt for the 1832 treaty and repeatedly refused to sign it, despite pressure from Gen. Wiley Thompson, its chief sponsor.

Continuing his effort to get unanimous Seminole approval, General Thompson called together a group of tribal leaders in 1835. Most of the chiefs who opposed the treaty stood by silently, refusing to take the pen offered them, but Osceola furiously plunged his hunting knife into the paper, declaring that he would never agree to the treaty's terms, and would do all he could to encourage Seminole resistance. Thompson had Osceola arrested, put into irons, and imprisoned.

The wily Osceola quickly got himself released by pretending that he had changed his mind about the treaty and would sign it. As soon as he was free, he began to organize his resistance campaign.

Osceola was too experienced to attempt open battle against the whites' superior military power. Instead, he formed small parties of Indian warriors, instructed them to cause Government forces as much irritation as they could, kill when possible, and then vanish into the wilderness. Women, children, and the old and sick of the tribe were hidden in the depths of the Florida swamps. The leading Seminole signer of the treaty, Charlie Amathla, was killed.

So successful was Osceola's guerrilla warfare that U.S. troops were sent into the field. On Christmas Eve, 1835, more than 100 soldiers under Major Dade set out from the military post at Fort King, confident of capturing the Seminoles' leader. Three days later all but three were dead, having been ambushed and cut down by Osceola and his men. The Indian leader went on to avenge the despised Payne's Landing Treaty by killing General Thompson and four other officers. The Second Seminole War had begun.

For the next 7 years a deadly game of cat and mouse was played in the Florida swamps and Everglades, as the U.S. Army tried to catch Osceola and his people. Immediately after the December massacres, 700 men, sent to bring in the most-wanted Indian, faced Osceola and his warriors in the battle of the Outhlacoochee River. After heavy losses on both sides, the Indians were forced to retreat, but Osceola, although wounded, escaped.

Officer after officer, and more and more troops, went to Florida to bring in the elusive Osceola, who remained invisible. In May of 1837, Gen. T. S. Jesup, latest in a long line of commanders sent to bring the Seminole War to an end, called a peace council attended by Osceola and some 3,000 Indians. Jesup was so sure of success that he had 24 transports standing by, ready to take the Seminoles west. But Osceola got wind of the plot. The next morning, every Indian had vanished.

"No Seminole proves false to his country, nor has a single instance ever occurred of a first-rate warrior having surrendered," wrote the frustrated Jesup. Failing to capture Osceola in battle or through "peacemaking" tactics, Jesup finally succeeding in seizing Osceola only by violating a flag of truce under which the Indian leader was awaiting Jesup for a conference requested by the General. Osceola and a group of his followers were imprisoned in Fort Moultrie, Fla.

The Swamp Fox could not endure captivity, and rapidly wasted away in prison. Within 3 months, in January of 1838, Osceola died.

The Second Seminole War was to go on for 4 more years, as a succession of military leaders declared that the Seminoles could never be defeated. The Indians came out of the swamp only in the fall of 1841, rather than forfeit the lives of a group of their tribesmen, who had been captured and held as hostages. After a peace treaty in 1842, most of the Seminoles moved to Indian territory.

Several bands refused to move. Their descendants (some of whom, although unrelated to the great resistance leader, bear the name "Osceola") are still there, making up today's Seminoles of Florida.

THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I hope all my colleagues will read the following speech Vice President QUAYLE presented to the New York Economic Club on February 27. He challenges the basic principles of the welfare state that dominates our country today.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT QUAYLE TO THE NEW YORK ECONOMIC CLUB

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Dick Voel, thank you for the kind introduction.

In the last ten days I have been in Delaware, Maryland, Georgia twice, North and South Dakota, Colorado, and Minnesota. There is only one issue on the minds of the people—the economy and jobs. Job security is especially an issue for new sectors of the economy that have been somewhat insulated in the past—like insurance, financial institutions, and the media.

The starting point for any discussion these days has to reference the end of the cold war. Today, in place of one great threat, there are many smaller, less recognizable threats. And today, more than ever before, other nations look to America for leadership. Who will take up this responsibility if we refuse it—Germany? Japan? China?

No, America is engaged in the world's economy, and there is no going back. Nor should anyone want to go back. One of the immediate imperatives in global economics and politics is the successful conclusion of the GATT negotiations. I can't think of anything worse than replacing the cold war with a trade war. Yet, the political dynamics around the world are threatening the conclusion of this agreement. As we seek economic expansion at home, one of the keys will be exports abroad.

No longer will competition be limited between New York and Los Angeles. It will be global competition—lots of it. And we should welcome competition.

And, let me add, we do not promise to "protect" our economy. We believe in stimulating our economy. "Protection" is the cry of the weak and insecure. America did not make its way this far in the world by cowering behind barriers. Our credo is not, "Take cover!" but "Let the competition come." Where others will compete freely and fairly, so will we.

What a tragedy it would be, ladies and gentlemen, if America were to lead in the triumph of free-market capitalism—only to lose faith in it ourselves. Historians looking back on our time would shake their heads in amazement that such a sad thing could happen at such a happy moment in our national life.

But I wonder if there is not a hint of that loss of faith in what we're hearing now from some quarters. All the world has spent the last two generations experiencing what works in economics, and what doesn't. What elevates man, and what oppresses and debases him.

It was our fate and good fortune to watch the great collectivist experiment from outside the laboratory. But those millions of souls who had to endure it—they are our witnesses. And what they tell is simple and unequivocal: socialism, or any glossed-over variation of it, won't work. It will diminish, destroy, and devour resources, instead of cre-

ating and building. In man's economic life, the State may be an uneasy ally but never a friend.

As we seek our economic security in this uncertain world, we must learn what works and what doesn't. Let us look at this great city. It attests to what becomes of those who put their faith in the benevolence of the state. In what should be a liberal paradise, what do we find instead?

Honest, ambitious, hard-working New Yorkers struggling to pay the highest local taxes in America—about \$1,600 per person.

A business tax three times greater than that paid by businesses in Chicago and Los Angeles.

One in every eight people on the dole.

Taxpayers investing \$7,000 a year for each public school student, compared to \$3,000 per student in private schools. The taxpayers' investment in education gets a high-school graduation rate of 38 percent. That means 62 percent don't finish on time.

Liberal economics may prevail here, but it sure doesn't work here. It's estimated that by 1994, a total of 320,000 private sector jobs will be lost in New York City. When the taxpayers meekly protest these high taxes, the liberal deep-thinkers snap back that we lack "compassion" for the working man. But the working man is usually the one most hurt by this kind of thinking. Now, I know: it's an election year. And I don't pretend to be entirely non-partisan. But ladies and gentlemen, I am not appealing to party affiliation. I'm appealing to reason and tragic experience: the liberal vision of a happy, productive, and content welfare state hasn't even worked on 22 square miles of the most valuable real estate in the world.

You don't build economic strength by taxing economic strength. If you tax wealth, you diminish wealth. If you diminish wealth, you diminish investment. The fewer the investments, the fewer jobs.

Congress will have a classic battle over taxes in the next few weeks * * *. A Republican approach and a Democratic approach * * *.

The Democratic approach holds out a temporary tax cut—right along with a permanent tax increase. For a family of four, this bold plan would offer a savings of about a quarter a day per person.

Today the Democrats in Congress passed their tax bill surprise of surprises, it is nothing more than a \$100-million tax increase on the American worker. In 1990, the President signed the Democratic Congress' tax increase, and the country got a recession. This time, the President will veto the Democratic Congress' tax increase and demand that his jobs package be passed.

You know, these last few days I've been asked a lot about the message from New Hampshire. The message is simple and direct: The people are fed up with Washington. They're fed up with big government. They're fed up with high taxes. They're fed up with government regulations. And they are fed up with our bad economy. We agree with that message.

Now let's look at the President's plan. No, it would not make our troubles disappear. But it will steer us along the right road. Put simply, the plan will:

Establish, immediately, a \$5,000 tax credit for first-time home buyers. Our real estate incentives alone will generate as many as 415,000 new jobs in six months.

Give priority to all pro-growth government projects, especially in construction.

Place a moratorium on all new Federal regulations that might hinder economic growth.

And, finally, something that matters to every American who owns a home, a farm, a business, or has a small investment—or needs a job: cut the tax on capital gains.

Let me pause here with a personal thought about Congress and how it operates. In the category of baring one's economic soul, the most frustrating public policy problem that I've faced in my 15 years in office is the Federal budget deficit.

When I graduated from college in 1969, the Federal budget was \$184 billion and we had a surplus. This year the Federal budget will be \$1.5 trillion and the deficit is projected to be close to \$400 billion. Whether there was a Republican President or a Democratic President, the Congress has been unwilling to get serious about spending restraint.

In fact, more and more our whole congressional system favors excessive spending. The appropriations bills that are annually heaved upon the President's desk contain more than 1,600 pages. Congress is very good at giving the President 75 or 80 percent of what he wants, and then adding 20 or 25 percent of what he doesn't want. And it's this part of the budget that causes so many of our fiscal problems.

A philosopher wrote many centuries ago: "Our peril comes from those who seek to please us, rather than to serve us." He could have been speaking of our modern Congress.

We have Members of Congress who have been there 30, 40, even 50 years. The problem is that our Congress has become insulated, out of touch with reality, but very proficient in getting re-elected because of the goodies they dispense.

According to Common Cause, only 6 percent of House Members will face financially competitive races, and about 98 percent seeking re-election will be re-elected—primarily because there is no genuine competition. To get spending under control, we need serious reform in Congress—and I'm not just talking about the line-item veto.

Congress thinks it is good for the Nation to limit the President to two terms. The argument for this is, of course, that too much power, for too long, has a way of making people arrogant and even corrupt. Well, it sure does. And if it is good for the Nation to limit our President to two terms, then it is good for the Nation to limit the terms of Congress as well.

Speaking of reforms and competitiveness, I'm compelled to mention our civil justice reform package. My competitiveness council has identified legal reform as a very serious competitiveness issue. An American business spends 15 times more for product liability costs than a Japanese or German business. That, my friends, is a competitiveness disadvantage, and we are determined to do something about it.

As you may know, I went before the American Bar Association a few months ago, and in my quiet, humble way tried to suggest that a reform or two might be in order. Well, never have I witnessed such a spontaneous outpouring of warmth and affection * * *

Ladies and gentlemen, I mean my friends the lawyers no harm. Their calling can be among the most valuable and noble in a free society. Just think about it. America has 5 percent of the world's population. Do we really need 70 percent of the world's lawyers? There were 18 million civil lawsuits filed in 1989. Were all those really necessary?

And more to the point, do you know how great a burden all this litigation places on our economy? Altogether, about \$300 billion. We're the most litigious society in the world and we need a legal system more efficient,

less costly, and more fair. It's estimated that a larger percentage of the costs of making a car goes into the company's legal bills than into buying metal.

In hope of improving this situation, the President and I have proposed the civil justice reform plan. It would limit punitive damages, speed up the delivery of justice, and discourage frivolous lawsuits. These are practical, common-sense reforms and would in no way compromise our sense of justice. Whether they will meet the standards of lawyers—62 of whom now sit in the Senate—is unfortunately another matter.

One of your past speakers, Churchill, reminded us that, "we make a living by what we get * * * but we make a life by what we give."

Hard times shake our confidence, cloud our vision, divide us just when unity, is most needed. But amid all the bickering and posturing in Washington, I believe there remains a simple, unselfish ideal worth fighting for. The credo expressed long ago by Thomas Wolfe:

To every man, regardless of his birth, his golden opportunity;

To every man, the right to live,

To work,

To be himself

And to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make

—This, seeker, is the promise of America.

Thank you, Good night. And God bless you.

EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY
ENHANCEMENT ACT

HON. ROBERT E. WISE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that students today face two very difficult problems when it comes to higher education—too few students can afford to go to college and too few college graduates earn enough to repay their student loans. That is why I recently introduced legislation that would make it easier for more Americans to receive financial assistance for education—legislation which attacks both of these problems.

This legislation expands eligibility for Pell grants and Stafford loans. It increases the maximum Pell grant from \$3,100 to \$4,500 and it increases the minimum Pell award from \$200 to \$400. This means that students are eligible for more money through Pell grants.

In my State, we have a situation where bright, talented individuals have to leave the State after graduation because there are too few high paying job opportunities. One reason graduates need higher paying jobs is to help repay huge student loans. By providing students with a larger percentage of grants and a smaller percentage of loans, I hope to lower their debt ratio as they start their new careers. This legislation can help break the cycle of student debt and spiraling wages required to pay for that debt.

This legislation also changes the way expected family contributions are calculated. Ownership of principal residences, family farms, and small businesses will no longer work against families by being counted in their financial aid asset formula. As a result, fami-

lies who have lower incomes but own their own home, farm or small business will not be penalized.

One of the most important things this legislation does is to allow working students from low-income families to use their income to help support their families without being penalized when they apply for financial aid. This bill would reinstate an offset for working students that existed in previous Pell grant computations. This provision would help more students qualify for all types of financial aid—both grants and loans.

The needs analysis formulas for all types of financial aid are being combined for administrative simplicity. Currently, in calculations for Pell grants, if the available income from the family is calculated to be a negative number, that number can offset income earned by the student. This bill would reinstate that offset in the new, combined needs analysis formula, helping students from lower-income families who work to help support their families.

Mr. Speaker, today it is popular to talk about competitiveness and building an economic infrastructure. To successfully accomplish this we must allow more people more access to education with less of a debt burden. This is a vital component in our Nation's economic growth today and our Nation's future tomorrow.

DEDUCTIBILITY OF STUDENT LOAN INTEREST

HON. CHESTER G. ATKINS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Speaker, while I rise today in support of the Democratic tax plan, I must express my concern that the plan does not go far enough to make college education more affordable for middle-income students and their families.

As it is structured, the bill would allow families to subtract only 15 percent of the interest on student loans—up to \$300 for single people and up to \$500 for a married couple. This means that those just entering the job market are still saddled with significant debts. The escalating cost of education places an enormous strain on our students. Higher education is rapidly becoming inaccessible to low- and middle-income families. Interest payments on these loans can virtually wipe out a new graduate's income.

That is why, along with 142 of my colleagues, I am a cosponsor of a bill introduced by Representative SCHULZE, which makes the interest on these loans fully deductible.

The Tax Reform Act of 1986 reclassified student loan interest as consumer interest and made it nontax deductible. It made no distinction between interest incurred because of a vacation to the Mediterranean and that incurred because of payment toward a college education.

The tax plan under consideration today allows parents to make penalty free IRA withdrawals for tuition expenses. It is an important first step, but many families do not have IRA's on which to fall back. Or, the IRA's are insuffi-

cient to pay for the full cost of postsecondary school education. And, in any case, fathers and mothers and grandparents should not have to give their retirement savings to educate their children and grandchildren.

Parents and their children are forced to rely upon student loans, not because they want to, but because the expense of education requires such dependence.

If we are to grow and prosper as a Nation we must reinvest in our future. Education is the primary building block of that future. An investment in education is one which will provide returns for years to come. Moreover, we now recognize that our economic viability as a Nation depends upon producing the human resources that only education can provide. As the costs of education rise higher and higher, it is more important than ever to provide relief to those who, in attaining an education for themselves, also provide for the future of their country. Only in this way may we ensure an educated work force for America's future. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the inclusion of full tax deductibility of educational loans when this bill returns from the Senate.

THE FORMOSAN ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to extend my hearty congratulations to the officers, board members, staff, chapter leaders, and members of the Formosan Association for Public Affairs on the occasion of its 10th anniversary.

The creation of FAPA in 1982 under the leadership of my good friend Dr. Trong Chai was an important event in the life of the Taiwanese-American community. It signaled the engagement of that community in the American political system in efforts both to protect the community's interests in America and to enhance the prospects for democracy and human rights on Taiwan itself. That such an engagement occurred so quickly after the arrival of significant numbers of Taiwanese in our country is quite remarkable.

Over the past decade, FAPA has joined the ranks of other American ethnic organizations which seek to play an active and constructive role in our country's political life. In the process, it has made a profound contribution both to the welfare of the Taiwanese community in the United States and to the shaping of American policy toward the Asian region in a way that enhances the ability of the people on Taiwan to shape their future.

I am very pleased to have been associated with FAPA since its founding in 1982 in promoting these important objectives. I look forward to many more years of fruitful cooperation.

THE TAX BILLS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, March 4, 1992, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE TAX BILLS

Last week the House took up three alternative tax packages. The first incorporated all of the President's tax proposals included in his State of the Union address and his budget submission, including an increase in the personal exemption for children, a tax credit for first-time homebuyers, and a deep cut in capital gains taxes. The second was a substitute crafted by House Republicans that had fewer provisions, dropping, among other things, the President's proposal to increase the exemption for children. These two packages were defeated in the House by wide margins, largely because they were projected to significantly increase the deficit. The main vote was on the Democratic tax package, which passed by a vote of 221 to 209. The debate now shifts to the Senate.

Outline of democratic package: The tax package approved by the House has two main goals: improving tax fairness and boosting the economy. To improve the fairness of the tax code, it would provide middle-income tax relief through a two-year, refundable tax credit on social security taxes that would provide up to \$200 per year for singles and \$400 for couples. That tax cut would be paid for by permanently increasing the top income tax rate from 31% to 35% (which would apply only to individuals with taxable income over \$85,000 and families with taxable income over \$145,000), imposing a 10% tax surcharge on those making more than \$1 million per year, and extending a phase-out of deductions and exemptions for high-income taxpayers.

In an effort to boost economic growth, it contains a variety of tax incentives, including a cut in capital gains taxes by exempting the portion of such gains due to inflation and an extra first-year deduction for businesses for the cost of newly purchased equipment. It would allow real estate professionals to deduct their rental losses from their active income, and make permanent the research tax credit.

The package has been estimated to lose revenue over the first two years, but reduce the deficit by \$14 billion over the six-year period through 1997.

Merits: The House-approved package has several positive features. First, it would restore some equity to the tax code, giving middle-income taxpayers most of the tax cuts after a decade in which upper-income taxpayers received most of the tax breaks. Second, it is more fiscally responsible than the alternative tax packages, which were estimated to increase the budget deficit by tens of billions of dollars over six years. Third, several of its tax incentives—from making the research tax credit permanent to providing a tax credit for student loans—are reasonable. Fourth, it highlights the different emphases of the two parties when it comes to tax policy, in terms of favoring upper-income taxpayers or the middle class.

Drawbacks: Yet in the end I voted against the package for the following reasons:

First, my primary reason was that the package has the wrong focus. Important as

restoring some equity to the tax code and trying to stimulate the economy during this recession are, they are not the main problems facing the nation. Our major effort really should be boosting long-term growth, and that means our priorities should be on reducing the budget deficit and making important long-term investments—in infrastructure, research, education, training, children. Stagnant productivity growth exceeds all other problems. What Americans want most now are jobs and improvements in their standards of living, and this package is not designed for that.

Second, the package seeks contradictory aims. It tries to stimulate a weak economy without increasing the deficit. That cannot be done. Overall, the stimulus proposed in the package would have only a modest impact on getting the U.S. out of the current recession.

Third, the modest economic stimulus from the package may also be too late. Most forecasts suggest that the recession will end later this year because of actions already taken by the Federal Reserve to lower interest rates. If so, the tax changes in this package could kick in after the recession is already over. The overwhelming consensus of economists is that another rate cut by the Fed would be a far more useful tonic to this recession than a tax cut.

Fourth, the overall impact on tax equity would be small. Although the House-passed tax package makes a good effort at trying to restore some equity and fairness to the tax code through the two-year tax credit for middle-income Americans costing \$46 billion, its various tax incentives cost some \$29 billion over six years plus more thereafter, and would benefit primarily the wealthy.

Fifth, the package would worsen the budget deficit. Although crafted to have a positive impact on the deficit over six years, it is still the case that over the next two years—when the federal government will be running annual deficits in the \$300-400 billion range—the package will lose some \$30 billion. Moreover, estimates of the revenue loss from tax breaks—such as from indexing capital gains or from the passive loss provision—always seem to turn out to be optimistic. And perhaps most importantly, the hugely optimistic assumption at the heart of the package is that in the midst of the next election year, 1994, Congress will let the middle-income tax cut lapse. I think that is highly unlikely. Instead, it would almost certainly be extended, and unless some painful offsetting cuts are made, that could drastically increase the deficit. The risks that the deficit created by this package would grow are substantial.

Sixth, the additional revenue gained from the higher taxes on the wealthy, some \$73 billion over six years, is an enormous sum that should not be squandered. It far exceeds the President's proposed peace dividend from the collapse of the Communist threat, and under the House-passed plan it would be used for a tax break of about a dollar a day that few people are clamoring for and that is unlikely to do much to help the economy. It is more wisely used for long-term investment in infrastructure and education and for deficit reduction.

Finally, this vote was to a large extent political maneuvering. There is no chance that President Bush would sign the House-passed tax package into law. It is a political response to the political challenges laid down by President Bush in his State of the Union address. What is really needed at this time is statesmanship and a real plan to deal with

the biggest challenges facing the American economy, not partisan games.

STATEMENT HONORING HOME-STEAD AIR FORCE BASE ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Homestead Air Force Base on its 50th anniversary. To commemorate this great milestone in the history of our Armed Forces, the State of Florida, and the national defense of our own United States, I offer the following proclamation:

Whereas Homestead Air Force Base which, since its inception in September of 1942, has been a defense stronghold for our nation, helping to guide American forces to victory in World War II, as well as playing a pivotal role in the Cold War and developments in Cuba;

Whereas Homestead Air Force Base, less than 200 miles from the coast of Cuba, has proven to be an invaluable asset in monitoring activity on the island and, in October of 1962, when it was discovered that the Soviet Union was positioning medium-range missiles on Cuba, Homestead led the American crusade against the spread of the Communist specter;

Whereas Homestead Air Force Base has proven its worthiness to the United States, and really to all free lands, by continually standing ready to project air power around the globe while still maintaining an operational, ready Tactical Air Force;

Whereas Homestead also participated in the Vietnam War and has trained countless members of our Air Force during the past fifty years;

Whereas, on its 50th anniversary, Homestead Air Force Base stands more ready and able than ever to assist in the tactical defense of our country through its superior personnel, resources and geographical location;

Whereas bases such as Homestead will always be of the utmost use to our nation as we seek to ensure our national security and assist other countries in their fights for free rule: Now, therefore, I ask our colleagues to join me in proclaiming March 21, 1992, a day of celebration commending and saluting Homestead Air Force Base on its 50th anniversary;

Offering profound thanks to the officers, enlisted men and women and civilians who are on duty this day and to the thousands who came before them these past fifty years;

Acknowledging that Homestead Air Force Base has been, is, and will continue to be a great defense, educational, social and economic contributor to Homestead, the state of Florida and the country, and

Recognizing that Homestead Air Force Base and the men and women who serve there have earned a rightful place in the political and military annals of a grateful nation.

HER AIM IS TO EVEN-UP GRAMMY SCORE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article by Earl Caldwell, which appeared in the New York Daily News on Monday, February 24, 1992.

In this article, Mr. Caldwell describes the tireless efforts of New York State Assemblywoman Geraldine Daniels, who represents the 70th District, in Harlem, to have that community's contribution to our Nation's musical history recognized.

HER AIM IS TO EVEN-UP GRAMMY SCORE

Hers was another side in the "we want our piece of the action" argument. This time it came from Assemblywoman Geraldine Daniels. Her target was the National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences, the organization that sponsors the Grammy Awards.

The way it turned out, Geraldine Daniels didn't win.

The Grammy Awards are going ahead as scheduled tomorrow night at Radio City Music Hall. Only a thin slice of the Grammy action figures to get as far north as Harlem. But even though that's the case, Assemblywoman Daniels didn't exactly come away from her fight a loser.

"This was a beginning," she said. "And I want the Academy and the world to know that Harlem will continue its fight to have more of the Grammy week events."

All of it is about "a piece of the action." Just a week ago, the NAACP announced it was urging blacks not to buy Japanese cars, explaining that Japan's car makers did not hire blacks at the same level that American companies do and that Japan car makers also gave few dealerships to blacks. The "Don't buy Japanese" decision was the NAACP's strategy to pressure Japan for "a piece of the action."

The "piece of the action" demand goes back to the 1960s. Leaders of civil-rights organizations found that blacks suffered in some ways as a result of integration. Their feeling was something like this: We lost our black businesses, and then we got shut out of the major businesses. Large white concerns got our money through integration, and we were left with nothing, not even jobs. We got no piece of the action.

So the battles began. In the late '60s the Rev. Jesse Jackson and his organization, Operation Push, signed "fair-share" agreements with major corporations. The NAACP soon followed with similar agreements. When the economy was going strong, the fair-share agreements had an impact. Once the economy began to slow, the old "we want our piece of the action" arguments resurfaced. One of the voices heard was Geraldine Daniels' as she took on the Academy and the Grammys.

The "piece of the action" Daniels wanted had nothing to do with recognition; she was looking for dollars.

The Grammy Awards is one of the big specials from the entertainment world that brings a lot of money to a city. Some estimates are that the Grammys can pump as much as \$60 million into a city's economy. In 1972, in 1975, in 1981, in 1988 and in 1991, New York had the Grammys. That meant all the

money that's a part of the package was spent in New York.

What put Geraldine Daniels into a mood to fight was realizing, as she says, that "not a dime" of the Grammy money that came into New York in all of those years was spent in Harlem.

So with the Grammys in New York again this year, Daniels was determined to have a different history written for that money.

In the state Legislature, she represents the 70th District, which is Central Harlem. Her office on 125th St. is just a few blocks from the Apollo Theatre. In telling of what Harlem did for the world of music, Daniels starts at the Apollo. So many artists started there and introduced so much music there that still feeds the music industry. Daniels asks, "So why shouldn't Harlem be recognized? Why shouldn't some of the Grammy events be televised from the Apollo, so the world can see what this community gave to the music?"

All of it was her way of saying what Jesse Jackson and Benjamin Hooks said before. Daniels was saying that by bringing some of the Grammy show to Harlem, in turn, the community gets its fair share of the \$60 million pot.

In leading her fight, Daniels confronted Michael Green, who heads the Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences. He found a lot of ways to say that Daniels was right in her argument. "Harlem is most definitely an important birthing and nurturing center for many uniquely American music styles," he acknowledged.

But for 1992, Harlem got only a small part of the Grammy action. "But it's not over," Daniels says. "We hope the Grammys come back in 1993. We are ready to continue the fight." What she didn't say is that it is happening that way now on a lot of fronts.

INTRODUCTION OF THE EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH ACT

HON. CARL C. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to address the true crisis of this recession—unemployment. This bill, the Employment and Economic Growth Act, is designed to provide temporary, emergency employment and training for the unemployed with the greatest need and to assist communities in alleviating social and infrastructure deterioration.

There is no more important issue facing our country than the crises of unemployment and economic dislocation. The U.S. economy slipped into a recession in July 1990, where it has remained for the longest period since the 1930's depression. The jobless rate grew from 5.4 percent to 7.1 percent in just the last 19 months, and the unemployed population surged from 6.8 million to 8.9 million. In addition to the jobless, at least another 1.2 million are discouraged workers who have stopped looking for work, and an estimated 6.7 million work part time, because no full time work is available.

Numerous proposals have been introduced by a number of my colleagues to help create jobs and stimulate the economy. The bill I am

introducing today has one distinct difference from the others. This act uses an existing local service delivery system in the Job Training Partnership Act [JTPA] to expedite the expenditure of funds—enabling us to put people back to work with little or no delay.

One of the principal criticisms of previous employment creation programs has been the extensive delay in spending job funds and placing individuals. Under the Emergency Jobs Act of 1983, the GAO estimated that only one-third of the funds had been spent by the end of the 1980's recession, a full 15 months after the funds had been appropriated. In local JTPA programs, working relationships have already been developed with employers, service providers, and educators, and can be expanded with relative ease. In addition, this bill would encourage placement in community service jobs, such as in child care and education services, which do not require as much planning and design as public works jobs.

Hardly a day goes by that the media is not reporting a massive layoff or factory closing. In the past few weeks, General Motors announced that a staggering 74,000 employees will permanently lose their jobs over the next few years; at IBM 20,000 employees will be laid off; and at DuPont another 10,000 will be laid off.

Many economists have predicted that the economy should turn around by mid-summer, but this will not eliminate the existing poverty and unemployment in our country. The creation of jobs is as essential to rebuilding lives, as it is to rebuilding and renovating neighborhood streets, housing, parks, and schools. This act would authorize \$5 billion in 1992 to create an estimated 360,000 jobs for the unemployed for a maximum of 1 year. I recognize that there are still millions more unemployed, but I intend this proposal to be a modest first step toward relieving the economic woes of the unemployed.

Finally, I would like to extend a special note of thanks to Richard E. Johnson, retiring counsel to the Committee on Education and Labor, for his assistance in developing this legislation. Dick Johnson has been a good friend and trusted advisor to me and my staff on the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, and he will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, attached is a summary of this bill that I would ask to be printed in the RECORD in its entirety immediately following my remarks.

THE EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH ACT

(Introduced by Carl C. Perkins)

The Employment and Economic Growth Act is designed to provide temporary, emergency employment and training for the unemployed with the greatest need and to assist communities in their efforts to address social and infrastructure deterioration.

The Secretary of Labor shall make grants to states and service delivery areas (SDAs) to fund local jobs projects. Of the appropriated amount, 90% shall be for state allocation to SDAs, based on formula factors targeting substantial unemployment and poverty. The remaining 10% is the Secretary's discretionary fund which is to be used for grants to SDAs experiencing long-term or high unemployment or poverty.

Not less than 70% of the funds allocated to the SDAs must be used for wages and em-

ployment benefits, with not more than 15% of the funds allocated for benefits. No more than 25% of funds can be used for on-the-job training. No more than 10% of funds may be used for tools, supplies and equipment. Administrative and assessment expenditures are limited to 10% of funds; and supportive services (i.e., education, training, transportation, child care) are limited to 20% of funds.

Eligible participants must be over 16 years of age and unemployed for 30 days or working part time because of being displaced from a full time position. Targeted unemployed individuals with priority include: Unemployment Insurance recipients for at least 3 months, cash welfare recipients, basic skills deficient, veterans, the homeless, and other groups defined to be at risk.

Participant wages shall not be less than the minimum wage plus 30%, or the amount of public assistance an eligible participant receives plus 15%, or the prevailing wage for a construction job (under Davis-Bacon), whichever is higher. An eligible participant may not be employed for more than 40 hours or 5 days a week and may be employed in no other job for over 20 hours a week. Benefits shall be comparable to prevailing benefits at the employment site. All eligible participants are also eligible for supportive services. JTPA benefits and labor standards are required where applicable.

SDAs must use funds for community service or community improvement job programs, employing individuals for not more than a year. Supplemental job training plans must be submitted to the governor for approval and shall include a description of prioritized community needs, jobs to be filled, work to be done, the duration of projects, and assurances of participant assessments. Participants who do not have high school diplomas will be required to enroll in a basic skills or high school program and work toward a diploma or a GED. For one half day each week participants will be required to seek unsubsidized employment through the use of the job placement services in coordination with local employment service offices.

Community service jobs may be contracted with local nonprofit, governmental, or community-based organizations to improve services to community residents. Community improvement jobs may include the repair, maintenance, and rehabilitation of public facilities or public lands.

The number of supervisory personnel is limited to one-tenth of participants employed. Funds may not be used for activities such as revolving loans, capitalizing businesses, and economic development.

Secretary has 30 days to notify recipients of funds appropriated. SDAs have 30 days to develop requests for proposals for service providers. SDAs or service providers have 30 days to assess and place eligible applicants.

In FY 1992, there is \$5 billion authorized for this Act, and such sums thereafter for each qualifying fiscal year. A qualifying fiscal year is if during a 6 month period, the national unemployment rate raises more than 1%. With full funding, an estimated 360,000 unemployed would be provided jobs.

JUSTICE DELAYED IS JUSTICE DENIED

HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again urge that the House enact a strong anticrime bill with meaningful habeas corpus reform. I believe the measure passed by the House last year is inadequate and insulting to the millions of Americans who have been victimized by crime.

I wanted to call the attention of my colleagues to an excerpt from California Attorney General Daniel Lungren's "State of Public Safety 1992" address.

Attorney General Lungren helped to organize the campaign for habeas corpus reform last year, marshaling a broad coalition which included a majority of all State attorneys general, all 58 of California's district attorneys, law enforcement, and other interest groups. His leadership is making a real difference in California, but as he points out, California's efforts to improve public safety have been stymied by this House's failure to act.

Mr. Speaker, justice delayed is justice denied. The House should move quickly to reopen this question and enact a tough, anticrime bill which the American people demand and the President can support.

EXCERPT OF REMARKS BY HON. DANIEL E. LUNGREN, CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL

No approach to crime can be complete, nor can the public's faith in our justice system be fully restored, until we implement the death penalty in California.

Last year, the state Supreme Court upheld 24 out of 25 death sentences. In 1990, it upheld 25 out of 27. That's a far cry from the record of the Rose Bird Court which overturned virtually every death sentence.

Unfortunately, the public removed the Rose Bird barrier only to find another obstacle adding to the interminable delay—repetitive habeas corpus appeals in federal courts. Those courts are under a duty to provide fair and prompt hearings, a duty which was underscored most recently by the U.S. Supreme Court in a strongly worded message to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, which covers California.

I applaud the Supreme Court's action, but we need to go further. We need a federal crime bill which contains provisions to limit the number of death sentence appeals and set time limits on the process.

Last year, I led an effort—which was joined by all of California's district attorneys and a majority of the nation's Attorneys General and throughout the law enforcement community—to advocate these measures in the United States Congress. With the courageous assistance of victims and their families, we won substantial reforms in the Senate, only to watch our efforts sabotaged late last year in the House of Representatives. We will carry the fight forward this year. In the words of Winston Churchill, we will "never, never, never give in."

RULE OF LAW IN UKRAINE

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, newly independent Ukraine is making determined progress toward becoming a democratic state. Indeed, Ukraine's very act of independence has been dubbed a "ballot box revolution." It was achieved peacefully—through a popular referendum in which over 90 percent of those voting supported independence. Ukraine, along with nine other independent states of the former Soviet Union, has also recently joined the CSCE, and has pledged to live up to CSCE's human rights commitments. Ukraine, even prior to independence, was making encouraging progress in the area of human rights, and especially minority rights. Nevertheless, profound challenges remain for Ukraine in its transition from a command legal system to a rule-of-law state which would ensure human rights for the individual and underpin a free market economy.

Mr. Speaker, United States Claims Court Judge Bohdan A. Futey has made several recent visits to Ukraine to advise on its legal transition, most recently in January with a representative of the State Department's Bureau of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs. I ask that Judge Futey's February 11, Wall Street Journal article, "Ukraine's Legal Revolution," which describes both the current changes and challenges ahead, be submitted into the RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal Europe, Feb. 11, 1992]

UKRAINE'S LEGAL REVOLUTION

(By Bohdan A. Futey)

Since the collapse of the Berlin Wall Western attention has been riveted on eastern Europe's transition from a command to a market economy. Meanwhile, political economists have largely neglected the transition from a command legal system to the rule of law—despite the fact that a legal transition must underpin and structure any economic changes there.

The nations of eastern Europe have long been ruled by a heavy hand from above. If they are to enjoy the benefits of liberty, including economic benefits, they will need legal systems that allow those benefits to flourish from below. But that legal transition will be no less difficult than the economic one.

Recent developments in Ukraine reflect some of those difficulties. Two months ago, Ukrainian citizens voted overwhelmingly in favor of their country's independence from the Soviet Union. Dubbed a "ballot box revolution," the Dec. 1 referendum was a popular ratification of the parliament's Declaration of Independence—proclaimed shortly after the August coup attempt in Moscow—and its declaration of sovereignty a year earlier.

Ukraine has thus begun its legal revolution with due respect for the democratic principle: political legitimacy comes from the bottom up, not from the top down. But the formal, political legitimacy rooted in popular sovereignty is only half the equation—and the easier half at that, especially when driven by the fever for independence that 70 years of tyranny engenders. Now the hard work begins that will be needed to se-

cure the substantive legal legitimacy that "rule of law" denotes.

QUESTIONS OF SOVEREIGNTY

Standing in the way of that work, however, are two immediate problems. First, while the Ukrainian people have established their de jure sovereignty, it is too early to be confident that de facto sovereignty is secure. The disputes between Moscow and Kiev over the Black Sea Fleet and the divisions in the ranks of the military between those who have pledged allegiance to Ukraine and those who will return to Russia are only the surface manifestations. Underlying these reconfigurations of the Soviet military are territorial issues. In early January, for example, the Russian parliament recommended a review of Khrushchev's 1954 decision that Crimea belonged within Ukraine's borders. Until these "international" issues are settled, they can only distract the Ukrainian people from the pressing need to establish their domestic order on a sound legal footing.

A second problem frustrating this domestic agenda is that a large portion of Ukraine's leaders, especially in parliament and the courts, are carry-overs from the old order. And many of them, by training and habit, to say nothing of interest, stand in the way of establishing anything like the rule of law as we know it. Nowhere was this more clear than with members of the current judiciary with whom I recently met. Given that one of their principal interests was to find out who assigns housing to judges in the U.S., you know they have a long way to go. Already, the concerns of the judicial elite with housing, telephones, purchasing privileges and the like have found their way into legislation. Before a legal order suited for a free society can arise, leaders who understand that order must come to the fore.

That need points to the deeper cultural issues that must be overcome in all of the nations of the former Soviet Union. For underlying any legal system is a legal culture. In the West, that culture developed over centuries, especially in the private sector. A private bar, dedicated to securing the rule of law that enabled a vast private sector to grow and flourish, was the animating force behind ordered liberty. But in Ukraine today there is no private bar as we would think of it, and only an inchoate legal culture to sustain such a bar and be sustained by it.

Soviet rule systematically destroyed nearly everything that was private in Ukraine—using Soviet "law," the law of command, to do so. Once the procurator and local party boss gave the command, the judge carried it out—with the "defense" counsel, an employee of the state, resigned to an administrative role. Given that history of "telephone justice," as it came to be known. Is it any wonder that for many Ukrainians the idea of an independent judiciary is little understood—and even less appreciated?

Yet for all this, there is a hope and confidence in Kiev that one does not see in Moscow—at least to the same extent. As they begin to build their legal culture, many of Ukraine's new leaders—members of Rukh, the Ukrainian Popular Movement—are drawing from their experience as dissidents over the long and often brutal struggle for independence. During the Brezhnev crackdown, but especially following the signing of the Helsinki Accords in 1975, Ukrainian intellectuals and activists repeatedly tried to work within the confines of Soviet law to insist upon a rule of law. Having developed a healthy respect for the regularity and consistency that are central to the rule of law,

those new leaders are now trying to build upon these ideas.

Although parliament is now focusing on the immediate problem of creating and reinforcing institutions to protect Ukraine's sovereignty and independence—from military forces to a Ukrainian currency—work is also underway toward creating new, constitutional institutions of government. Right now, government in Ukraine is composed largely by institutions from the old order. But a parliamentary committee on the constitution is drafting a new one that they hope to circulate among European and American constitutional law experts this month. If present plans hold, a final document could be ready for ratification by fall.

Speaking about the draft constitution before a Dec. 26 conference of Ukrainian judges, President Leonid Kravchuk strongly endorsed the separation of powers and the creation of an independent judiciary as a third, co-equal branch of government. Legislation has already reduced the once-powerful Procurator General's Office, stripping it of many of its court oversight functions. And the concept of trial by jury has sparked great interest, although judges from the old guard remain skeptical.

While institution building is underway, so too are changes in the substantive law—the rules by which Ukraine will be governed. Here, classic conflicts are arising between those who want to preserve much of the old order—"legitimized" by local institutions rather than received by "diktat" from Moscow—and those who want to move to a free, private, market society. Not surprisingly, the nomenklatura is in the former camp since they have the most to lose from any moves toward a market—at least in the short run.

RUDDIMENTARY ENFORCEMENT

Fortunately, liberals appear to be in the ascendant. Legislation was passed last fall to protect foreign investment and to enable the formation of economic partnerships. At the moment, however, these are limited, rudimentary changes, "enforced" more by political connections than by the rule of law. Continued movement in this direction is needed. Privatization and a property law to secure it must be the first orders of business.

In Russia we are seeing what happens when privatization is postponed while prices are set free: The increase in supply that free prices are meant to encourage never materializes because only private suppliers, who stand to profit from rising prices, will respond with greater production. If those problems are to be avoided in Ukraine a law of property, and a closely related law of contracts, must be established quickly. Ukraine will doubtless follow the European code method in this since there is too little time to allow for an Anglo-American style common law to evolve. If that private law is to be enforced, however, it is imperative that an appropriate judicial system also be established and a private bar emerge.

But the business of nation building has begun. In all of this, Ukraine, like every other country in transition, can benefit from sound Western advice, especially from the private sector that has so much to gain from thriving societies to the east. The past year has seen epic change in the former Soviet Union. Now is the time to help keep that change on course.

MESSAGE OF HATRED AND RESENTMENT IS ALIVE AND WELL

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, a message of hatred and resentment is alive and well in this country of ours. It has many messengers and many different guises. It is seldom as direct and overt as a white hood and robe, or a swastika. But it is the same essential message of racism and bigotry—whether it takes the form of a campaign commercial, or it is conveyed through a deceptive attack on civil rights legislation. It is a message that plays upon the fears and prejudices of an increasingly alienated, vulnerable, and insecure population. It seeks to divide people, to sow hatred, and to sow distrust.

Mr. Speaker, it is a message that is working. It worked in Mississippi a few months ago. A race there did not attract the national attention of the Louisiana race because the candidate in Mississippi did not have in his history the overt symbols of a Klan membership and a Nazi swastika. But the code words deployed were essentially the same as those used in Louisiana—and they were effective. And the message worked earlier in North Carolina—where 2 years ago a television commercial successfully stigmatized affirmative action programs as providing unfair advantages to unqualified minorities. Indeed, is there anyone who doubts that even now there are scores of highly paid political consultants out there pouring feverishly over the Presidential primary election returns and post-election polls, seeking ways to manipulate racial fears and prejudices even more subtly and effectively in the elections ahead of us. Because in a society that has never really come to terms with the issue of race, it is a tactic that works.

Race has been described as the principal fault-line of the American political system. But in the sixties and seventies, the emergence of a mass civil rights movement gave testimony to the deep yearning of Americans to come to terms with that part of our history that was so at variance with American ideals. The voices of leaders such as Martin Luther King, Cesar Chavez, and John Kennedy inspired all of us to dare to believe that we could in fact create a more just society and a more peaceful world. And, as America celebrated the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Fair Housing Act of 1968, the structure of law and custom that had made minority Americans second-class citizens and closed them out of the key institutions of the society began to change. These legislative achievements did not occur without struggle, but they gave expression to the determination of the vast majority of the American people to address the deep-seated racial inequities of our society.

But if we look around America today, it appears that all that we have worked so hard to achieve in past decades is now at risk. Racial and ethnic tensions have intensified. Our society is increasingly polarized along racial, ethnic, and economic lines. And now we see certain of our leaders and would-be leaders, in-

stead of working to bring us together, playing upon our racial fears and prejudices and developing race-based political strategies. All of us need to be very clear about how high the stakes of this cynical game really are: The effort to manipulate racial divisions for political advantage will ultimately prove enormously destructive to the entire Nation.

Yet most white Americans, recent public opinion surveys indicate, are increasingly receptive to these race-based negative appeals. They feel that the most egregious forms of racism and discrimination are a thing of the past. Moreover, as America's economic strength has eroded, white anxieties about their own economic status and future have intensified. Middle-income Americans, in particular, are being squeezed as never before, and they are frightened—for themselves and for members of their families. So it is not surprising that they have become increasingly resentful of affirmative action programs that, in their view, are designed to give to minority Americans unfair and unjustifiable special advantages.

Given some dramatic changes that have occurred in the past three decades, current white perceptions are understandable. Increasing numbers of blacks have in fact been elected to local governments, state legislatures, and the Congress. Colin Powell is but one of a long list of African-Americans that have risen to prominence within America's military establishment. The doors of corporate America have opened—and black college graduates find themselves in demand. More blacks have entered the Nation's middle-class, with the percentage of black families with incomes over \$50,000 at its highest point ever, about 10 percent.

But as significant and hopeful as these developments have been, the harsh reality is that they have not touched the lives of the vast majority of minority Americans. Over two centuries of racial subordination and discrimination have taken their toll, and significant racial inequities persist. For the most part, African and Hispanic Americans continue to lack the education, the skills and the resources to take advantage of the opportunities created by civil rights legislation. Minorities can now seek redress in the courts if they are discriminated against in their efforts to secure decent housing, but few have the resources to purchase housing outside of their ghettoized communities. Minorities can go to court if they experience job discrimination, but few have the education and skills to land the better paying jobs; the number of middle-class minority families may have increased, but 30 percent of black Americans continue to live in poverty, three times the percentage for whites. Black college graduates may be in demand, but the number of African-Americans entering and finishing college is actually declining. Indeed, continued racial inequities are literally a matter of life and death: A black baby is twice as likely to die within its first year of life as a white infant, and African-Americans have over 6 years lesser life expectancy than white Americans.

That is the reality—but that is not the way the world appears to middle-class working Americans. These folks have seen their own living standards steadily erode this past decade. They have seen their hard-earned tax

dollars go to finance tax cuts for the rich and programs targeted at those who are even poorer than they. They have seen their jobs eliminated or threatened by foreign competition, and they are struggling to send their children to college or to provide medical care for themselves and the members of their families. These Americans have their own legitimate set of grievances—and they have come to feel increasingly powerless, the victims of economic and political forces they cannot control.

In a very real sense, America is at a turning point. We can either continue down the path of race-based political strategies, a path that can only lead to deeper inequalities, greater divisiveness, and more intense conflict and violence—or we can begin to address—by action, not by lip service—the real issues that confront all Americans, that transcend the boundaries of race and ethnicity, and that will permit us to forge a new sense of national unity and common purpose. We can either opt for a politics that manipulates our divisions, that feeds multiple hatreds and resentments, or we can opt for a politics that offers a unifying vision of a more fair and secure future for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, my hope is that as we all reflect on the political turbulence that is swirling all around us, we Americans will come to recognize that just as we will all be losers if racial conflict becomes more intense and more violent, so we will all be winners if we can move aggressively to attack the problems that are making all Americans feel threatened and insecure.

Our Nation faces challenges on many fronts, but surely none is more serious or troubling than America's economic decline. All Americans—whites no less than minorities—will be hurt if this decline cannot be arrested. The real enemy of beleaguered workers today is not affirmative action programs designed to overcome a legacy of race prejudice and discrimination, but an economy that does not provide secure employment for all Americans. The solution is not to fight over who gets the limited number of jobs available, but to create more jobs and to train people to fill them.

This last point deserves special emphasis. For it is increasingly clear that the only means by which America will be able to hold its own in international competition in the years ahead will be the development of a better educated, more highly skilled work force. When our educational system leaves large numbers of people unable to perform in a modern economy, we all lose. And it doesn't matter whether the uneducated and unskilled are black or white or brown. If our economy continues to lose ground to our trade competitors in Europe and Asia, we will all pay an increasingly heavy price. But if we can turn this economy of ours around, if we can reinvigorate our educational system, if we can insure that American workers will be given the necessary training and skills, if we can regain our competitive edge—then we will all win.

Thinking about issues of social conflict in win-win terms is often difficult. As author Stephen Covey observes, most of us "have been deeply scripted in the win/lose mentality since birth." It is often taken as a gift that one person's victory is another person's defeat. But, in Covey's words, " * * * most of life is not a

competition. We don't have to live each day competing with our spouse, our children, our co-workers, our neighbors, and our friends. 'Who's winning in your marriage?' is a ridiculous question. If both people aren't winning, both are losing."

"Most of life," Covey continues, "is an interdependent, not an independent, reality, and most results you want depend on cooperation between you and others. And the win/lose mentality is dysfunctional to that cooperation."

And so it is with the politics of race. Whenever we think black gains mean white losses, or that the security of whites depends upon continued black subordination, we are still in a win/lose mentality—which ultimately means we all lose.

Mr. Speaker, if ever there were a time for Americans to be united, surely it is now. If ever there were a time for Americans to be reminded of our interdependence, surely it is now. If ever there were a time for our national leaders to remind us, not of our differences, but of what we as Americans hold in common, surely it is now. It matters not whether one is black or white or Hispanic or Asian or Arab; it matters not whether one is Protestant or Jew or Catholic or Moslem. What does matter is that we are Americans all—believing in the American dream of a just and open society, in which all might live out their lives in dignity and security, and in which every individual will be free to realize his or her fullest potential.

It is clear that the key to turning things around, to creating a more secure and hopeful future for all Americans, is to make those public investments essential to economic performance. There is so much work to be done: We should be investing, now, in education, in job training, in research and development, in environmental cleanup, in the rebuilding of our public infrastructure, in constructing a system of national health insurance, in restoring blighted urban areas. Instead of allowing ourselves to be played off against each other, we must insist on an aggressive domestic agenda that would address the underlying problems that feed the anxiety of Americans and fuel racial and ethnic conflict.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the message of David Duke will be heard again in the weeks and months ahead. But I am convinced that the vast majority of Americans will reject this message, as long as they believe that their grievances will be addressed, that their Government will begin to respond to the needs and aspirations of all Americans for a better and more secure future. Most Americans understand the dangers that the David Dukes of our country represent—and in Louisiana voters turned out in record numbers to overwhelmingly repudiate the racism and bigotry of the Duke candidacy. Likewise, in Pennsylvania, when voters were offered a positive alternative to do-nothing domestic policies—an alternative responsive to the needs of working-class Americans for tax relief, for national health insurance, and for a more secure economic future—they produced one of the most extraordinary political upsets of the decade. Neither outcome was predicted: Only a couple of weeks ago, many commentators were saying a Duke victory was almost inevitable. And, in Pennsylvania, a political unknown began with a 44-point deficit in the polls. What an el-

quent testament to the power of an aroused citizenry, motivated not by a divisive appeal to racial fears and prejudices, but by a unifying sense of new hope and possibility.

Mr. Speaker, the past two decades have seen a dramatic withdrawal from political participation throughout our Nation. Some commentators have read this decline in political activity as symptomatic of voter apathy and indifference. I don't buy it. It is not indifference or apathy that has turned off the voters, but rather a profound sense of political powerlessness. Americans everywhere have come to believe that the Government is divorced from their real needs and concerns, and that average citizens simply don't count for much—particularly in comparison with powerful economic interests. And, while this sense of impotence is understandable, particularly given the unresponsive nature of our political institutions the past several years, it has also produced a self-fulfilling prophecy: Feeling powerless, people have become powerless. Fewer people have been voting, or petitioning, or demonstrating or, for that matter, even reading the newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, the real lesson that we must take from Louisiana and Pennsylvania is that people do count, and that we can make a difference, a profound difference. When we register and vote we have the power to change our path, our Nation, our future. We, all of us, have the power—and we are now beginning to use it.

INTRODUCTION OF OMNIBUS CRIME LEGISLATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing omnibus crime legislation for the Nation's Capital. In recent days, the murder of a member of the Senate staff, the assault of Senator CONRAD's wife, and the attempted murder of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives has focused new attention on the problem of crime in the District of Columbia. These crimes which have so closely touched the Congress provide but a glimpse at the immense human cost that crime has exacted from the people who reside in the shadow of the Capitol dome and only hint at the catastrophic failure of the District to control the crime epidemic that now engulfs it.

Under home rule, front line responsibility for crime in the District rests with the Mayor and the Council. Yet, the Constitution vests ultimate responsibility for the Federal city with the Congress. If local authorities are unable or unwilling to take appropriate action to bring crime under control in the near term, then the Congress must act.

Mr. Speaker, it has become clear that, for whatever reason, local authorities either cannot or will not take the action that is needed to stop the killing on the streets of our capital. Indeed, not only has the city failed to take necessary action against crime, they are now proposing to cripple the local judiciary. Incred-

ably, the Mayor has recommended cuts in the fiscal year 1992 superior court budget that has forced the chief judge of that court to suspend all jury trials in August and will result in funds for Criminal Justice Act attorneys for indigent defendants to run out in September. How can the city expect the Congress to take its anticrime efforts seriously if they will not even provide for jury trials and legal representation for criminal defendants by the Constitution?

The time for promises is over and the time for antics and posturing has long since past. It is time for Congress to take matters into its own hands and to act now.

In 1991, 489 individuals were the victims of homicide in the District of Columbia. Since 1986, the homicide rate in the District has increased each year while the average age of homicide victims has decreased. Over all, since 1986 the number of killings occurring in the District has increased 252 percent. Moreover, in 1990 alone, there were more than 27,000 violent crimes and more than 92,000 crimes of all descriptions committed within the District of Columbia. For whatever reason, local leaders—despite much protest to the contrary—have been unable to stop the killing.

As with violent crime throughout the Nation, violent crime in the Nation's Capital disproportionately affects the most vulnerable members of society: the young, the poor, and ethnic and racial minorities.

According to a 1988 report of the Bureau of Justice Statistics of the U.S. Department of Justice, the victims of violent crime are predominantly young, poor, and black or Hispanic. Incredibly, the lifetime chance of being a homicide victim is 1 in 30 for black men. That compares with a 1 in 179 lifetime chance for white men. After accidents, homicide is the leading cause of death for men and women between the ages of 15 and 34. According to the same report, when calculated by households, over 30 percent more black households are victimized by all types of crime than white households; and 40 percent more Hispanic households are victimized by crime than are non-Hispanic households.

Today, whether you are rich or poor, whether you are black or white, if you are a law abiding citizen who lives in the Nation's capital, you are forced for safety's sake to live behind locked doors and barred windows while the lawless are free to roam the streets with impunity. The inability of the District to get control over the homicide rate over the past 6 years is itself sufficient reason for Congress to step in and exercise its constitutional authority.

On behalf of all of the residents of the District of Columbia, and on behalf of all citizens of our Nation who visit their Nation's capital, Congress should no longer tolerate the intolerable. And Congress should no longer accept the word of local officials who promise to produce results or to quit but do neither.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation takes a broad approach involving tougher penalties for violent crimes, tougher restrictions on bail, increased rights for the victims of violent crime, and increased judicial resources.

First, this legislation will tighten the District's bail laws to keep violent criminals off the streets. Time and again, the innocent fall prey to violent criminals who are awaiting trial for another serious felony. According to the U.S.

Attorney's Office, between January 1989 and January 1991, more than a third of all defendants charged with a violent crime and released on bail committed another crime while on release. During that same time period, approximately 3,000 bench warrants were issued for individuals who committed a violent crime or drug felony while on release.

Second, my legislation would provide a mandatory term of life imprisonment without parole for individuals convicted of first degree murder. Such legislation has been buried in committee in the D.C. city council. If the council will not act to protect the citizens of the District, Congress can and should do so.

Third, the legislation provides stiffer penalties for individuals committing crimes involving drugs or firearms near schools and playgrounds and for illegal distribution of firearms to minors.

Fourth, Mr. Speaker if a youth is old enough to pull a trigger like an adult, he is old enough to be punished like an adult—my bill would lower the age at which juveniles who commit violent crimes may be tried as adults to 14 years of age.

Fifth, the legislation would repeal the Youth Offender Corrections Act—the Congress repealed the Federal equivalent of that law years ago. Simply put, most violent criminals are young adults who should be held fully responsible for the pain which they inflict upon the innocent.

Sixth, this legislation would make applicable to the District existing tough Federal laws against witness intimidation and strengthen current D.C. laws against assaulting law enforcement officers.

Seventh, my legislation would strengthen the rights of violent crime victims. Victims should have the right to appear and be heard at sentencing and the right to notice when the defendant is released on bail, parole, furlough, or when the defendant escapes custody. These rights are available to crime victims in a majority of States and should be available to victims in the Nation's Capital.

Eighth, my legislation would provide an increased authorization to the local trial courts provide four new judgeships—two this year and two next year—and make technical amendments to the jurisdiction of superior court commissioners to allow more judges to be shifted to criminal cases.

Finally, my legislation would require the District to hold a referendum on the death penalty. Under the provisions of the bill, a death penalty for heinous murders would go into effect in the District unless the votes choose to reject it.

Mr. Speaker, it was my hope that local officials would have seen their way clear to undertake many or all of these reforms through the mechanism available to them under home rule. Yet for the past 6 years we have watched the killing fields in the District grow bloodier and the list of those who have fallen victim to criminal predation grow longer and these reforms simply grow evermore overdue.

Mr. Speaker, the time for action is now. I call on my colleagues on the District of Columbia Committee to quickly mark up my bill and to bring it to the floor—even if ultimately with a negative recommendation—so that the full House will have a chance to debate and vote upon its provisions.

CONGRESS MUST BE VERY CAREFUL WITH ITS POWER

HON. JON KYL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress can wield great power when it wants to. Our committees have the capability of calling people before them, as much as for effect as for effecting the basis for legislation. The term "McCarthyism" springs from an abuse of congressional power. Therefore, Congress must be very careful to always use its power in appropriate ways, giving due attention to the effect its actions may have on others.

The column below, which appeared in the Phoenix Gazette on March 1, 1992, illustrates the power of Congress and the need to be careful in its exercise. I commend it to my colleagues.

[From the Phoenix Gazette, Mar. 1, 1992]

SYMINGTON SCOURGING "NOTHING PERSONAL, JUST BUSINESS"

(By John Kolbe)

Gov. Fife Symington's epiphany on the long road to becoming a full-fledged politician—or at least understanding the game as it's played in Washington—may have come before a U.S. House banking subcommittee the other day.

That's when the panel chairman, Democratic Rep. Carroll Hubbard, told him to "lighten up."

Symington was there to respond to the panel's politically inspired probe into the failure of Southwest Savings, where he served as a director for 12 years until 1984, and there was very little lightness in his presentation.

His lengthy blast at the Resolution Trust Corp. fairly bristled with hyperbole and unconcealed rage: "A sneak attack, a political smear * * * RTC's campaign to discredit me * * * broken promises, false allegations, lies * * * public ridicule and humiliation * * * ruining reputations and careers * * * trampling individual rights * * * tyranny."

And Congress, he added, is far from innocent, for it is "a party to this effort (to discredit Symington) because scandal is the favorite game in town."

This cut uncomfortably close to the quick, which is why Hubbard suggested a lighter mood.

In one sense, Hubbard's admonition was sound advice, Symington, by his own choice, is a prominent member of the political community, and as such, a ripe target for any on-the-make bureaucrat or headline-hunting pool with a little ammunition, however innocuous.

Maybe not always fair game, but a prize animal nonetheless, and the season is 365 days long. Being shot at goes with the territory, and he might as well get used to it before he gets terminal ulcers.

Besides, he's starting to sound a lot like Charlie Keating, which should not be the goal of an upwardly mobile politician.

That much said, however, Hubbard's condescending put-down also revealed more than the chairman probably intended about how Congress views its own work. Loosely translated, what he was saying was this:

"Don't take it so seriously, governor. We certainly don't. Throwing around accusations and messing with people's lives (pref-

erably those of the opposing party) is what we do here. We do it because it's easier, and much safer politically (for us, not you), than grappling with serious policy issues, which require us to take unpopular positions. We're just using you to get some attention for ourselves and gain some clout for the committee. If it hurts you, that's too bad, but that's the price of public office."

Tessio, the loyal family hit man of "The Godfather," had another way of saying the same thing: "It's nothing personal. Just business."

Such reassurance, of course, wasn't very comforting to a guy with a piano wire around his neck, and more than it is to a governor whose political future (not to mention financial well-being) is under serious attack from a huge federal agency and a Congress hot in pursuit of scapegoats.

If Hubbard were serious about the issues and not just scoring political points (which, of course, he isn't), he might pursue these possible lines of inquiry:

Who at the RTC was responsible for criminally leaking to The Washington Post (1) a damaging memo containing allegations of self-dealing against Symington (which were apparently so flimsy they were discarded in drafting the lawsuit), and (2) a copy of the lawsuit, only hours after RTC lawyers warned defendants not to reveal its contents to anyone?

Why does the agency continue to refuse to release that memo? A document that's been in the newspaper (thanks to the agency itself) can hardly be called "privileged" any more.

Why, in a 34-month investigation, didn't the RTC once question the governor about his activities as a director? And why, when the agency notified the other directors of its intention to sue them, did it fail to notify Symington? Why did it renege on its own repeated verbal and written promises by refusing to meet with his attorneys before the suit was filed?

Why does the suit allege that Symington didn't quit the board until March 1984, when his letter of resignation was dated Jan. 30? Bank regulators (RTC's predecessors) acknowledged his departure two weeks after the letter.

Why does the 53-page complaint repeatedly accuse Symington (along with his co-defendants) of breaching his fiduciary duty with several large loans to major developers (including Westcor and Tucson's George Mehl), when they were all approved months or years after he resigned from the board?

Hubbard won't pursue them, because Congress isn't any more serious about probing agencies that keep it supplied with fresh scandals than it is the S&L mess itself, which it helped create.

So what was he up to? Here's a clue. Although the RTC has sued 32 thrifts and scores of directors in the wake of the \$500 billion S&L debacle, only one—a Republican governor from Arizona—was hauled before the cameras and had his integrity attacked.

No big deal, the chairman assured him. It's all in good fun. As Tessio might say, just business.

CONGRATULATING OLYMPIAN
KEITH TKACHUK

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate one of the Olympians from my

district who competed in Albertville, France during February. Keith Tkachuk, a resident of Medford, MA, was a member of the U.S. hockey team that surprised us all with its skill and tenacity in the 16th Winter Olympics.

As a hockey player at my alma mater, Malden Catholic High School, Keith was a 4-year letterman. In his junior season as a Lancer, Keith scored 46 points, and was named the team's most valuable player. He was further honored as a Catholic conference all-star. Although Keith suffered debilitating injuries his senior year, he demonstrated his determination by overcoming both a broken ankle and strained ligaments in his knee to continue on as a great hockey player.

On the national and international level, Keith was honored by being chosen to play on a U.S. select 17 team that played the Soviets in a three-game series. The following summer, he was invited to the U.S. Junior Team Tryout Camp at Colorado Springs. Further, Keith played his freshman year for the perennial powerhouse Boston University Terriers hockey team.

It is a testament to Keith Tkachuk to know that he was the youngest member of the U.S. squad, especially after having seen him playing against the professional teams of Europe. Keith displayed an aggressive perseverance that belied his age, and we are proud to have had him represent our country and our area.

I congratulate Keith Tkachuk on his success in the 16th Winter Olympics, he is a credit to the Bay State and the United States of America.

BANNING IVORY, SAVING
ELEPHANTS

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the African elephant was near extinction because of rampant poaching which was driven by an escalating ivory trade. In 10 years, the total African elephant population declined to 609,000 from a 1979 estimate of 1.3 million.

At the 1989 meeting of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species [CITES], 76 nations including 20 African nations voted to list the African elephant in its appendix I, banning all international trade in ivory and other elephant parts and products. U.S. leadership was crucial to achieving this ban.

Since this ban was adopted, elephant poaching in many areas has dropped dramatically, there has been little movement of ivory in the world market, and the price of ivory has dropped. The moratorium on the ivory trade is protecting African elephant populations.

But, this endangered pachyderm is in jeopardy once again. CITES nations meeting this week in Japan are considering a proposal by five South African nations to downlist the African elephant to appendix II. This would, in effect, lift the ban and allow the African elephant once again to fall victim to the world ivory trade.

Yesterday, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations reported a concurrent resolu-

tion to support the full protection of the African elephant through the unqualified listing of all African elephant populations on appendix I of CITES.

The House must maintain its commitment to the survival of this majestic animal and support the House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 256) which I introduced and was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

African elephants have a history spanning 5 million years but without our support to limit trade, their time will run out.

SALUTE TO OREGON CITY PIONEERS AND LAKE OSWEGO LADY LAKERS GIRLS' BASKETBALL TEAMS

HON. MIKE KOPETSKI

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the members of the Oregon City Pioneers and Lake Oswego Lady Lakers Girls' Basketball Teams who met in the Oregon class 4A high school girls' basketball tournament last weekend. In a hard fought game, Oregon City came back from a 14-point deficit to beat Lake Oswego 47-44 to win its first State championship. I am submitting an article from the Oregon City Enterprise-Courier which chronicles this exciting game.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to point out that three high schools, Oregon City, Lake Oswego, and Lakeridge, from the Three Rivers League were the top three finishers in the State class 4A high school division. This is the first time in the 17-year history of the State tournament that this occurred. This is a true testament to the caliber of the girls' basketball program and the dedication of the student-athletes in the Three Rivers League.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize all the student-athletes and coaches for both the Oregon City Pioneers and the Lake Oswego Lady Lakers.

The Oregon City Pioneers: Amy Alcorn (G), Jenny Gordon (PG), Sylvia Olvera (W), Mindi Loidici (G), Dina Haselip (P), Tammy Arnold (P), Heidi Alderman (W), Jenny Criteser (P), Diana Smith (P), Alison Newman (G), Ingrid McCoy (G/F/W), J.J. Richmond (C/F), Brad Smith, head coach; Carl Tinsley, assistant coach; Ken Alcorn, assistant coach; Stephanie Coughlin, assistant coach; and Liz Damon, assistant coach.

The Lake Oswego Lady Lakers: Heidi Hackenbruck (F), Mary Scotty (G), Kerry Schultz (F), Mindy Campbell (G), Kari Steele (G), Wendy Berg (G), Jaime Ellis (G), Laura Savage (F), Cynthia Lewis (F-G), Stacey Berg (F), Caroline Rich (F), Laura Martin (F), Gary Lavender, head coach; Craig Hynes, assistant coach; Mike Scotty, assistant coach; Reid Segal, assistant coach; Sharlene Brells, assistant coach; Lisa Segal, student assistant; and Meredith McGrew, student assistant.

All of these student-athletes are winners. They are winners today and I'm confident they will continue to be winners throughout their lives.

PIONEERS CAPTURE FIRST CAGE CROWN IN O.C. HISTORY

(By John Denny)

PORTLAND.—The Oregon City Pioneers did themselves and their community proud Saturday in the championship game of the 1992 state 4A high school girls basketball tournament, rallying from a 16-point second-half deficit to drop Three Rivers League rival Lake Oswego, 47-44.

With the spectacular comeback, the top ranked Pioneers earned the first state championship in girls basketball in the history of the sport at their school.

The Pioneers had placed at state seven times before, but the championship had always eluded them.

Oregon City was state runnerup in 1987 and 1988. The Pioneers placed third in 1991, fourth in 1983 and 1990, and fifth in 1981 and 1989.

The manner in which the Pioneers pulled out the state title game made their state championship all the more gratifying. It was a team effort. Every player on the team contributed, both those on the floor and those on the bench.

They never lost heart, and they continued to give their all, even when the circumstances made the situation appear incredibly bleak.

It appeared extremely likely that the Pioneers were destined to finish second fiddle a third time when they found themselves trailing 34-18 early in the third quarter.

The No. 3 ranked Lakers had just gone on a 21-3 scoring binge during a 9-minute stretch that began at the start of the second period. The Pioneers had gone 1-for-11 from the field and they had committed several turnovers during that span.

Lake Oswego appeared to have the game well in hand, still leading by 14 points, at 38-24, with 3:26 remaining in the third quarter.

But that's when the Pioneers said enough is enough, and they began to chip away at the Lakers' seemingly insurmountable lead.

Apparently content to sit on their lead, the Lakers turned from the up-tempo offense that had gained them their advantage, to a more patient game.

The change in strategy proved extremely costly, because the Pioneers became the aggressors, and the momentum of the game began to change. Oregon City went on to outscore Lake Oswego 23-6 in the final 11 minutes of the game.

Early in the fourth quarter, Oregon City senior post Dina Haselip intercepted a Laker pass in the lane and turned it into two points at the free throw line when she was fouled taking the ball to the basket at the other end of the floor. That made the score 41-32 Lake Oswego.

With just over seven minutes left to play, Haselip answered a Laker miss with a baseline jumper in traffic, and it was a 41-34 ball game.

The two teams traded free throws. Then senior playmaker Jenny Gordon added fuel to the Pioneer comeback with a steal near the Laker basket.

Gordon fired an outlet pass to sophomore guard Amy Alcorn near mid-court. Alcorn pushed the ball ahead to a streaking Haselip, who completed the play with an uncontested fast-break layup. The basket cut Lake Oswego's lead to 42-37.

Lake Oswego junior forward Kerry Schultz threw up a brick, and the Pioneers went on the run again. Alcorn hit freshman post Tammy Arnold with a crisp pass under the basket; Arnold canned the layup, and it was a 42-39 ball game.

Schultz found the basket from the outside for Lake Oswego, making the score 44-39. But Gordon was fouled and made both ends of a one-and-one, pulling Oregon City back to within three.

Gordon followed with a major defensive play. The Lakers were playing keep away near midcourt, when Gordon challenged Lake Oswego junior guard Mary Scotty one-on-one and came up with a clean steal.

With a smile on her face, Gordon raced to the basket for a fast-break layup that trimmed the Laker lead to 44-43.

With 3:06 remaining, Oregon City's aggressive half-court trapping defense forced Laker junior guard Kari Steele to travel.

Haselip scored inside off a great baseline pass from Ingrid McCoy, and the Pioneers were ahead for the first time since early in the second quarter, leading 45-44, with 2:44 left to play.

The Lakers were not without their scoring opportunities down the stretch.

Berg missed from 3-point range with just over two minutes remaining. Scotty stole the ball back moments later, and the Lakers had renewed life.

Scotty missed on an outside shot with 1:40 left, but a teammate collected the long rebound.

The Lakers continued to wind time off the clock, until Berg drove the baseline with just under 20 seconds remaining. Her layup missed the mark, but Arnold was there to gather in the rebound.

Berg, in apparent frustration at missing the shot, fouled Arnold.

Arnold swished both of her gifters, and the Pioneers had a more comfortable lead, at 47-44, with 16 seconds left to play.

Arnold followed with one of the top defensive plays of the game at the other end of the floor. Lake Oswego's Cynthia Lewis, a player with great quickness, drove the lane from the top of the key. The apparent strategy was for Lewis to blow by Oregon City defenders for a layup, or at the very least, a two-shot foul.

However Arnold had other plans. As Lewis began her drive, Arnold knocked the ball loose and into the hands of Haselip.

Haselip was immediately fouled. She missed the front end of a one-and-one with five seconds remaining. But it mattered little, because Lake Oswego could not get off a good shot before the final buzzer.

Haselip finished up with a game-high 24 points, connecting with 10-for-15 accuracy from the field. She tallied 16 of Oregon City's 29 points in the second half, to lead the Pioneers in their dramatic comeback.

Lewis led a balanced Lake Oswego attack with 10 points. She also had five steals.

Lewis also hauled down a game-high 10 rebounds to lead her club to a 26-23 edge on the backboards. Haselip had eight rebounds to lead Oregon City.

The Pioneers outshot the Lakers percentage-wise both from the field and from the free throw line. The Pioneers went 17 for 38 (.447) from the field and 13 for 21 (.619) from the line. They were 10-of-17 (.588) from the field in the second half.

The Lakers were 18-of-44 (.409) from the field and 8-of-15 (.533) from the line.

With the win, the Pioneers finished the year at 25-1. Lake Oswego finished up at 22-5.

The victory over Lake Oswego was Oregon City's 12th victory in a row.

Oregon City	15	3	12	17	47
Lake Oswego	13	17	11	3	44

Oregon City Scoring—Dina Haselip 24, Tammy Arnold 9, Jenny Gordon 6, Heidi Al-

derman 6, J.J. Richmond 2, Amy Alcorn, Ingrid McCoy, Sylvia Olvera, Mindi Loidici, Jenny Cristeser, Diana Smith, Alison Newman.

Lake Oswego scoring—Cynthia Lewis 10, Mary Scotty 9, Wendy Berg 7, Kerry Schultz 6, Heidi Hackenbruck 4, Kari Steele 4, Jaime Ellis, 4, Mindy Campbell, Laura Savage, Stacy Berg, Caroline Rich, Laura Martin.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO REMOVE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FROM FEDERAL INCOME TAXATION

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that would eliminate the taxation of unemployment compensation benefits.

The Tax Reform Act of 1986 made all unemployment compensation taxable effective December 31, 1986. Prior to the 1986 act, only a portion of unemployment compensation benefits was taxable. As is evident from the countless hours this body has spent over the past year in the course of enacting two extensions of unemployment benefits, the economy is still in a severe recession. While the unemployment rate nationally was 7.1 percent in December, it was 7.3 percent in Connecticut—a 9-year high. Connecticut has lost 120,200 jobs since February 1989. This figure is even higher in some States.

Thousands of my constituents have been hit with a triple whammy—they have lost their jobs, they have seen their incomes drop because unemployment compensation only partially makes up for work, and they now find that they have to pay taxes on unemployment compensation. As we approach April 15, many of these individuals find themselves in an even more precarious situation as they discover that because there has been no withholding they must somehow find a way to pay the tax.

Therefore, the legislation I am proposing today would eliminate the tax on unemployment compensation benefits received after December 31, 1991. It is my hope that we can enact this legislation when we consider permanent changes to the unemployment compensation system later in the year. I would urge my colleagues' support.

CONGRATULATING OLYMPIAN NANCY ANN KERRIGAN

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today to congratulate one of the Olympians from my district who completed in the 16th Winter Olympics in Albertville, France this past month. Nancy Ann Kerrigan represents the best America has to offer, and her stunning performance was one of grace, beauty, and unmatched athletic prowess. Nancy Kerrigan

captured the hearts of all us watching women's figure skating with her bronze medal winning performance.

A resident of Stoneham, MA, Nancy began skating at age 6, and for 15 years has worked long and hard to become a national rising star. Her grueling daily workouts on the ice have resulted in her outstanding athletic ability, as well as painful back and neck problems. Undeterred, she worked harder to make her dream of becoming an Olympic champion a reality. In 1988, she placed first in the New England Seniors Championship and later placed first in the National Collegiate Championship. She has won numerous competitions throughout the last 3 years. Just before the Olympic games in January of this year, Nancy won the silver medal at the National Championships in Orlando, FL.

At only 22, Nancy is not only is a world-class professional figure skater, but also a student working toward her business degree from Emmanuel College in Boston. She embodies the true American heroine, a superb athlete and exemplary scholar.

Those of us who are familiar with Nancy's past successes were not surprised by her inspirational performance in Albertville. I am confident that this is only the beginning of Nancy Kerrigan's remarkable athletic career and I am honored to have this opportunity to pay tribute to her. I extend my best wishes to a true Olympic champion.

RESTORING UNITY AND PEACE TO CYPRUS

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, for years Congress has deplored the continued division of Cyprus. Despite our best efforts, however, the crisis for that island nation remains unresolved. With the cold war over, the United States must now step up the pressure to reach a solution to outstanding regional problems such as this. The international community stood united and resolute behind the rule of law last year in the war with Iraq, and that stand proved victorious. With United States leadership, we can bring that same determination and sense of purpose to this outstanding conflict, so that Cypriot national sovereignty can at last be restored.

For nearly two decades, some 35,000 Turkish troops have remained in Cyprus, prohibiting that nation from finding a political solution to its problems. My message today is simple—Turkey must remove its troops immediately, so that all parties may work toward a peaceful resolution of the Cyprus problem.

Turkish troop presence on Cyprus is unjust and in violation of international law. The situation has dragged on for 17 years without resolution, leaving a nation divided and a population embattled. The international community has repeatedly condemned the Turkish occupation of the island's northern third, and several United Nations resolutions have called for the immediate withdrawal of those troops. While I agree with President Bush that the

United States cannot dictate terms in resolving the question of Cyprus, I do believe that American strength and resolve must be applied to the problem of Cyprus, and that this untenable situation must end.

For that reason, today I am introducing, along with Representatives MRAZEK and PELOSI, legislation to withhold United States military and economic assistance from Turkey so long as that nation continues to occupy Cyprus illegally. Turkey receives over \$500 million in United States aid annually. We must use that aid as leverage to achieve a Turkish withdrawal from Cyprus. Since the 1974 invasion of Cyprus by Turkish troops, our Nation has provided nearly \$6 billion in military aid to Turkey, and yet virtually no progress has been made in convincing the Turks to cease their occupation of Cyprus. The United States must use our political and economic muscle to back up the efforts of the United Nations to reach a just settlement of the Cyprus problem.

Shortly after the gulf war, the problem of Cyprus commanded the full attention of President George Bush, who met in Turkey with that nation's President Turgut Ozal on July 20, 1991, the 17th anniversary of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus. I commend President Bush for the interest and activity he has given to this problem, but I believe the President must go further and assign the highest priority to the Cyprus problem in all United States discussions with the Turkish leadership.

Cyprus must be permitted to benefit from the greater atmosphere of peace and freedom that is sweeping across so much of Europe. Cypriots, both Greek and Turkish, deserve to be free of the hostilities that have plagued their land for over 15 years. Let us erase the green line and bring an end to the division of Cyprus. Let us work to restore the civil liberties for the people of Cyprus. Clearly, the Turkish military presence must end, so that the citizens of Cyprus may at last enjoy peace and reunification.

In closing, I encourage my colleagues to join Representatives MRAZEK, PELOSI, and me in sponsoring this important legislation. United States policy must not perpetuate the division of Cyprus, but rather, we must provide a catalyst for unification. We must let the Turkish Government know loud and clear that finding a solution to Cyprus is paramount in defining the future of United States relations with Turkey.

H.R. 4394, REGARDING MERCHANT MARINES' DOCUMENTATION

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. It may be hard to believe, but there are vessels operating in waters of the United States with crewmembers who are not required to demonstrate their fitness for duty. Allowing undocumented seamen to work on these vessels unnecessarily increases the potential for injury or death of other waterway users. In addition, since many of these vessels transport oil or hazardous substances, any accident puts this

Nation at risk for serious environmental damage to our shores and natural resources.

Today, as a first step in correcting this dangerous problem, I am introducing a bill to require these undocumented crewmembers on tugs, towboats, and barges to meet Coast Guard standards for employment.

Current Law prohibits employment of a merchant seaman on a vessel over 100 gross tons unless that person has a merchant mariner's document issued by the U.S. Coast Guard. To qualify for this document, the individual must submit to drug testing, undergo a Federal Bureau of Investigation criminal record check, allow the Coast Guard to review driving records information contained in the National Driver Register, complete 60-90 days of seetime, and provide proof of commitment for employment.

These important safeguards do not apply to certain personnel on vessels under 100 gross tons, so thousands of undocumented seamen escape any kind of Coast Guard regulation or oversight. Even more shocking, an individual whose documents have been revoked or suspended for alcohol or drug abuse may end up employed on one of these vessels.

According to Coast Guard statistics, approximately 57 percent of towboat casualties between 1981 and 1987 were caused by personnel. The Coast Guard defines "personnel causes" to include factors such as lack of training and experience, intoxication, improper safety precautions, and operator error.

From these figures, it is obvious that the number of accidents should drop if the Coast Guard had some authority to ensure that only qualified seamen were employed on these vessels. My bill provides this authority by increasing the number of crewmembers on tugs, towboats, and barges required to have merchant mariners' documents.

While we cannot prevent every accident on our waterways, we can reduce the chances of one occurring. Enactment of this bill will increase navigational safety and alleviate one element of jeopardy for our shore environments.

A TRIBUTE TO OPERATION PEDRO PAN

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to bring to my colleagues' attention the Operation Pedro Pan Group, a group of individuals who are committed to helping some of south Florida's children. What is most special about this group of individuals is that they were all children of Operation Peter Pan. They were part of the thousands of frightened, unaccompanied Cuban children who came to the United States and had nowhere to go. Operation Peter Pan calmed these children, took care of them, and talked about being brave and proud because they represented their Cuban homeland.

Many years later, these children, who are all now adults, have launched Operation Pedro Pan Group to care for the children of south

Florida who desperately need love and care. In the closeness and unity of their shared experiences as unaccompanied Cuban children, they now have committed to help the children of today.

Operation Pedro Pan Group's objectives include to sponsor aid, promote, and assist programs that benefit children in need. Their first project is to help with the development of the Children's Village, a project of Catholic Community Services which provides a home-like atmosphere for children up to age 18. Another goal for Operation Pedro is to document their history and develop a directory of Peter Pans.

Last month, Operation Pedro Pan started a tradition of meeting for breakfast on the last Saturday of every month. In March, Operation Pedro Pan will be hosting an encounter seminar with the objective of sharing their common experiences.

I am especially pleased to recognize the people of Operation Pedro Pan Group. I wish to commend Lynn Guarch-Pardo, Gerardo Simms, Alfonso Garcia, Elisa Vilano Chovel, Silvia Gonzalez Munoz, Guillermo Rodriguez, and Fulvia Almeida Morris for their tremendous efforts to continue the pride and strength that was witnessed during Operation Peter Pan.

THE NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARIES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1992

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will reauthorize one of this Nation's most important marine environmental protection programs—the National Marine Sanctuaries Program.

Since 1972, the National Marine Sanctuaries Program has worked to accomplish what was once thought to be impossible—the protection of special areas of the marine environment for conservation and multiple use. This program has worked against the odds from the start, attempting to manage existing sanctuaries and designate new ones with grossly inadequate funding and with relatively little backing from its parent body, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

In spite of these hurdles, the Sanctuaries Program now encompasses 10 very special areas of our Nation's marine environment, thanks in large part to its championship by many of my colleagues in the Congress and to the tremendous grassroots support for marine sanctuaries. Within these sanctuaries—from California's Channel Islands to North Carolina's wreck of the U.S.S. *Monitor*, from Massachusetts' Stellwagen Bank—I may be a bit premature on this one but ever optimistic—to Florida's Keys—environmentalists, scientists, fishermen, and others work together to conserve the fragile marine environment and its resources for future generations.

For coastal Massachusetts, effective marine conservation is an essential building block of our economy and our future. Without it, we risk losing the fishing and tourism industries

that have served so well and so long as our economic foundation. The sanctuaries program itself is a solid contributor to the goal of dependable marine conservation, and it deserves our support.

That is not to say that it doesn't need improvement. The National Marine Sanctuaries Reauthorization Act, which I am introducing on behalf of myself and my colleagues, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. JONES, and Mr. DAVIS, would strengthen NOAA's ability to conserve marine resources effectively and reaffirms the program's commitments to research and education. It takes the important step of defining NOAA's authority to manage activities outside of sanctuary boundaries that are likely to injure sanctuary resources. This bill also streamlines a lengthy and cumbersome designation process. Perhaps most importantly, it authorizes the kind of funding this program so desperately needs to conduct even its most basic functions.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the National Marine Sanctuaries Program is very much worth our endorsement, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting its reauthorization.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MEDICARE GEOGRAPHIC DATA ACCURACY ACT OF 1992

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I, along with many of my colleagues, are introducing the Medicare Geographic Data Accuracy Act of 1992, which will require the Health Care Financing Administration to use current, accurate, and regularly updated data when computing the geographic-cost-of-practice indices, or GPCI, in conjunction with the new Medicare payment system.

This would seem to be a humble request. Shouldn't even require congressional action. As my grandson and Saturday Night Live fans would say, "Not".

What if I invented a new car, a politically correct car, that was more fuel efficient, environmentally cleaner, safer, and more available to buyers?

You'd buy it. We did. And so did the doctors in my State, and other States represented by those sponsoring this bill today. But, now we've got a dose of buyer's remorse. We've discovered that we've bought a new unit with 10-year-old parts and a drive train that only works in certain States. It's a new looking car equipped with junk parts and the same old problems . . . spewing out pollutants and breaking down right when you accelerate onto the freeway.

When the Federal Government trotted out its new Medicare payment reform system, the RBRVS, they promised to deliver, in 187 or so pages of regulations, a design that would equalize the large payment disparities between urban and rural settings and between specialized and primary care services. One of the multipliers, as they call it, in this elaborate formula is supposed to modify the RBRVS to account for the obvious differences of practice

costs across our country . . . costs of office rent, employee wages, and medical malpractice insurance, for example. True to bureaucratic fashion, it has an acronym as well—GPCI.

But the number crunchers in Baltimore took the quick and dirty route—one of their words of art—in building the scientific data base, using that term loosely, for their GPCI. The data is ancient—sometimes a decade old, doesn't measure what it pretends to, and in no way even remotely reflects the actual costs of practicing medicine in places as diverse as New York City and Rockwall, TX.

The practice costs for office rent are based on rental data from a 1987 study by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development of suburban apartment rents.

The practice costs for employee wages are based on a 20-percent sample of clerical workers and nurses from the 1980 census.

Physician work is from the 1980 census of average hourly earnings of nonphysician professionals, like teachers and engineers.

Medical liability costs are from a company that, in Texas, underwrites only a couple of hundred out of 30,000 plus doctors, and only for low-risk office type practices.

The legislation we are introducing today simply requires current, accurate data, and regular updates of that data.

When the Federal Government tinkers with Medicare, it is fooling around with one of our most vulnerable constituencies. A seemingly minor statistical adjustment in Washington, barely making a peep or whimper, goes off like a sonic boom of seismic proportions when its multiplied across 50 States and millions of elderly people. We should at least be sure that what we launch from here is truthful, reliable, and accurate.

The doctors in Texas and other States as varied as California, New York, Alabama, Florida, Arkansas and Georgia did, in fact, ask the Health Care Financing Administration [HCFA] to clean up their statistical act. In so many words, HCFA replied, "Make me."

This bill makes them do the right thing. We respectfully request the favorable consideration of this modest, budget neutral repair to the "new" Medicare fee system formula so that all the moving parts of this shiny new model are in perfect working order. We would like to be able to issue a warranty to the physicians and Medicare beneficiaries in our respective States so that they won't be taken for a ride by their Government.

THE 225TH ANNIVERSARY OF LENOX, MA

HON. JOHN W. OLVER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lenox, MA, which is celebrating its 225th anniversary this year. Lenox is known for its rich and diverse cultural history. Tanglewood in Lenox is the summer home of the Boston Symphony Orchestra as well as popular musical artists, both contemporary and classical. Lenox is a wonderful place to

live. Lenox is known as the gathering place for its growing arts, tourism attractions, and resorts.

Lenox was first incorporated in 1767 and held its first town meeting on March 11, 1767. Lenox town government predates the United States. The Appalachian trail in the Berkshires travels through town.

The Lenox Board of Selectmen have declared March 11, 1992, as a great day of celebration honoring the town's 225th anniversary. The town has many events planned throughout this year to celebrate this historic occasion.

Lenox is a town with a proud history deeply rooted in the Berkshires. I hope all my colleagues will join me in honoring this Berkshire town's 225th anniversary.

SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT ACT OF 1992

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Small Business Innovation Development Amendment Act of 1992. Eleven of my colleagues have joined me as original cosponsors of this legislation which seeks to improve on the successful Small Business Innovation Research Program. First and foremost, our bill would reauthorize and increase the SBIR Program. In addition, our bill would increase the emphasis which the program places on the commercial potential of Federal research and development. And finally, the amendments we propose would enhance the protection for participating small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Innovation Research Program has been in operation for a decade. If you consider the pilot program, the concept has been successfully providing top quality research to the Federal Government for over 15 years. It is one of the most studied and most copied programs that the United States runs. Nations such as Japan, Italy, Germany, Switzerland, Canada, and Great Britain have shown an interest in the program and in some cases, adopted similar programs.

The concept is a simple one: Building on our knowledge that small businesses are often more focused and more imaginative than large firms, the Federal Government should harness small business ingenuity in a special program. A large number of small awards are made to small firms who believe that they can help the Federal Government perform a research task. Once the research is done, it is thoroughly reviewed by experts in the field and, if the idea shows promise, a larger award is made to develop the idea and perhaps build a prototype. Finally, the best ideas developed in this way have achieved astonishing success in finding their way to the marketplace. Commercialization has been achieved either through sales to the Federal Government, in outright production and incorporation into products and services, or through licensing agreements.

The process makes it as simple as possible for small business to involve themselves in

Federal research. As a result, benefits are provided to the Government, to the participating small business, and to the public at large. Not only do we think of new ways to squeeze more bang out of each buck since small businesses are remarkably efficient—program participants also generate jobs and exports that dramatically help our economy; they developed weapons and defense systems that served our troops well in Desert Storm; they have helped us to improve our health care and to explore outer and inner space. The program has already produced billions of dollars in sales and financing commitments to private industries and billions more are projected.

We needn't only take the word of small businesses for the success of the program. All of the participating agencies, no matter how reluctant they originally were in joining the program, now endorse it heartily. In fact, 53 percent of the project officers in the field who run research programs felt that SBIR would be more likely to produce commercial products than other Federal research, versus 12 percent who did not.

Large industries know the value of having small businesses perform research. In fact over the last decade, they have doubled their use of small firms for research and development while Federal small business use has remained constant.

The bill we introduce today, Mr. Speaker, seeks to correct that situation by increasing the amount of research that must be done by small firms and then encouraging those firms to develop products that can compete on world markets. This bill reaffirms that the best ideas, including the SBIR Program, can be found right here at home.

MICHAEL H. HUDSON

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the many friends of Mike Hudson were saddened to learn of his untimely death last week. For many years, Mike had been a confidant and adviser to public figures in Illinois, and was widely respected for his knowledge, his professionalism, and his love for our State and its people.

We first got to know Mike when he served Gov. Dick Ogilvie of Illinois in the early 1970's. Throughout the years, he was always willing to take the time and effort to provide advice and assistance on issues involving Illinois.

At the time of his death, Mike was vice president, public affairs, of the Illinois Tool Works, Inc., in Glenview, IL. He was a member of many organizations, including the Chicago Area Public Affairs Group and the Foundation for Public Affairs, and was former chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers Public Affairs Steering Committee.

Our great democratic system needs the participation of its citizens if it is going to do the work of freedom. For many years, Mike helped make democracy work in Illinois, in official and nonofficial capacities. We all will miss him and our condolences go to his wife, Linda, and his son, Buell.

HATE VIOLENCE CONDEMNED

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage over an act of hate and violence which was inflicted Tuesday upon two young black women in Montgomery County, MD. The women were allegedly chased and attacked by two white males who were later taken into custody. One woman escaped physical harm when taken into the home of two good citizens who called police. The second had her clothes ripped from her and was doused with lighter fluid, after which her assailant attempted to light her on fire. Fortunately, police arrived and thwarted these actions.

It is unconscionable that, after almost 30 years following the passage of the Civil Rights Act, we are still faced so pathetically with the ignorance and hate of racism. Black women often suffer double discrimination as they become the targets of hate because of their sex, as well as their race. It is imperative that we continue our efforts to educate our youth on the value and beauty of diversity, but, at the same time, our laws must reflect a societal condemnation for racial intolerance and all hate crimes. This unfortunate incident is yet another example of our need to pass the Violence Against Women Act and other legislation which will assist in making this country safer for women.

A TRIBUTE TO BRUCE HAYDEN AND THE SPECTRUM PROGRAMS

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to acknowledge Mr. Bruce Hayden for his work at the Spectrum Programs during the past 22 years in which he has dedicated his life to the war against drugs. Mr. Hayden's commitment to those who suffer from substance abuse is certainly commendable. His work is a challenge to him and to those he helps and his work is their hope for a better life. Those who come to Spectrum for help are not only his clients, but also his friends. In a Miami Herald article entitled "Stint as Drug Volunteer Turns Into a Life's Work," Bea L. Hines reports:

When Bruce Hayden joined the staff at Spectrum Programs, bell-bottom pants and long hair were in. Heroin and LSD were big. Nobody had heard of crack cocaine.

That was 1970. Today, Hayden, executive director of the largest substance-abuse treatment program in South Florida, celebrates 20 years of service to Spectrum.

Hayden came to South Florida as a VISTA volunteer, after graduating from St. Mary's College in California. He was stationed in Fort Lauderdale, assigned to work with teenage runaways. A new substance-abuse program had just opened.

"I volunteered to work as a counselor there," Hayden said. "The idea was to spend just a couple of years here and head back to California."

This week, Hayden, 44, reflected on the victories, challenges and changes he has encountered.

"This could be a depressing job," he said. "But * * * there has never been a lack of challenge. The client population we work with is pleasurable. They don't all make it, but we get an opportunity to see real, life-long changes. That makes it for me."

One victory, he said, is how "educated" the general population has become about substance abusers.

"It used to be that people thought drugs only affected a certain class of society. The message was hard to get across that drugs know no class," he said.

The progress is evident, Hayden said, in the number of drug-free work places, the curriculum in schools, parental involvement and in television programs that include drug-free messages.

"Communication is happening that didn't happen even 10 years ago. Today, even the Department of Corrections has developed substance-abuse programs because 70 percent of the people coming into the prison system have a drug problem," he said.

Although there are four other substance-abuse programs in South Florida, Spectrum is the only one that is accredited by both the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Health Care Organizations and the American Corrections Association.

In the 21 years since it started, more than 12,000 people have gone through Spectrum.

Hayden said that Spectrum's success can be measured by the number of clients who have completed the program and taken charge of their lives.

Count among them Doreen Barton, 46, and Warren Samet, 43.

Both came to Spectrum in the mid-'70s, strung out on drugs. They found the help they needed—and a friend in Hayden.

"He is a mentor and a friend," said Barton, who came to Spectrum as a heroin addict. "He is running a program that does not have a popular clientele. Yet he stands up for us."

Barton became the administrator of quality insurance training for Spectrum.

Samet said he finally came to Spectrum for help after missing four previous appointments. After a year in the program, Hayden encouraged Samet to get a job as a social worker.

"I've been working here 11 years now," Samet said. "And the biggest single reason I'm still here is because of his leadership. We are treated with respect and given room to grow."

Samet is supervisor of admissions for a program called Treatment Alternative to Street Crime at Spectrum.

"As my mother would say, 'Bruce Hayden is a mensch.' That's Yiddish for human being," Samet said.

How has Hayden lasted for 20 years at a job that causes burnout for many others?

"I guess people who get burned out can't see the light at the end of the tunnel. And also, maybe I'm just a little bit crazy. But I've always been able to see that light, no matter how dim."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hayden's lifelong commitment to the troubled lives of others has made a significant impact in the war against drugs and it has certainly made a difference in the lives of those who have come to him for help. His tireless efforts to rid our streets and our community of deadly substances are undeniably changing many lives.

CONGRATULATIONS OLYMPIAN JOE SACCO

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of the Olympians from my district who competed in Albertville, France this past month. Joe Sacco of Medford, MA, was a member of the U.S. Olympic Hockey Team that thrilled the entire country with its performance at the winter Olympics.

Joe Sacco has displayed the hard-working, persistent attitude that we saw on the ice in Albertville all of his life. He was a first line left wing all 4 years at Medford High School. Joe set the Greater Boston League scoring record while becoming the first Mustang to ever score over 200 points in his career. He was chosen to the Boston Globe All Scholastic Team during his junior and senior years, and also played for Team Massachusetts for two seasons.

Joe continued his winning ways at Boston University, playing both left and right wing. He was named the "Most Improved Player" as a freshman, and then "Most Valuable Player" 2 years later. He also tied the Terrier team record for game winning goals during his sophomore year.

Joe was selected to play on the U.S. Junior Team competing at the World Junior Championships in Alaska, where he scored four times and had two assists. He also served on the North's team at the 1989 National Sports Festival in Oklahoma City.

It was no surprise to see Joe Sacco selected to the U.S. Olympic Hockey Team after his success in Massachusetts. It was a pleasant surprise to see the team do so well in international competition, taking fourth place amongst a field of traditional hockey superpowers.

Joe also recently scored his first goals in the National Hockey League, where he is currently playing for the Toronto Maple Leafs.

I would like to congratulate Joe Sacco on his success and thank him for representing his country so admirably during the 16th winter Olympics in Albertville, France. I wish him good luck in the NHL.

HOOSIC VALLEY SENIOR CITIZENS, CELEBRATING 25TH ANNIVERSARY, REPRESENT WHAT IS BEST ABOUT AMERICA

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to some of the most special and valued citizens of the 24th Congressional District of New York, the members of the Hoosic Valley Senior Citizens.

This organization of people aged 55 and older in the towns of Schaghticoke and Pittstown was founded in 1967 and will celebrate its 25th anniversary on April 14.

Over its quarter-century of existence, the Hoosic Valley Senior Citizens have provided untold benefits to the older residents of the area, including social activities, educational programs and advocacy on behalf of the needs of seniors.

Most of all, however, they embody collectively all of the vital contributions which seniors everywhere in America have made to our Nation, from raising families to keeping alive the values and sense of patriotism which have made America great.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and all Members of this House of join with me, not only in saluting the Hoosic Valley Senior Citizens on their silver anniversary, but in thanking them on behalf of a grateful nation for all that they have done and continue to do for America.

MENTALLY DISABLED VETERANS

HON. H. MARTIN LANCASTER

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Speaker, last month the mentally disabled incompetent service-connected veterans won a victory when the southern district of New York granted a preliminary injunction that prohibits the Department of Veterans Affairs from implementing a provision of law that suspends benefits for certain service-connected disability to certain "incompetent veterans." Subsequently, Secretary Derwinski ordered that benefits be restored to the affected individuals.

It makes sense to continue the benefits until September 30, 1992 when the provision in the law expires. However, the Department of Justice has filed a motion for an expedited appeal on the preliminary injunction, which was granted by the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. As a result, the plaintiffs were given barely 3 weeks—to March 13—to prepare their arguments. By appealing the preliminary injunction, the administration is merely postponing substantive review of the merits through a procedural gambit. If successful, it will have the effect of once again subjecting the plaintiffs to denial of the benefits they need while further depriving them of their day in court.

Legislation that I have introduced, H.R. 1473, with my colleague, Congressman BOB DORNAN of California, would reinstate this benefit. However, I and many of the colleagues in this House on both sides of the aisle who have cosponsored H.R. 1473, feel that the suspension of this benefit is not only discriminatory against the mentally ill, but also appears to make reductions in the budget by cutting benefits to those who are least able to defend the merits of this reduction. Balancing the budget by reducing service-connected disability compensation benefits of disabled veterans cannot be justified under any circumstances. To single out the most vulnerable and defenseless category of disabled veterans, the mentally incompetent, defines all reason and compassion. Requiring mentally incompetent disabled veterans to deplete their modest savings in order to qualify for benefits awarded in service of their country is cruel to their families, unconscionable and reeks of ingratitude.

U.S. District Judge Shirley Wohl Kram found that the current status is based on "irrational discrimination against the mentally disabled."

This is a bipartisan effort and I urge the 150 Members of this body who have cosponsored our legislation, and others who have not, to convince the administration to advise the Department of Justice to withdraw their appeal of the preliminary injunction. Prolonging resolution of this unfortunate situation will do nothing but subject these veterans and their loved ones to prolonged uncertainty and suffering.

COMMENDATION FOR PEPSI COLA OF PROVO AND SALT LAKE CITY

HON. BILL ORTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, recently, it was my privilege to present Pepsi Cola of Provo and Pepsi Cola of Salt Lake City, UT a certificate of appreciation for their efforts in recycling. The recycling campaign, which was entitled "Reuse it or Lose it" featured special labels which highlighted recycling facts. They were distributed locally on Pepsi cans through the month of November. Pepsi distributed over 1 million cases through Utah and Colorado.

The information was designed to stimulate the consumer's interest in recycling. Among those I found especially interesting were facts such as, the energy saved from recycling a single aluminum can will operate a TV set for 3 hours, making cans from recycled aluminum uses 90-percent less energy than making them from scratch, and recycling creates six times as many jobs as do land fills and incinerators. I commend Pepsi Cola for their recycling efforts and I think it was especially important that they targeted young people, whose future quality of life will depend on our wise stewardship of our natural resources.

ERNIE AND REGINA GOLDBERGER HONORED WITH THE TIFERET AWARD BY BETH JACOB CONGREGATION

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday March 11, 1992, Ernie and Regina Goldberger, respected leaders of the southern Californian Jewish community, will be honored with Beth Jacob Congregation's Tiferet Award in recognition of their foresight and devotion to the congregation and community.

Over the years, the Goldbergers have been closely identified with UJA and with State of Israel bonds. As past principal of Hebrew school, vice president of Hillel Hebrew Academy, and a member of the Board of Bureau of Jewish Education, Ernie Goldberger has been consistently dedicated and committed to Jewish education. The Goldbergers are active in Yeshiva University and Chabad as well.

Mr. Goldberger dedicates nearly all of his spare time to Beth Jacob congregation, serving as a member of the board and as an officer for many years. He currently serves as financial secretary. He has served as president of the West Coast Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, and is a founding vice president of the West Coast Diamond Dealers Club.

In all of their endeavors, Ernie and Regina Goldberger share the support of their children, Sam and Yosie, and Yosie's wife, Sharon. I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me now in congratulating and honoring Ernie and Regina Goldberger on this most wonderful occasion.

TRIBUTE TO SISTER KAREN DIETRICH RECIPIENT OF 1991 PRESIDENTIAL AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN SCIENCE TEACHING

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Sister Karen Dietrich of Belmar, NJ. Sister Karen has been selected as a recipient of the 1991 Presidential Award for Excellence in Science and Mathematics Teaching.

Sister Karen is a teacher of sophomore and senior science courses at St. Rose High School in Belmar. She has been recognized for both her outstanding ability in the classroom and her many contributions to her profession. Over the 9 years she has been at St. Rose High School, Sister Karen has devoted much of her time and energy to improving the quality of scientific education. In her role as department chair, she helps new teachers learn the ropes. Sister Karen has spoken at many in-service trainings, sharing her expertise and knowledge of effective teaching styles with other faculties. The Governor of New Jersey selected her from among teachers across the State to write a section of a State-sponsored biology textbook.

Everyone who knows Sister Karen is thrilled that her achievements have been recognized by the Presidential Award for Excellence. All the sisters of St. Joseph of Chestnut Hill, PA, can take great pride in their gift to us of such an outstanding teacher. Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Dietrich of Ewing Township, Sister Karen's parents, have traveled to Washington to be with their daughter as she receives the Presidential Award.

Of course, the people who know best just how richly Sister Karen deserves the Presidential Award are the many students who have studied with her over the years at St. Rose High School. I join them in congratulating Sister Karen and in wishing her continued success in all her endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO DANNY HALL AND HIS GARDEN AT WHISPERING PINES ELEMENTARY

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to acknowledge the gardening work of Mr. Danny Hall at Whispering Pines Elementary School in Miami. Mr. Hall has been a source of motivation and encouragement to the students, teachers and even the parents of students at Whispering Pines. Through his gardening he has made the school grounds quite special, and the response has been remarkable. His colleagues and the students at Whispering Pines enjoy his kindness and thoughtfulness as well as his beautiful plants and flowers. It seems Mr. Hall has made a home for himself and his friends. Jon O'Neill of the Miami Herald reports:

At first glance, Whispering Pines Elementary looks more like a botanical garden than it does a school.

The front of the building features more than eight little gardens, surrounded by rocks and dotted with poinsettias, palms and other trees. The rest of the school at 18929 SW 89th Road is also lush with flowers, trees and gardens.

School custodian Danny Hall has created the gardens during the past five years and labors over them every day.

"I'm just trying to create a special atmosphere," said Hall, 49. "I love doing this. It shows people that I care, and it brightens up everyone's day."

Principal Eduardo Rivas, who started at the school three years ago, liked Hall's work so much he assigned him to care for the grounds full time.

"He's really incredible," Rivas said. "He doesn't stop. He's constantly asking to work on special projects, and he ends up volunteering a lot of his own time. He's really become a fixture here."

That is obvious whenever the friendly custodian walks down the hall. A chorus of "Hi, Mr. Hall" rings out from students, teachers and parents, and many stop to compliment him on the landscaping.

"The flowers and things make me feel good," said Sophia Hulst, a 10-year-old fifth-grader. "It makes our school look so much cleaner and prettier."

Kelvin Watson, 11, agreed.

"I think they're nice," the fifth-grader said. "Our school looks different than most other schools."

Hall has no real experience in horticulture or landscaping, and he is modest about the work he has done at Whispering Pines. He gives a lot of credit to Rivas and head custodian Lula Coley. But he admits the gardens have become a personal mission.

"Everyone tells me I've got a green thumb," he said. "It's just something I kind of took a liking to. I just hope it makes everyone feel proud."

Originally from Chicago, Hall worked at Portland Cement for 15 years before starting at Whispering Pines in 1986. At the time, Nereida Santa-Cruz was principal there.

"I looked at the grounds, and they were nude," he said. "I asked if I could try to brighten them up, and she really supported me."

Hall does a lot of work on his own. He makes numerous forays to nurseries around

South Dade, looking for plants to add to his growing gardens. Rivas once went with him.

"It was amazing," the principal said. "He went up and down Krome Avenue, stopped at every nursery and somehow convinced the people there they needed to donate plants to the school."

Recently, Hall picked up more than 100 poinsettias from a nursery. To get them to the school, he took out the back seat and the passenger seat in his car and installed some makeshift shelves.

Hall says everything—the extra hours, the work in the hot sun, the car modifications—are worth it.

"The people here, especially the kids, really make my day," he said. "So I do it for all of them."

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of Mr. Hall's beautiful work at Whispering Pines. It is his thoughtfulness and dedication to his work as well as his commitment to serve our community that has earned him his success and the many friendships he has made at Whispering Pines. I would also like to acknowledge Principal Eduardo Rivas and past principal Nereida Santa-Cruz for giving Mr. Hall this wonderful opportunity and for supporting his terrific green thumb.

A TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL
GIAMBATTISTA

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, today I am privileged to congratulate an outstanding public servant who is retiring after 35 years with the Michigan Employment Security Commission, Michael Giambattista.

For over three decades, he has worked patiently and professionally to ensure the economic security of Michigan's working men and women. Michael has earned the respect and admiration of his coworkers who unanimously think of him as fair and dedicated. Michael has carried his responsibilities even further by working closely with city and local governments as well as the Job Partnership Training Act [JPTA] to create a climate of hope and opportunity for our displaced workers.

Mr. Speaker, on all accounts, Michael Giambattista has served his community with distinction and honor. On this special occasion, I ask that my colleagues join me in saluting this fine individual and extend to him our best wishes in all his future endeavors.

HAZARDOUS WASTE BURNING

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing H.R. 4413, requiring a 2-year moratorium on the burning of hazardous waste in cement kilns, and requiring the EPA to study the effects of handling, storing, and burning these wastes on human health and the environment.

Mr. Speaker, the striking and most memorable feature of the Gallatin Valley and the community of Bozeman is that it is pristine. The people of Bozeman are tenacious in their ownership and pride in the Gallatin. They know they've got a good thing in Bozeman, and they are understandably concerned that a permit may be issued, at any time, to burn hazardous wastes at an existing cement kiln plant on one end of the valley.

We Montanans are and ought to remain skeptical about the safety of burning hazardous wastes, which include oil sludges from refineries, contaminated soils from wood preserving, mining, refining, and other industrial Superfund sites. We want evidence that mixing such materials together and feeding them into a high temperature burner will not result in the releasing of dangerous materials through the smokestack and into the Big Sky.

Our skepticism is reasonable: When Montanans have asked what specifically is known about the specific airborne pollutants involved with burning these materials, the answer is always uncertain; neither governmental nor company officials know what the environmental effect will be because it depends on the combination of materials being burned at a given time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill simply assures that we will have 2 years in which to take a time out in order to find out. We want EPA to determine the implications of burning these wastes. We want EPA to review their existing regulations pertaining to boilers and furnaces and tell us if they are adequate in assuring the safety of these projects.

Montanans and all Americans are reasonable in wanting to find appropriate solutions to the problems we have with hazardous materials. We ask only that full information be available prior to making a decision which could have a serious effect on their living environment. This bill takes us in that direction.

CONGRESSMAN GERALD SOLOMON
RECEIVES VFW CONGRESSIONAL
AWARD

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my colleague Congressman GERALD SOLOMON of New York, for receiving the 1992 Veterans of Foreign Wars Congressional Award.

Those who have served in the defense of freedom choose to give GERALD SOLOMON the VFW's highest award not only because of all he has done to help America's 27 million veterans, but because of his contributions toward strengthening our Nation's security.

I have had the honor of serving with Congressman SOLOMON on the House Veterans Affairs Committee and now on the Rules Committee. I congratulate him on this most deserved award, and commend his acceptance speech to my colleagues:

REMARKS BY GERALD B.H. SOLOMON, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS ANNUAL DINNER, MARCH 3, 1992

Commander-in-Chief, Bob Wallace, your lovely wife Dianne, distinguished officers,

and members of the veterans of foreign wars, national President Mary Sears and our auxiliary, distinguished Members of the House and Senate, outstanding voice of democracy participants, ladies and gentlemen.

Four years ago, at your VFW convention in Chicago, I was deeply honored to have been the recipient of your VFW Commander-in-Chief's gold medal award.

But this evening, I am even more proud and privileged to receive the VFW's highest citation, the Congressional Award.

Proud, because it allows me to join with those other Select Members of the House and Senate, many of them here with us this evening, who have received this coveted award for what they have done for their country and for the veterans of this great Nation.

But, Commander Wallace, I am even more proud because this award comes from an organization of over 2 million brave men and women, over two thousand of them here this evening, all of whom, during times of great peril of war, risked their own lives in defense of their country, and in defense of freedom and democracy for all mankind.

Commander Wallace, the men and women of your organization are the true heroes, who not only served their country in uniform, but continue to do so as Members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, a group that is always in the forefront of efforts to develop and maintain adequate veterans benefit programs.

Mr. Commander, the community work carried out by your local VFW posts in hometowns all across America is legendary.

And your promotion of pride, patriotism, and good citizenship, as exemplified by your nationwide "Voice of Democracy Program" and these wonderful, young people here tonight, are an inspiring and proud example to all Americans.

And Mr. Commander, the American people are grateful for what you and your organization have done, and continue to do for America.

This Nation has a great memory, and will never forget those who labored mightily in its cause, who suffered hardship in its defense, or became disabled in its preservation.

No, America will not forget, nor will veterans ever forget because those who wear the proud label of "veteran" have great memories.

They are memories of pain, glory, and honor.

They are memories of the horror of war and the preservation of freedom.

They are memories we must never forget * * * because those memories are the very reason we are the greatest, freest Nation on earth.

And it is those memories that brought about the VFW's greatest accomplishment during the 1980's.

And that was your never-ending support of the peace through strength philosophy of a strong national defense second to none.

That peace through strength concept stopped international communism dead in its tracks, it brought the Soviet Union to its knees; and it is the very reason that democracy is breaking out all over Europe and around the world.

And it is the very reason that our military, in magnificent fashion, and led by Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf, was so successful in Operation Desert Storm.

But, my fellow veterans, even though we have been successful, the war is not over.

The threat to American freedom is still there. Yes, the Berlin Wall has fallen and the

former Soviet Union is no more, but the cold fact is that tens of thousands of armed nuclear warheads are still aimed at American cities.

Four million Soviet troops still remain in uniform and the new Russian confederacy is highly volatile and unstable * * * and no one knows the future, or who will control it.

There is also the very serious threat that no less than ten hostile anti-American terrorist countries either have (or are on the verge of having) nuclear missile capacity * * * and any one of them would not hesitate a moment to launch a sneak terrorist attack on Americans, both here and overseas.

And of course we all know that deadly atheistic communism still enslaves almost half of the world population in places like Cuba, North Korea, Vietnam, and Mainland China.

And my fellow veterans that means the job is not done * * * the war is not over.

And that is why we must never let down our guard. We must never again leave America undefended, as we did on December 7, 1941.

That is why we must absolutely continue to maintain a peace through strength and strong national defense, that can guarantee the protection of American interests both at home and abroad.

Yes, while still protecting America's interest, we can reduce our defense budget within reason, as Secretary Cheney and Gen. Colin Powell have recommended.

And, yes, most of those savings should be used to reduce the unconscionable deficit that is ruining our Nation's economy.

But, any of that savings that is not applied to the deficit ought to go directly towards restoring the Department of Veterans Affairs Hospital and Health Care Programs to a funding level that will guarantee our Nation's obligation to provide the highest quality medical care to any, I repeat any, sick or disabled veteran, and do it in veterans hospitals * * * where only veterans are served.

And so my fellow veterans, the fight is on. We must fight with all our might to see that our military budget is not decimated.

We must fight to make sure that the future veterans of America, the young men and women serving in our all voluntary military today, continue to be the brightest, the best educated, the best trained, the best equipped, and some of the most highly motivated soldiers ever to serve.

We must make sure that these volunteers, coming from the inner cities of America, from the suburbs, from the farms, from all across America, have an opportunity to pursue an honorable and proud military career.

Where they can accumulate up to \$25,000 of educational benefits through the Montgomery GI Bill.

And where they can learn something desperately needed in America today * * * how to be good citizens.

In today's military, our young people learn things all too often neglected in our homes and schools.

They learn discipline and respect.
They learn teamwork and responsibility.
They learn the importance of being polite and courteous.

They learn to live by the rule of law.
They learn not to use illegal drugs.

They learn the meaning of the words pride and patriotism.

And more often than not they even get a little religion.

Yes, every year, hundreds of thousands of these kids, many from the inner cities, from broken homes, from middle class America,

join the military, become good citizens * * * and they learn these terribly important principles they, somehow, missed at home or in school.

And when their enlistment is over, when their service is done, they turn in their uniforms and return home, bringing these ingrained principles along with them, to be spread about their community, and taught to the younger generations to come.

Yes, these men and women are no longer soldiers, sailors, marines or airmen, they now have a new responsibility.

They have now joined one of the most important groups of people in America, a group that is, without doubt, the most responsible for making America the greatest and freest Nation on Earth.

It is the group represented by all of you gathered here tonight, those who have earned the right to proudly call themselves veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States of America.

Thanks to them, America is No. 1!
Commander Wallace, on behalf of all veterans, I gratefully accept this cherished congressional award.

God bless you * * * and God bless America.

THE FISCAL YEAR 1993 BUDGET RESOLUTION

HON. BILL ORTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, today the House adopted a budget resolution for the next fiscal year. This completes a critical 2-week process in which we have made major tax and budget decisions that affect all Americans.

I vote against final adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 287, the budget resolution as reported by the House Budget Committee. I also voted against the three substitute budgets. I would like to take this opportunity to explain my reasoning behind these actions.

Quite simply, I cannot in good conscience support any budget resolution that produces a deficit in the range of \$325 billion. The debate this week has centered almost entirely on a question of spending priorities—primarily, how we allocate spending between defense and domestic projects. While this is an important decision, it fails to ask the more fundamental question of how we can bring down spending in line with revenues.

With the exception of the Dannemeyer substitute—which relies on refinancing gimmicks and unrealistic Medicare/Medicaid cuts—all three of the budget alternatives contemplate a deficit in the range of \$325 to \$331 billion. As a result, there is effectively no opportunity for me or other Members to vote for a budget that makes a serious effort to make real spending cuts. The only choices involve business as usual.

Such inaction on the deficit is unacceptable. The deficit for the current fiscal year is estimated by the President to be just short of \$400 billion. This is a figure of unprecedented proportion. If we continue along this path, our national debt will overwhelm the economy. The result is a mortgage on our children's future, the crowding out of the private sector from financial markets, and an increasing fiscal straitjacket.

Instead, we need to make hard choices on real spending cuts and work toward a balanced budget. To be sure, certain factors will move us in this direction automatically. Three years from now we will presumably not need to spend the approximately \$75 billion we are spending this year on the banking, savings, and loan bailout. And, a full employment economy may increase tax revenues and lower spending on unemployment insurance and other support programs.

But we have to do more. To start with, consider defense. There is near unanimous agreement in Congress that the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the cold war gives us an unprecedented opportunity. The House Armed Services Committee has undertaken an extensive analysis on the question of military preparedness. Based on a realistic appraisal of the need to sustain a number of foreseeable military operations at the same time, Chairman ASPIN has recommended that we can make significant funding reductions and still maintain force readiness. The Budget Committee's reduction in defense spending of \$15 billion in budget authority and \$10 billion in outlays next year is based on Chairman ASPIN's recommendations. These recommendations foresee cuts of some \$100 billion over the next 5 years, while maintaining readiness to conduct a Desert Storm-type operation simultaneously with other military scenarios. I support this level of defense reduction, and feel that the President's budget in this area is too timid in taking advantage of the current state of world affairs.

However, it is in the use of this peace dividend that I part company with many of my colleagues. Under the 1990 budget agreement, we created the firewalls in an effort to enforce fiscal discipline. Under the firewalls, cuts in spending in one category could not be added back to another category, if doing so would break the budget cap in that second category. Since we are at or near the caps on domestic spending, many Members in Congress want to tear down the firewalls and allow three quarters of the defense savings to be poured back into domestic spending.

I oppose this approach and believe that 100 percent of the peace dividend should be used to reduce the deficit. Shortly after adoption of the budget resolution, the House will be considering H.R. 3732, the Budget Process Reform Act. This bill would tear down the firewalls and allow us to spend the peace dividend. I plan to vote against this bill. Eighteen months is far too short a period of time to give up the small degree of fiscal discipline created by the 1990 budget act.

The decade of the 1980's has dulled our senses. We have become accustomed to borrow and spend policies in which we borrowed trillions of dollars to pay for a military buildup. Now that we are able to reduce our large expenditures on defense, we characterize it as a dividend. It is not a dividend; it is only money that we will not have to borrow to spend.

I recognize that this position may be characterized as being heartless. I know that we are experiencing a recession and that it is attractive to advocate increased social spending to cushion the hard times. But, aren't we being more heartless to our children and future generations if we saddle them with so much debt

that ten or twenty years from now, we cannot even afford basic Government programs, such as Social Security or education?

We must act now. There are many other areas in which we can make measured, but real spending cuts. Currently, entitlements are rising at an astronomical pace. Reforms are necessary. Welfare reform is an example. The State of Utah has instituted real changes in their welfare system that are working to cut costs drastically. We should apply these types of changes at the Federal level. In the areas of Medicare and Medicaid, we need to take steps to keep costs under control. This does not mean rolling back eligibility or cutting back on quality of care. But it does mean increased attention to curbing the causes of runaway health costs.

Domestic spending is another area where cuts should be made. I am not one of those who claim that we can balance the budget simply by cutting back on wasteful domestic spending, as some of my Republican colleagues seem to believe. But, it is true that significant savings can be achieved. I serve on the Democratic Caucus Task Force on Government Waste. Our preliminary report estimates that there are \$65 to \$85 billion in savings that can be achieved in the first year alone from specific actions.

The President has recommended the termination of some 261 substandard projects and 246 programs in his fiscal year 1993 budget. Some of the projects targeted for termination are in my congressional district. Their deletion would undoubtedly cause some pain or economic distress. Nevertheless, I could support termination of these projects, provided that all projects and programs on the President's list were deleted. The problem, however, is that many Members of this body complain endlessly about pork barrel spending, but flinch when it comes to any specific cuts in their own district. The result is that virtually nothing is ever cut. As I have indicated, I for one would be willing to support cuts for projects in my district as a tradeoff for comparable cuts nationwide. We all must sacrifice and share the pain of cuts if we are ever to make progress on deficit spending.

Is it possible for the Congress to make the hard choices I have outlined to cut the budget? As a first term Congressman, I am not so cynical as to proclaim that it will never happen. At the same time, I have been here long enough to realize that Congress needs a push in the right direction.

That is why in addition to advocating spending cuts, I also support a wide range of budget process and Federal management reforms. To begin with, we need a constitutional amendment to mandate a balanced budget. No organization can achieve certain goals without a statement from the top defining those goals. The budget being adopted today, with a deficit of \$325 billion, is the wrong statement to make.

Other needed reforms include enhanced Presidential rescission or impoundment power, in order to permit the President to delete wasteful spending projects; sunset laws to review and eliminate outdated programs; capital budgeting to encourage long-term planning; and a revision of the Federal bureaucracy, in order to adopt management and efficiency techniques common in the private sector.

In conclusion, I am disappointed that I was unable to support any of the budget plans. But I have not given up on the process. I intend to work constructively to support appropriate Government spending. At the same time, I cannot and will not compromise on the need to restore fiscal sanity to our process of budgeting and spending. I believe that our future economic well-being hangs in the balance.

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO
MS. ELOISE BUSSIO

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an exceptional woman whom I greatly admire, Ms. Eloise Bussio. On Friday, March 6, 1992, Ms. Bussio will retire after 24 years of dedicated service to the Los Angeles Unified School District [LAUSD].

Upon graduation from the University of California, San Francisco with an R.N., B.S., and P.H.N. in 1957, Eloise immediately entered the University of California at Berkeley and received her M.S. degree in June 1959. She began her career as an assistant head nurse with Alameda County Hospital in psychiatric emergency admitting. She was quickly promoted to head nurse in June 1960.

For the past 7 years, Eloise has served as the field coordinator of school nursing for the LAUSD. Her position was a demanding but rewarding one, and her duties included the orientation and supervision of all nurses with the system. She was also instrumental in coordinating a program designed to assist individuals with exceptional needs. Prior to this post, Ms. Bussio was a school nurse for 17 years with the Los Angeles city schools.

As dedicated to her community as she is to nursing, Eloise is a board member for the Toberman Settlement House. In addition, she is an honorary life member of the PTA and the recording secretary for the Council of School Nurses. These noteworthy contributions to her profession and community have not gone unnoticed, Eloise has been chosen as Staff Member of the Year and has been honored with the Outstanding Service Award.

My wife, Lee, joins me in extending our thanks to Ms. Eloise Bussio in recognition of her contributions to our schools and community. She is a very special individual who has devoted her talents and energies to making our school system a healthier and happier environment. We wish her all the best in the years to come.

NATIONAL FARMWORKER ADVOCATE
HALL OF FAME AWARD
PRESENTED TO JOHN DAVID
ARNOLD, PH.D.

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year, Dr. John Arnold was named as a re-

ipient of the National Farmworker Advocate Hall of Fame Award. I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the achievements of my longtime friend. John Arnold has spent much of his life exemplifying what America was built on. He has demonstrated commitment, valor, and honor with his unsurpassed efforts. John's work originated with the working people of Arizona, and improving the working conditions of Arizona's farmworkers.

The contributions that John Arnold made to improve the housing, training, and job placement of the farmworkers will be well noticed far into the future. John's commitment started in 1954, when he began to employ his bilingual talents as a volunteer in order to improve the lives of the Mexican farm laborers. Perhaps one of John's most recognizable feats was the founding of PPEP [Portable Practical Educational Preparation], an organization that was designed to provide instruction in practical educational experience which prepared the farmworkers to acquire basic survival skills.

His untiring efforts focused on improving the lives and welfare of farmworkers. His commitment to their cause endures and his work on their behalf goes on.

Congratulations, John, on your achievement.

MILITARY MEDICAL FACILITIES
LEGISLATION

HON. J.J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would direct the Department of Defense to take into account the needs of retirees and reservists when considering whether or not to close a military medical facility.

Under a current Defense Department directive, DOD can only consider the needs of active duty personnel when deciding whether to close a military medical facility. At a time when the military is drawing down under the base closure process and many active duty service men and women are being asked to take early retirement or transfer to Reserve status, this directive creates an unintended penalty on areas of the country which have substantial concentrations of military retirees and reservists.

Many of our military hospitals and pharmacies were built nearly 50 years ago and the populations around the facilities has changed considerably since that time. In some areas of the country there are too many medical facilities and in other areas too few. In my district there is only one veterans' hospital, yet there are 65,000 veterans and 30,000 military retirees.

To close a hospital on the strict basis of active duty personnel needs fails to take into consideration the needs of the thousands who would otherwise be deprived.

My bill does not require the Defense Department to keep all military medical facilities open. It simply directs DOD to decide on a case-by-case basis whether or not to close a particular facility based on the needs of all of the users of the facility.

THE SYRIAN BUILD-UP

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, Syria's military buildup, financed by the Saudis, raises not only serious questions about Syria's commitment to Arab-Israeli peace talks, it also underscores the difficulty in implementing a multilateral arms restraint regime for the Middle East. As William Safire reports in his commentary China's "Hama Rules" (New York Times, 3/5/92), the President's policy toward proliferating countries like China undermines his own arms control efforts. By vetoing the bill that would link China's missile restraint to MFN status, the President has acquiesced in the continuing flow of sophisticated arms and technology to dangerous proliferators.

In fact, the administration's current policy is now allowing our own dual-use technology—that which has both military and civilian application—to get into the hands of terrorist countries. I recently introduced legislation, H.R. 4378, which places a flat-out prohibition on the transfer of dual-use technology to terrorist countries. If we are to tell countries like China and Russia not to sell Scud missiles or SU-24 aircraft to Syria and Iran, then the United States must ensure that our own policy restricts the flow of dangerous technology and arms to this volatile region.

I urge my colleagues to review the following report of the administration's latest foreign policy blunder.

CHINA'S "HAMA RULES"

(By William Safire)

WASHINGTON.—When Syria's dictator, Hafez al-Assad, decided to deal with an intifada of Muslim fundamentalists in 1982, he did not bother with rubber bullets, deportations or the killing of a neighboring terrorist leader.

On the contrary, he leveled his guns on the city of Hama and wiped out its center. About 20,000 people were bulldozed into mass graves. All such rules of firm dealing are now called "Hama Rules."

Hama has been largely rebuilt and repopulated with Assad loyalists and Syrian soldiers. South of the town is a facility under construction of interest to the world's non-proliferation agencies because it has been repeatedly visited by delegations of Chinese missile technologists. These scientists shuttle between the secret Hama plant and another, larger facility under construction at Aleppo.

Parts of the Aleppo plant are being built underground. Its expert workers underwent training in China last year. Some suspect that the Aleppo plant will produce surface-to-surface missiles.

The Hama plant, say these sources, is supposed to make sophisticated guidance systems for these missiles. It may also be improving the accuracy of the Scud-C missiles, with a range of 400 miles, sold to Syria last March by North Korea with Saudi financing.

The intelligence on the recent visits to the Syrian sites by the Chinese groups is, I think, "hard"; but the purpose of the new secret plants has not yet been confirmed.

If the Chinese have been contributing to the indigenous Syrian missile production, it

would mean that Congress was right and the President wrong about the best way to stop China from helping increase the risk of war in the Middle East.

Last Nov. 17, after giving Chinese leaders diplomatic condonation by paying a visit to Beijing, Secretary of State Baker announced "clear gains in the fields of proliferation and trade." He told reporters this meant that the Chinese had agreed not to export M-9 missiles to Syria.

One week later, if my information is correct, the Chinese secretly agreed to help the Syrians construct their own missiles locally. This included the supply of Chinese equipment needed to assemble the advanced weaponry.

The plot: China would live up to the letter of its agreement with the U.S.—holding back the Pershing-type M-9's—but violate its spirit by making it possible for Syria to deliver destruction in a locally produced missile of equivalent range.

On Feb. 10, 1992, the Chinese scientists secretly visited the plants at Aleppo and Hama.

On Feb. 22, President Bush announced he would lift a ban on the export of satellite parts and highspeed computers to China. The ban had been imposed, according to Senator George Mitchell, "when a secret sale of Chinese missile launchers to Pakistan was revealed."

Next day, as its supervisory delegation was returning secretly from Syria, Beijing announced that "China will act in accordance with the Missile Control Technology Regime * * * in its export of missiles and missile technology."

Meanwhile, the U.S. Congress has been concerned about sales by China of missiles to Syria and nuclear technology to Iran. To discourage any backing away from commitments made by China on the Baker visit, a bill was passed to cut off Most Favored Nation status it Beijing reneged on its promises.

This week, on March 2, unaware of—or worried about—possible Chinese participation in local Syrian missile production, President Bush vetoed the bill linking China's missile restraint to M.F.N. status. The Senate vote to override was 59 to 39, six votes short of the two-thirds needed.

Might six more senators, if informed of the Chinese circumvention of agreements touted by Secretary Baker even as the voting took place, have voted to override?

This sort of story is difficult for a journalist to check out; Hama's off limits for me. But I remember how a concern for verification two years ago constrained me from writing about Iraqi nuclear development for months. (At first that story was universally derided; it has since been confirmed.)

So I pose the question with appropriate caveats. What are those Chinese scientists doing in Syria?

THE DEMOCRATIC BUDGET

HON. TIM VALENTINE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I was chairing a hearing of the Technology and Competitiveness Subcommittee during nearly all of the debate on the Democratic tax and economic growth proposal last week and was thus unable to come to the Chamber to speak

on that bill. I supported the Democratic substitute and want to explain the reasons for my vote.

The tax and economic growth legislation we considered last week placed many Members in a serious quandary.

My dilemma, and that of other Members, arose because this bill represents our failure to take advantage of a historic opportunity. This is the best chance we are likely to have for the foreseeable future to address our No. 1 economic problem—the Federal budget deficit.

Mr. Speaker, like nearly all Members, I am not opposed to the prospect of being identified as one who cuts taxes. I want to reduce the tax burden on the citizens I represent whenever possible. I particularly like the idea of reducing taxes for middle class individuals and families.

At the same time, I believe that the greatest help we can offer to the middle class and to the entire Nation would be a significant reduction in the budget deficit. No other single action would do more to build confidence in the American economy or send a clear signal that we are serious about putting our economic house in order.

While the Democratic substitute represents a modest stab at deficit reduction over the next 5 years, I believe that we should do much more. At a time when we can finally cut defense spending significantly, we could attack the deficit in a way that every American would understand. Such a direct assault on the deficit, in my view, would do more for the middle class than the temporary tax reduction included in this bill.

Despite these misgivings, I find much of real value in the Democratic proposal. First, even on the question of the deficit, it clearly accomplishes much more than either of the alternatives. The very last action we should take is to increase the deficit—and that is exactly what would happen under the Republican plans. Under the Democratic substitute, we are at least starting—again—down the road to long-term deficit reduction.

Second, the Democratic proposal injects more fairness and equity into the Tax Code. This bill will begin to reverse the trend of the past decade in which the richest Americans paid less in Federal taxes while middle and lower income citizens paid more.

Especially in these difficult economic times, it is absolutely essential that those with the most resources bear their fair share of the burden. This plan raises desperately-needed revenue without raising taxes for the vast majority of Americans or for those citizens who can least afford it.

Third, while I do not believe that this bill will jump-start the economy out of the current recession, it does contain a number of provisions that will promote investment, economic growth, and job creation.

The Democratic substitute will encourage businesses to invest in research and development, in their employees' education and training, and in new, modern equipment. Over time, these investments will improve productivity and competitiveness and support the jobs of the coming decades.

The investment tax allowance, the research and development tax credit, the modification of

the passive loss rules for real estate operations, the accelerated corporate alternative minimum tax depreciation, and the increased writeoff for new equipment purchased by small business will all provide relief to businesses that need it.

Small businesses will also benefit from the permanent extension of the 25-percent deduction for health insurance for self-employed individuals. This is clearly an improvement over the President's proposal to extend the uncertainty for small business owners by continuing this provision temporarily.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Democratic substitute creates more opportunity for more Americans. The more flexible Individual Retirement Account will help people buy homes, educate themselves and their children, and meet unexpected medical expenses. Permanently extending the exclusion for employer-provided education and adding a tax credit for 15 percent of interest on student loans will allow more Americans to prepare for the careers of the 21st century.

The Democratic proposal also contains a reasonable compromise on the contentious issue of the capital gains tax. Indexing the gain taxed for new capital assets will protect citizens from being taxed on illusory profits that are due solely to inflation.

Finally, institutions that depend on charitable donations, such as universities, will benefit from the provision that allows a tax deduction of the fair market value, rather than the original cost, for gifts of appreciated property.

For those reasons, I voted for the Democratic substitute. I hope that passage of this plan can be coupled with a commitment to take bold and unambiguous steps to reduce the deficit in the coming weeks. If middle class Americans deserve tax relief—and they do—then the entire country deserves relief from the crushing burden of our deficit and debt.

NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

HON. LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years the month of October has been commemorated as National Domestic Violence Awareness Month, and today I am introducing this resolution to make this designation in 1992. Ten women are killed every day because of domestic violence, and each year, it is responsible for 100,000 days of hospitalization, 30,000 emergency department visits, and 40,000 visits to physicians. While anyone can be the victim of domestic violence, in 95 percent of the cases the victims are women.

Domestic violence leaves no one untouched. Police spend one-third to one-half of their time investigating domestic violence calls. Urban and rural women of all racial, social, religious, ethnic, and economic groups are affected. Fifty percent of all women will experience physical violence in an intimate relationship, and in 25 percent of those relationships, the battering is continual.

National Domestic Violence Awareness Month creates the opportunity to support vic-

tims of violence, and to recognize the efforts of those who work to end the battering. Domestic violence is a daily reality. Victims need to know they can escape these brutal conditions, and our society must be adequately prepared to rescue the victims. Right now, half of all counties in the United States have no battered women's programs. There are three times as many animal shelters Nationwide as shelters for battered women.

Awareness is crucial if we wish to break the cycle of violence. Violence is a learned behavior. Children who have witnessed abuse or who have been abused are 1,000 times more likely to abuse their own spouse or child than children who have not been exposed to abuse. We must make it clear that domestic violence is a crime and unacceptable in our communities.

Often it is easier to pretend that this type of violent behavior does not exist, but closing one's eyes does not make the problem disappear. I urge my colleagues to join me and Congressman GEORGE MILLER in cosponsoring this resolution to designate October 1992 as National Domestic Violence Awareness Month. Recognizing the widespread nature of domestic violence and educating our country about its detrimental and long-term effects can help end the tragedy of domestic violence.

A TRIBUTE TO KAREN JO DOTSON

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in our lives, each of us is touched by special individuals whose spirit of giving and caring for others sets them apart from others. My longtime dear friend, Karen Jo Dotson of San Bernardino, CA, is one such person. Karen, who has literally devoted her life to community service, will be appropriately honored by many of our close friends and family on Saturday.

Karen was born in Canton, OH in 1942. She later moved to New York where she attended Long Beach High School and worked as a supervisor at a garment factory. Karen moved to California 21 years ago and has spent the last 18 years managing some of the areas finest establishments.

Karen is best known, however, as the lady that never says no. She has earned this reputation over the years for her boundless enthusiasm and willingness to help others. For the last 14 years, she has committed her time and energy to the Multiple Sclerosis Society. Over the years, she has also committed herself to the Bethlehem House—a shelter for battered women and abused children—the Make a Wish Foundation Golf Tournament, the Arthritis Foundation, the local firefighters association, and other organizations.

If there are things Karen is most known for, they are her willingness to listen, to take people in under her wing, and to lend a helping hand. She has made, and continues to make, a real difference in the lives of many people in need.

Karen is a beautiful woman and a lovely lady. She is mother to her two daughters, Ta-

mara Clark and Kellie Whittaker, and a proud grandmother of grandchildren, Kellie Jo and Wesley. Her brothers, Blaine and Blakely, live in Florida and New York.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, and the many dear friends of Karen Jo Dotson in recognizing this remarkable lady for her lifelong spirit of giving. Her years of dedication and community service are certainly worthy of recognition by the House of Representatives today.

THE 17TH ANNUAL BROOKLYN IRISH-AMERICAN PARADE

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, March 22, 1992, marks the 17th annual Brooklyn Irish-American Parade, honoring the cultural, educational, and historical contributions of Brooklyn's Irish-American community.

It is with pride that I join my constituents in celebrating the culture and ancestry of the Irish people, who maintained strong ties to their country despite numerous hardships, including religious persecution, famine, colonial occupation, and political oppression.

This parade pays tribute not only to the accomplishments of the Irish people, but also to the cultural diversity and richness of Brooklyn.

The members of the Brooklyn Irish-American Parade Committee deserve special recognition for their hard work and dedication; in particular, Mr. Peter Tuohy, this year's grand marshal, and his family must be commended for all they have done to ensure the success of this year's parade.

The parade will take place on the historic site of the Battle of Brooklyn, where Irish freedom fighters gave their lives to secure American independence.

ST. ROSE OF LIMA CATHOLIC PARISH CELEBRATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate St. Rose of Lima Catholic parish in Quincy, IL, on its 100th anniversary in March of this year. The parish was formed in 1892 for the English speaking Irish in the northwest part of Quincy. They had been served by German language churches and parish schools before the new parish was formed. The new parish was named for the first person born in the New World to be raised to sainthood, St. Rose of Lima, Peru.

The financially depressed year of 1892, just before the panic of 1893, was a Presidential election year, just like this year of 1992. Grover Cleveland was running against incumbent Benjamin Harrison, who had unseated him 4 years earlier. In the heat of Harrison's cam-

paign, the Know-Nothing organizations were being revived. The Know-Nothings discriminated against the Irish and Catholics in employment and government, forcing them to take the lowest paying jobs to survive.

Nevertheless, the Irish of St. Rose undertook to build a church and school. They had faced persecution in Ireland, where it was a crime to teach Catholic children to read and write. The result was a large proportion of illiteracy among the Catholic Irish. The Catholic Irish in America were resolved to correct this condition.

On election day, November 8, 1892, Cleveland defeated Harrison and became the 24th as well as the 22d President. Adlai Stevenson, of Illinois, became Vice President. Before the end of the month the first church of St. Rose had been completed. The people of St. Rose were able to worship in their own church and to receive comfort and strength from the sacraments in their own parish. The school opened January 3, 1893.

There were only 125 families in the parish at first. But their numbers grew rapidly, and 20 years later, in 1912, they built a new church, one of the most beautiful in a city of beautiful churches. Through the years, the parish has grown and prospered, and it is thriving today.

Through the years, graduates of St. Rose School have gone on to college and outstanding careers in business, government, the courts, and science. They even number

among their graduates a beauty contest winner who became Miss Quincy.

The parish has set the date of March 15 to open the centennial officially. There will be a solemn High Mass that morning celebrated by Bishop Daniel L. Ryan, bishop of the diocese, and a dinner that evening in the parish hall.

The present greatly loved pastor, Francis Damian Lee, will celebrate his golden anniversary as a priest on April 5. During this centennial year many activities are planned for the parish and for its friends in the city and country.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the pastor and the parishioners of St. Rose of Lima on the 100th anniversary of the founding of their parish.

TRIBUTE TO THE MALOONER

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1992

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the writers and creators of the Malooner, a publication by students at Youngstown State University in my 17th District in Ohio.

This piece of literature shows excellence in organization and creativity. I was proud to

read its contents and even entertained by its graphic art and easygoing style.

With former Student Government President Brian Fry and other distinguished students including coeditor and artist Tom Welsh, art editor Steve Bobovnik, as well as Dan Lucas, Duane Price, David Mularchik, Christopher Byrne, Mike Yonkura, Rebecca Tally, Steve Farkas, Elaine Arvan, and Judy Terlecki, the Malooner was established as a representation of the student concerns. The Malooner encompasses the interviews and editorials from the campus on national issues, social controversies and local opinions. The unique characteristic of this publication is its creative approach to these issues. The magazine forgoes the traditional layout in favor of college lingo and friendly interpretations. For the student or alumni, the piece is illuminating and inviting.

I also compliment the writers of the Malooner for including local talent and artistic events in the work. I believe that the Malooner provides inspiration to other students signaling the overall increased awareness by the students at Youngstown State of the artistic and governmental issues in our midst.

Again, Mr. Speaker I rise on this occasion to congratulate the writers of the Malooner at Youngstown State University in my 17th District of Ohio.