

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HEALTH CARE AND THE TRIAL ON  
SEPTEMBER 12

## HON. JAMES V. HANSEN

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern over the administration and Democratic leadership's attempt to force a health care bill through Congress before the outcome of a very important trial on September 12. The trial I am referring to, involves First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton, Ira Magaziner and other top health care aides, who flagrantly used Federal dollars to conduct secret meetings of the Clinton health care task force and then refused to supply factual information to the court as to who attended, what was discussed and how much it cost the taxpayers.

On Tuesday, after reviewing thousands of documents and hearing oral arguments, U.S. District Judge Royce C. Lamberth ordered the administration to face civil charges in his court. I think it is irresponsible of this body to move on legislation before the outcome of the trial is known.

In Federal court, on July 26, the White House abandoned their 18-month effort to hide its members of the health care task force and virtually admitted that it was made up of representatives of proreform interest groups. White House lawyers said in court that the task force was an anonymous horde that had no influence on Clinton's health care plan. If these working groups were anonymous and loosely invited to attend, then why the secrecy? And if they didn't influence the basic provisions of the Health Security Act, then, the big question is: Who did?

President Clinton's plan is the foundation of the bills being considered by the House today. When the list of about a thousand participants in the White House working groups was finally made available, the managed care industry and nonprofit organizations were strongly represented in high profile roles. Today, the influence of these people is still very apparent. Let me give you a few examples:

Mark Smith is executive vice president of the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and chaired a subpanel for the Clintons on HIV and AIDS. What's interesting is the Foundation has spent at least \$10 million campaigning for drastic reform and continues to fund various health care polls in favor of managed care. Kaiser is one of the largest health maintenance organizations in the country and, coincidentally, Mr. Smith is now being considered by the administration as the next AIDS czar.

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation was represented on numerous subpanels within the health care task force working group. This Foundation has funded a number of health

care town meetings led by Mrs. Clinton and also paid NBC \$2 million to air a recent 2-hour special about health reform. The special was noticeably orchestrated and strongly favored massive health reform like the President's plan.

Aetna's Richard Connell, Benjamin Curtis, Ken O'Donnell and Jim Pickering were all included in the deliberations, as were representatives from Telesis, which was formerly owned by Ira Magaziner. The list goes on.

Just like Whitewater, the White House has conveniently censored, back dated or tampered with many documents which would enlighten the public as to who the members of the so-called working group were, what was actually discussed and how it was paid for. In fact, pages 15 through 26 of a memo explaining the organization of the White House task force were left out of documents the White House supplied to the court.

Eventually, the pages were handed over, however, thousands of others have yet to be seen. Judge Lamberth has instructed the White House to supply the documents by August 3 in preparation for the trial—doesn't this sound familiar?

This administration has continually obstructed justice by side-stepping the law and releasing information when they believe it is in the best interest of their case, or promotes their own agenda. What about the people's agenda?

Judge Lamberth asked a very perceptive question at the end of the oral arguments this week. The Washington Times quotes him as saying,

In light of where we are in health care reform, what's the great secrecy of all these recommendations? Why are we going through all of this?

I concur with the Judge and would like to ask the same question. Why is this such a big secret? What is the administration trying to hide?

Kent Masterson Brown, the plaintiffs attorney, answered that nonprofit organizations, managed care industry and others who stand to advance their social agendas, gain power, or profit from health reform, had secretly helped craft the President Clinton's health plan which is still alive under other names on the Hill.

If Federal law was violated, the public deserves to know. The result of a trial involving Mrs. Clinton and White house staff is important to Americans and the security of their future.

This Congress is on the verge of taking drastic measures in health care reform which are based on a plan presented by this administration. The public needs to know exactly who cooked up this plan and how it will affect a vital component of each of our personal and financial lives.

The foundation of current health care proposals is this bill, the Health Security Act. This

proposes drastic changes to the way we deliver and pay for health care in this country and places mandates on every single person within U.S. borders.

This is serious stuff and before we move forward on major health care reform, we should stop and learn about its roots. I firmly believe the fruits of this administration's efforts to dramatically reform health care should not be borne without understanding its origin. The trial will expose the bill's true heritage.

I call upon my colleagues in the House and the Senate to halt deliberations on this issue. No votes should be taken until all of the information surrounding the case against Mrs. Clinton has come forward under oath in Federal court. We have a responsibility to the public and I urge my colleagues to use good judgement and exercise integrity by representing the folks who sent you back here, they deserve to know the truth.

INNER-CITY POUGHKEEPSIE HIGH  
SCHOOL SENDS ENTIRE GRAD-  
UATING CLASS TO COLLEGE

## HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I've heard one of the most amazing and encouraging stories recently, and I'd like to share it with you.

The 22d Congressional District borders on the city of Poughkeepsie. Poughkeepsie High School is a typical inner-city school, with all the disadvantages that entails, including poverty and a poor environment for learning. Yet, all 160 graduates this year are headed for college.

But the story was told best by Dan Davidson, an editorial writer for the Albany Times-Union, to whom I yield by placing the column in today's RECORD. I hope all Members will enjoy this inspiring story.

WHY SOME PUBLIC SCHOOLS MAY SUCCEED IN  
EDUCATING

It is pretty much established doctrine that it is not the public schools that are responsible for their failures. Rather, the blame for high dropout rates, growing illiteracy and falling academic achievement is "society's" fault. It results from the breakup of the family, if not the weakening of neighborhood and community ties, with perhaps an admixture of national malaise.

Such is the consensus. All of which, it seems to me, has pretty much been given the lie by this year's graduating class of Poughkeepsie High School. The senior class there, all 160 of them, are headed to college.

These are not the children of privilege. The majority at inner-city Poughkeepsie High are minority—and poor. Few come from families that can boast a college graduate. Many of these kids have suffered from racism, or its vestiges. The home life of others is absent

● 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.

a trace of encouragement, when it is not worse.

Yet, all have applied for admission to a college—and all have been accepted.

This is in large part the work of one man. He is Paul Jankiewicz, a most special kind of guidance counselor who has made it his mission to give these students "a sense of hope" and let them know of "the opportunities that are there for them."

Given many of these students' backgrounds, the limited education of their parents, and the narrow circle of their acquaintances, if these students don't learn about themselves and the wider world in school, they will likely not learn much about it at all. How could it be otherwise?

All kids, says Dr. Jankiewicz, can learn. But for many learning must be preceded by their hearing a "can-do" message instead of that "can't-do" message most of them have been getting from every quarter.

"I won't accept anything less," is the message Dr. Jankiewicz drums into his charges beginning in the ninth grade. They are told they are going to college and that they have no choice in the matter. By the time they have reached their senior year, almost all of them believe it.

Mr. Jankiewicz repeatedly asks the students what college they're going to. He chases them around the building, corrals them, and inquires about their college application, whether it has been sent in. If a student proves elusive, this guidance counselor will look for him (or her) on the street or visit him at his home.

When students are finally accepted by a college, Mr. Jankiewicz sees to it that the news gets the attention it deserves. Announcements are made on the public address system; notices are posted on the bulletin board. In that way, he explained last week, the students on their way to college are encouraged while the younger students have examples to follow—and know what will be expected of them.

Mr. Jankiewicz has a "secret," but it is neither faddish nor the product of any teacher's college. It is his own version of "tough love."

He is, evidently, tough enough. Those who offer excuses for their derelictions are subject to ridicule. ("That's not a good enough excuse. Take a better one out of my excuse jar.") He will tell those who make too little effort that they are SAPs (spoiled American princes—or princesses) and bums (or bumettes).

One student complained to his parents about being called a bum. Dr. Jankiewicz gave no ground. That student, he believed, had to be challenged to do better.

And all of them need someone to believe in them. All of them need love. They most especially need that. He has told other teachers that if they do not love themselves and do not love their students, they should not be teaching.

What is remarkable about Mr. Jankiewicz's approach is that there is so little new—or faddish—in it. Indeed, there is much that is old-fashioned, especially his insistence that educators go back "to teaching the old virtues and vices."

Whatever the merit of that proposal (I suspect it is considerable) the example of Poughkeepsie High, by itself, demonstrates that virtually no kid who comes from a troubled or broken family is beyond hope, beyond learning. All these lives may lack are teachers like Mr. Jankiewicz who can point (and push) them in the right direction.

Most of the efforts to reform public schooling over the past two decades were very like-

ly misdirected. The students may not need new teaching methods, stylish curricula or state-certificated-bearing teachers. They may simply need dedicated teachers—teachers who care enough about their students to look them up at their homes.

### HON. SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, quickly and easily, Congress can act to protect children victimized by current tax laws.

I am introducing legislation today, modifying the Tax Code for children who earn income from personal injury awards.

Under current law, these children pay taxes on this income at the marginal rate of their parents. The Tax Reform Act of 1986, which sought to discourage incentives to shift income-producing assets among family members, overlooked this unique and unfortunate situation.

The parents of Kristen Parisi bravely brought this matter to my attention. Peter and Anita Parisi of Whitesboro, NY, reported that their 9-year-old daughter was left paraplegic as a result of a devastating automobile accident in 1990. By 1992, she was awarded a settlement to help pay for medical and extraordinary living expenses she will incur as she gets older.

Kristen's settlement was constructed to accrue interest to provide for her future living expenses. Yet, Kristen must pay Federal income tax on this interest based on the salaries of her parents.

This is policy that is unfair and incognizant of the very special needs that Kristen and children like her have. The tax policy punishes families who are responsible preparing for the future. These families are trying to keep themselves solvent, while constructing a durable settlement that grows with their children and contributes to expenses associated with their rehabilitation or survival.

Moreover, in this case, the Parisi's are not trying to camouflage assets by pouring them into their children's account. This is an insult to any family of modest means whose child has been permanently injured through no fault of his or her own.

The law must be changed. Even the Internal Revenue Service [IRS] is sympathetic to this situation and is asking for legislative action to remedy it. I am attaching a copy of its letter to me explaining the need for narrowly drafted legislation to help these children.

I understand that our tax committees in Congress are exceedingly busy with the health care challenge in the coming weeks. But before this session ends, we should at least be able to adopt reasonable measures to revise the Tax Code and provide for fundamental fairness for our children in need.

I am also soliciting the support of the Children's Defense Fund, the American Bar Association, and other groups interested in tax reform, children, and disabilities.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,

Washington, DC, May 23, 1994.

HON. SHERWOOD BOEHLERT,  
Member of Congress, Utica, NY

DEAR MR. BOEHLERT: This is in further response to your letter to the Internal Revenue Service enclosing correspondence from your constituents, Mr. and Mrs. Peter Parisi, regarding the tax treatment of their daughter's trust fund.

Before the Tax Reform Act of 1986, if income-producing assets were transferred to a minor child, income earned on those assets was taxed to the child at the child's rate. Congress believed those rules provided inappropriate tax incentives to shift income-producing assets among family members. In particular, under prior law parents whose income would be taxed at a high marginal rate were encouraged to transfer income-producing property to a child to ensure that the income was taxed at the child's lower marginal rates. In order to reduce the opportunity for tax avoidance through transfers of income-producing property to minor children, Congress enacted a provision as part of the 1986 Act to tax the unearned income of a minor child under age 14 at the parent's marginal rates. This also reflects the belief that the family, in particular parents and dependent children, is the appropriate unit for determining tax liability.

We are aware of situations such as your constituents' daughter's where the minor child's unearned income is not attributable to property transferred by family members. We are sympathetic to her situation. Unfortunately, legislation would be required to provide an exception from the general rule for unearned income received by a minor.

We hope that this information is helpful to you in responding to your constituent. Please let us know if we can be of further assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL B. LEVY,  
Assistant Secretary  
(Legislative Affairs).

### VOTES MISSED ON H.R. 3838, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORIZATION

#### HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, last week my colleagues voted to support the final passage of H.R. 3838, Housing and Community Development Authorization. This legislation reauthorized for 1995 and 1996, most existing housing programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Farmer's Home Administration [FmHA]. Included were measures that would provide loans to families in need, allow HUD to provide incentives for tenants to get jobs and continue working, and regulatory relief for soundly run local public housing authorities. H.R. 3838 embodies the ideas central to reform efforts: work, responsibility, and flexibility for State programs.

During the last days of debate on H.R. 3838, my attendance was required in Oklahoma and I was unable to vote on an amendment by Congressman JAY KIM of California which would have prohibited illegal immigrants

from receiving benefits under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's emergency food and shelter programs; an amendment by Congresswoman MARGE ROUKEMA of New Jersey which would not apply Congressman KIM's amendment during federally declared disasters; Congressman SERRANO's amendment which required Federal funding to States to enforce Congressman KIM's amendment; and on final passage of H.R. 3838. Had I been present, I would have voted for final passage of H.R. 3838, Congresswoman ROUKEMA's amendment, and Congressman SERRANO's amendment. I would not have voted for Congressman KIM's amendment. The Roukema and Serrano amendments would continue to allow relief to States which in times of emergency must deal with the needs of all families. Without these amendments to Mr. KIM's amendment, the cost shift to States and local charities during times of need, like when floods raged through the Midwest last year, would be unbearable.

The fact that people are immigrating illegally to this country is a big problem. In 1990, Congress created the bipartisan Commission on Immigration Reform. The Commission is to report recommendations to Congress September 30 of this year. The solution to the illegal immigration problem is not to take financial options away from States during times of emergency, but to better enforce our borders and immigration laws that prevent illegal immigrants from entering and remaining in the country. I look forward to the recommendations from the bipartisan Commission.

#### PLIGHT OF CITIZENS OF ANGOLA

### HON. JAMES H. BILBRAY

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to the plight of the citizens of Angola. We have all seen the horrible pictures of human death and disease coming out of Rwanda. In order to avoid a repeat of this situation in Angola, the United States and the international community must unite behind the country democratically elected Government to help bring an end to 19 years of civil war in Angola.

Angola's President José Eduardo dos Santos, was elected in September 1992 in an election declared free and fair by the United Nations. The opposition National Union for the Total Independence of Angola [UNITA] led by Jonas Savimbi, not satisfied with the election results, renounced the election and, therefore, democracy by resorting to armed attacks.

The U.N. Security Council has strongly condemned the attacks by UNITA, stating that they were a clear violation of Security Council resolutions and international laws. The Security Council has further called upon UNITA to immediately cease its armed attacks and abide by the rules of international humanitarian law.

We in the Congress have recently witnessed the triumph of democracy of South Africa and the sordid tragedy of Rwanda. Angola now faces a choice: to travel down the road to

democracy and peace to take the dark, forbidding road of conflict and bloodshed. We must help Angola choose the path to peace and avoid a repeat of the disaster in Rwanda.

The negotiations in Lusaka have reached an unfortunate stalemate despite the commitment and many concessions put forward by President dos Santos. Mr. Speaker, the President of Angola has proven to be a visionary and effective leader for his country. He is the best hope for a lasting peace in a country that has endured 19 years of fighting. It is time for the United States to do whatever it can to ensure that both sides the Lusaka Agreement and that the agreement is properly implemented and enforced.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to recommend to my colleagues an article written by President dos Santos that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on June 29, 1994.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 29, 1994]

#### ANGOLA SEEKS PEACE WITH UNITA REBELS

(By Jose Eduardo dos Santos)

Reconciliation, reform, and renewal are the guiding principles behind Angola's efforts to bring peace and a better life to all our people. We know there is a wide gap between making peace and making peace work, and we are trying to bridge that chasm by building a solid structure for Angola's future.

We are negotiating peace with full dedication, but we are not waiting until the talks in Lusaka, Zambia, are completed before embarking on the future. We realize there is only so much we can do in the absence of a peace agreement, no matter what we and our friends would prefer. But even if the unthinkable happens and the negotiations fail, we intend to carry out our program to the greatest extent possible.

The seeds we are planting need the sunshine of peace to flourish and make our young democracy bloom. But even if we must begin in the shade, we are ready.

Our nation has been deeply divided for too long. It cries out for reconciliation. As the democratic revolution of the 1990s swept much of the world, we moved quickly to end our civil war and hold elections. The September 1992 voting was internationally recognized as free and fair. Tragically, the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA) rejected the outcome and has been trying ever since to overrule the voters by waging a civil war far bloodier than in Yugoslavia, Armenia, South Africa, Rwanda, and Burundi.

We have tried to be generous at the peace table in the spirit of national healing. Conscious of our responsibility, the Angolan government is striving to achieve understanding in a peaceful manner while protecting people and their homes from rebel violence.

We have been generous in offering UNITA a significant place in government at the national, provincial, and local levels. Our May 27th proposal has been lauded by the United States and most United Nations Security Council members, as well as impartial observers at the Lusaka talks, and they have urged UNITA to "follow suit."

We are prepared to welcome UNITA into the government and provide housing and jobs for war veterans, refugees, and displaced persons from all sides. We are committed to the reintegration of rebel forces into Angolan society because we believe that helping former soldiers is essential to removing the seeds of war.

To make reconciliation succeed, we have embarked on a reform program to improve the quality of life—economically, socially, and politically—for all Angolans. We are accelerating the transition to a free-market economy, privatizing most state businesses, bringing down inflation, tightening monetary supplies, correcting pricing mechanisms, cutting deficits through vigorous budget control, and slashing state bureaucracy. We are creating a legal, economic, and political climate attractive to foreign investment.

Special attention is being paid to renewal, repair, and reconstruction of our agricultural, housing, transportation, energy, and water systems, as well as to professional training. This will be done in all corners of our country, particularly those under rebel control, so that shortages of these vital elements do not become pretexts to sabotage the peace agreement.

It is a source of great national pride that President Clinton acknowledged the historic achievement of our elections and recognized our government by establishing full diplomatic relations on May 19, 1993.

Our commitment to democracy is genuine and permanent, not a propaganda declaration rendered transparent by a refusal to accept the decision of the voters.

We have embarked on a new relationship with the U.S. Angola is America's second-largest foreign trade partner in sub-Saharan Africa. The Angolan government has approved a Memorandum of Agreement with the Overseas Private Investment Corporation that will open the doors for direct American investment. The U.S. has been generous in providing humanitarian relief, but that has been only a fraction of what it spent in the last decade to arm our enemies. Now that we are friends, we look forward to expanding our alliance as partners in building peace.

We are prepared to take risks for peace, and we look to our stronger friends to help us minimize those risks.

Many Angolans, weary of holding out the olive branch only to have it shot off, question whether we should be so forthcoming because it may be perceived by our enemies as a sign of weakness, encouraging them to take future grievances and demands to the battlefield. But we are steadfastly committed to a negotiated settlement and are prepared to make significant compromises because we want more than a piece of paper; we want a real working peace.

We cannot afford to make mistakes because they could prove fatal for our country and our burgeoning democracy. With the friendship and support of the U.S., I am confident we can build the national consensus to permit us to go the extra mile along the perilous path we have charted.

#### REFORMING WELFARE

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, July 27, 1994, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### REFORMING WELFARE

Most of the people I talk to think the welfare system requires radical change. They

say that welfare costs too much, saps the spirit of recipients, and discourages work and marriage. In many ways the current system is at odds with the core American values of work, family, and responsibility. It does not reward work; too often it discourages work. It does not strengthen families; it penalizes two-parent families. It does not instill personal responsibility; it lets many absent parents off the hook. It does not promote self-sufficiency; it often encourages dependence.

#### THE CURRENT SYSTEM

Welfare is made up of several need-based programs: Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), Medicaid, and food and housing benefits. AFDC provides cash assistance to needy families in which one parent is either absent, disabled, deceased, or unemployed. Those receiving AFDC are eligible for Medicaid benefits, which cover doctor and hospital costs for the poor and long-term disabled. Many also receive food stamps and housing subsidies. EITC offers a tax credit for the working poor employed in the private sector.

Five million households, including 9.6 million children, currently receive welfare benefits, a 31% increase since 1989. The recent surge is largely due to the recession, the scarcity of good-paying jobs for the unskilled, and the rise in households headed by single mothers. AFDC recipients are typically mothers with little education or work experience and with small children at home. The average welfare family has two children. In 1991, 38% of the recipients were white; about the same percentage was black and approximately 17% Hispanic. Over a lifetime more than one third of all recipients receive benefits for less than two years, about one quarter for eight years or more.

States administer AFDC and set eligibility standards and maximum benefit levels. The federal government pays at least 50% of a state's AFDC benefits and administrative costs. In fiscal year 1993, combined state and federal AFDC benefits totalled \$22.6 billion, with families receiving on average \$377 per month \$263 in Indiana. In 1993, AFDC costs represented 1.1% of federal spending and 3.4% of state spending.

#### RECENT REFORMS

In recent years a flurry of reforms have been tried, all of them intended to make welfare a bridge to self reliance. These include federal work and training programs such as the Work Incentive (WIN) program, expansion of the EITC, and the comprehensive 1988 Family Support Act. This law required states to set up an education, training and jobs program (called JOBS—Job Opportunities and Basic Skills) for recipients, to provide transitional Medicaid and child care benefits for those who begin working, and to garnish wages of absentee parents for child support payments. The JOBS program is targeted on those most likely to become long-term AFDC recipients.

Due to shrinking budgets, states have been unable to take full advantage of federal matching funds available for the JOBS program. Still, some initial evaluations are encouraging. In studies of some California and Florida counties, earnings gains among those in the JOBS program exceeded gains by those not in the program by 7% to 53%. Welfare benefits among those enrolled in JOBS also declined, and exits from AFDC increased.

#### CURRENT EFFORTS

But more needs to be done. In considering additional reforms, one theme to take into

account is that society's obligation to help those in need is balanced by the recipient's obligation to society. Another is to make work pay, in order to cut welfare costs and promote self-sufficiency. A third theme is to strengthen the family. I am critical of welfare regulations which sometimes divide families by limiting benefits when the father lives in the house. I also believe child support enforcement must be further tightened. Other themes are to pay more attention to education and to allow states greater flexibility over certain aspects of welfare policy.

To achieve such reforms, some advocate strengthening the JOBS program already in place. Others encourage new penalties and rewards, including time limits on AFDC benefits for those physically able to work, denial of additional benefits for additional children, subsidized jobs for those unable to find work, and further expansion of the EITC. Many such reforms are being tried at the state level, including Indiana.

The Clinton Administration's new welfare reform proposal focuses on making work pay. The core of the proposal is a mandatory education-and-training program for able-bodied beneficiaries born after 1971. Participants would be encouraged to look for jobs and would be given job search assistance, and benefits would be cut off after two years. Those unable to find a job would be offered community service or subsidized private-sector jobs. The President's plan also calls for a campaign against teenage pregnancy, improvements in child support enforcement, loss of benefits for parents who refuse to participate in job-training programs, increased child care for the working poor and other incentives for recipients to work.

#### EXPLANATION OF H.R. 4825

### HON. AUSTIN J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to explain H.R. 4825 which I introduced on July 25. This reform legislation will establish fairer appellate procedures for handling Federal employee claims for compensation for work-related injuries.

Throughout my 18 years in Congress I have been diligent in my quest to make the Department of Labor's Office of Workers Compensation Programs more responsive to the needs of injured Federal workers. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor Standards, Occupational Health and Safety which has oversight of Federal workers compensation program, I have observed that the OWCP has structural and procedural problems and is in need of meaningful reform.

The OWCP is very competent at the task of resolving a high volume of relatively routine cases expeditiously and with a high degree of professionalism. Unfortunately, once the case proceeds beyond the routine, the needs of the injured are placed in jeopardy.

One of the most frustrating aspects of the FECA program to the vocal cadre of dissatisfied claimants is the lack of real administrative due process. The way the current system is administered, there is not even the appearance of impartiality in the appeals procedure. If an individual doesn't like the OWCP determination on a claim, the disappointed claimant

must request a review by another OWCP employee who works for the same boss. Unless the first case officer is acting contrary to law or his superior's instructions, why would we expect a different result or an independent attitude from someone else reporting to the same director.

The purpose of this legislation is to conform the FECA appeals procedure as near as possible to the three-tiered system which has worked so well in the Black Lung and Longshore and Harbor Workers Compensation Programs. In these two programs, intermediate administrative appeals are conducted by an administrative law judge under the procedural safeguards of the Administrative Procedure Act. While we have received complaints that the eligibility criteria for these two programs are too stringent, we never receive the allegations of conspiracy and malfeasance that regulatory plague the Federal Employees Compensation Program.

Last year, House Education and Labor Committee Chairman William D. Ford and I asked the Comptroller General of the United States to have the General Accounting Office investigate the U.S. Department of Labor's administration of the Federal Employees Compensation Act. Although the report was inconclusive as to the impropriety of decisions by the FECA program or the Employees Compensation Appeals Board, the mere possibility of collusion caused me to prepare this reform legislation.

The House Majority Leader, in the waning days of the first session, introduced reform legislation calling for a more effective, efficient and responsive Government. A portion of this legislation provided for a deterrence of fraud and abuse in the FECA Program. The Government Reform and Savings Act of 1993 mandates fines and imprisonment of any individual convicted of fraud in the application or receipt of benefits. Now today, I offer for the consideration of the Congress this bill that will further reform FECA to allow for an administrative law judge to conduct appellate hearings of OWCP decisions.

I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me as cosponsors of this important workers compensation reform legislation.

BUSINESSMAN-ELECTED OFFICIAL  
JOHN A. MURPHY IS MOURNED

### HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest public servants I have ever known passed away after a long illness.

John A. Murphy, 89, was long active in local political life, having served as a councilman and supervisor in the town of Hoosick and as Rensselaer County legislator.

But like every other community leader I have had the pleasure to know, John Murphy was much more than a local politician. He was the manager of local supermarkets for many years and also operated a grocery store in Hoosick Falls.

Mr. Murphy was an active communicant of Immaculate Conception Church and was an active member of the Knights of Columbus. For many years he was a strong booster of St. Mary's Academy in Hoosick Falls, from which he graduated in 1921. He also belonged to the Elks Lodge and Derby Club in Hoosick Falls.

If he was best known for the elected offices he held, it was because he was universally respected and an inspiration to me when I began my own public life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this House to join me in expressing condolences to his wife, Loretta, and to the rest of the family for their great loss. John A. Murphy was a great American, he was a great friend, and he will be sorely missed by all who knew and loved him.

#### HONORING TWO CONSTITUENTS

##### HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the contributions of Howard B. Neufeld and Joan Nina Birn, two of my constituents who are to be married on August 7, 1994.

Mr. Neufeld is the administrator of the Judith Lynn Home for Adults, one of the finest adult care facilities in New York. He has also served the community as president of Young Israel of Co-op City, president to the Co-op City Jewish Community Council, treasurer of the Bronx Jewish Community Council, and a board member of the Bronx Jewish Relations Council. In all his endeavors, Mr. Neufeld has worked to foster understanding and cooperation among people in the community.

Joan N. Birn works as a data processing analyst at the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association—College Retirement Equities Fund. She has also served the community ably as a member of the Remona Chapter of Amit Women and a board member of the Beth Jacob Beth Miriam School.

As they go forward through life together, I know Howard Neufeld and Joan N. Birn will continue to use their talents to serve the community and enrich their own relationship. I wish them the best of luck and much happiness in their marriage.

#### LEGISLATION RESOLVING BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION'S FEDERAL DEBT

##### HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am joined by 10 of my Northwest colleagues in introducing legislation designed to resolve the longstanding battle over the Bonneville Power Administration's debt to the Federal Treasury. This bill is fair to the U.S. Treasury and fair to Northwest electric ratepayers.

Northwest electric ratepayers have been under attack from three successive administra-

tions, starting with President Reagan's attempt to sell the Bonneville Power Administration to private investors, and going straight through to Vice President AL GORE's Government re-invention proposal, which would have raised BPA's rates unacceptably. Speaker FOLEY and Senator HATFIELD deserve a lot of credit for protecting the Northwest from those attacks. Now is time to settle the matter once and for all.

Very simply this bill will refinance the present value of Bonneville's appropriated Treasury debt at prevailing interest rates. In addition, we in the Northwest are agreeing to pay the Treasury \$100 million as a refinancing fee. It is a steep price, we believe, but will provide us a guarantee against future attacks on our debt repayment terms.

I am pleased to say that the administration agrees with this approach and has agreed, by and large, with the terms of this bill. We still have some details to work out, but the largest share of the work is behind us.

One significant provision in this bill allows BPA to include a provision in its power sales contracts with its utility customers that will enable Northwest utility customers and their ratepayers to make claims against the U.S. Treasury in the event any future Congress or administration seeks to alter the terms of this debt refinancing agreement. We believe this is a necessary protection for our ratepayers against specious claims of Federal subsidies.

Allegations of so-called Federal subsidies for Pacific Northwest electric ratepayers have created a substantial degree of uncertainty for the Bonneville Power Administration and the region's economy. This bill will settle that issue for the foreseeable future and represents an important element in our efforts to keep the region's economy strong and growing.

#### GABE PRESSMAN: A JOURNALIST FOR ALL SEASONS

##### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues here in the House, the story of one of the finest journalists ever to cover a story, walk a beat, and who helped pioneer broadcast journalism to what we know today. That TV newsman is none other than Gabe Pressman.

Gabe Pressman is a true go-getter—that's his style. He helped to invent local broadcast journalism and was the first broadcaster in New York to take to the streets to cover stories. Pressman is one who still tries to make a good story out of complicated and controversial community issues.

His journalism career really began in 1949, where after a 3-year stint in the Navy, followed by journalism school and freelancing in Europe as well as working in newsrooms around New York and New Jersey, Pressman began working in the city hall bureau of the New York World Telegram. In 1954, he began working for WRCA radio and WRCA-TV,

which would later become WNBC and WNBC TV. As it happened, this would be Gabe's transition to television and this is where he would remain.

If one were to describe Gabe Pressman, it would be said that he believes in hard news coverage—that news reporters should be known not only for their completeness, but for their credibility—that news reporters should genuinely care about the city in which they cover and know it well and that no obstacle is ever too great in getting a news story. This is the Gabe Pressman that everyone knew—this is the Gabe Pressman that we know today.

#### TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY DEVELOPS AND BROADENS RELATIONSHIPS WITH MEXICO

##### HON. GREG LAUGHLIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the efforts of Texas A&M University to develop and broaden relationships with Mexico. Texas A&M has been a leader in strengthening ties with universities, agencies, and the private sector in Mexico. Particular emphasis in these activities have been in the areas of telecommunications, information technology, environment, the applied sciences, and engineering. As a result of these initiatives, Texas A&M University has from time to time recognized qualified and talented individuals in Mexico who have played important roles in these efforts. Such a person is Ing. Jose Alberto Celestinos.

Ing. Jose Alberto Celestinos Isaacs is recognized for his contribution to the development of the petroleum and chemical industry in Mexico, and for his vision and leadership in stimulating important new initiatives between Mexico and the United States in conjunction with the North American Free-Trade Agreement. Ing. Celestinos has held many positions of increasing responsibility, culminating in his current role in which he directs all activities relating to refining production for Pemex, Petroleos de Mexicanos.

Ing. Celestinos, a chemical engineer who is a native of Tampico in the State of Tamaulipas, received his academic training from the National Autonomous University of Mexico and the National School of Chemical Sciences. He has spent most of his professional career since 1955 with Pemex, but for 5 years, from 1977 to 1982, guided the refining and chemical petroleum directorate of the Instituto Mexicano del Petroleo [IMP]. IMP is recognized internationally for the strength of its research and development activities in petroleum related fields. Ing. Celestinos has served in important academic roles as well and holds the positions of professor of physics at the Nautical School of Tampico and professor of electrochemistry at the Iberoamericana University in Mexico City. He has published internationally in the fields of expertise relating to improving the efficiency of petroleum refining processes to yield reduced emissions and better energy utilization and environmental protection. He has organized several global

conferences addressing these topics. Ing. Celestinos is active in numerous professional organizations in the fields of chemistry, petroleum engineering, and chemical engineering. Ing. Celestinos has received recognition from many organizations for his contributions to improving chemical processes, limiting hydrocarbon emissions and emphasizing ecological awareness.

Furthermore, Ing. Celestinos is also recognized here for his emerging leadership for building strong and meaningful ties between Mexico and the United States, especially in the critical fields of information technology and telecommunications relating to the energy sector. Through his vision, the critical flow of information in these important fields promises to grow and flourish to the clear benefit of both of our countries. Ing. Celestinos has our gratitude and recognition for these crucial efforts.

IN MEMORIAM: PATRICK J. HILLINGS, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS

**HON. ALFRED A. (AL) McCANDLESS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, one of my most distinguished constituents, former Member of Congress Patrick J. Hillings, finally succumbed to cancer, after a long and valiant battle, and passed away on July 20.

Pat served in this body for 8 years in the 1950's, having been elected to the district vacated by the late President Richard Nixon when he was elected to the U.S. Senate. They worked closely as a House-Senate team on behalf of southern California. Pat's subsequent lifelong relationship with the late President brought much joy to both their lives.

Pat's post-Congress professional life as an attorney also brought joy to the many immigrant families who were guided through the labyrinthian legal system of naturalization; he clearly enjoyed bringing families together, and he did an excellent job of it for many years, working closely with his dear wife Celia, who worked with him side by side as his paralegal assistant.

A native Californian, Pat Hillings loved his family, his country, helping people, and traveling across this great land. He was a unique individual, and he left indelible impressions on all whose paths he crossed. Our deep sympathies are extended to his wife and his children during this difficult time.

SALUTE TO ELI LILLY AND CO.

**HON. DAN BURTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Eli Lilly and Co., the well-known pharmaceutical manufacturers from my district in Indianapolis, IN, for their unprecedented response to the terrible tragedy unfolding in Rwanda. Eli Lilly is donating enough an-

tibiotic medication to care for over 1 million refugees suffering in Goma, Zaire. A huge donation of gastrointestinal disease-fighting medicine is also being donated.

Eli Lilly and Co. deserve our gratitude and a hearty salute for their good citizenship and humanitarian concern. I commend this news release on the matter to the attention of my colleagues.

LILLY RUSHES ANTIBIOTIC AID TO MORE THAN ONE MILLION RWANDAN REFUGEES

Eli Lilly and Company late yesterday began shipment of enough antibiotic product to provide relief to more than one million Rwandan refugees. This aid represents the largest product donation in Lilly's history and is believed to be the largest one-time pharmaceutical product donation ever.

"This effort is yet another example of Lilly's commitment to giving, especially in times of human tragedy. We are responding to the dire needs of the Rwandan refugees and are assisting with our strength in the area of infectious disease," said Randall L. Tobias, chairman and chief executive officer.

Distribution of the product will be coordinated through relief organizations, including MAP International and the American Red Cross. This donation will provide individual courses of antibiotic therapy for nearly 1.3 million Rwandan refugees.

The United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) facilitated and supported Lilly in its initiative to donate the new twice-daily dosage form of Ceclor®, the world's largest selling oral antibiotic. This sustained released formulation of Ceclor, which, when approved by the FDA, will be called Ceclor CD, is currently available in several international markets.

Under the special circumstances of the Rwandan relief effort, the FDA granted Lilly permission for export of the product which is pending approval.

In anticipation of FDA approval of Ceclor CD, Lilly had increased its production of this formulation. Regulatory approval has been delayed to the point that existing inventory will be too close to the expiration date for marketing purposes, and the product will not be able to be sold in the U.S.

Lilly determined that the best immediate use of the available drug is for the Rwandan relief effort. The delayed approval situation afforded Lilly the unique ability to provide aid on an unusually large scale for the biggest refugee disaster in modern history.

In addition to the donation of the antibiotic, Lilly has donated approximately \$2 million worth of Axid®, a medicine used to treat ulcer and gastrointestinal diseases.

Lilly is a global research-based pharmaceutical corporation headquartered in Indianapolis, Indiana, that is working with its customers worldwide to help ensure that diseases are prevented, managed, and cured with maximum benefit and minimum cost to patients and society.

STAATSBURG, NY, FIRE DEPARTMENT CELEBRATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

**HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, those of you have been to my office know that the walls of the reception area are lined with fire helmets.

It's my small way of paying respect to volunteer firefighters, having been one myself for 20 years in my hometown, and therefore knowing what a great job they do. Today, I'd like to single out one of those volunteer fire companies, the Staatsburg Fire Department, which is celebrating its 100th year of service this Saturday, August 6.

Mr. Speaker, in rural districts like the New York 22d, the only available fire protection comes from volunteer companies, which are made up of people from every income level and walk of life. What they all have in common is civic pride and a high level of dedication. In New York State, for example, volunteer firemen save countless lives and billions of dollars worth of property. Volunteers attend frequent training classes to upgrade their skills, and the result shows in their quick responses to fire alarms and their professionalism in extinguishing fires.

Nothing is more all-American, as far as I'm concerned, than volunteer firefighting. It's exactly this desire to treat one's neighbors like family and to come to their aid in times of danger that sets Americans apart.

The Staatsburg Fire Department has been typical in that regard for one century now. They will celebrate that century with exhibits, demonstrations, sports and some great food, and I'm looking forward to joining them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and all Members to join me in a salute to the Staatsburg Fire Department for its 100 years of outstanding fire protection.

HONORING CHARLES TOKER

**HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I recognize today the contributions made by Charles Toker to the communities I represent as he celebrates his 60th birthday this month.

As a native of the Bronx, Mr. Toker has dedicated much of his life to assisting the development of the borough. For nearly 30 years, he worked for Chemical Bank, except for a brief period in the 1970's when he worked for the Beaumont School for Special Children. He was a founding member of an athletic club and has often entertained others through his musical skills.

Mr. Toker is also a dedicated father, grandfather and neighbor, and everyone who has been touched by his positive personality are grateful for his friendship. On behalf of all the people who have come to appreciate and respect Charles Toker, I wish him continued success and good health.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN J. DRISCOLL

**HON. SAM GEJDENSON**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, the State of Connecticut has lost one its most popular and

charismatic labor leaders. John J. Driscoll died on Thursday, July 21, at the age of 82. John's decades of dedication to our State's working families earned him the title of "Mr. Labor."

In 1935, Mr. Driscoll became the first secretary-treasurer of the Connecticut Congress of Industrial Organizations. He later went on to serve as president of the Connecticut AFL-CIO, a position he held for nearly a quarter-century before his retirement in 1985.

After leaving that post, Mr. Driscoll taught at the University of Connecticut. He also remained committed to Connecticut citizens, working tirelessly to help those who lost their jobs due to plant closings.

Mr. Driscoll was made a Knight of St. Gregory by Pope Paul VI for his work with the Diocesan Labor Institute, and was awarded Italy's Star of Solidarity for his efforts in flood relief. He is survived by his wife Margaret, a son, and grandson.

The loss of John Driscoll will be felt deeply throughout Connecticut. His determination and compassion are an example for us all.

#### LEINER HEALTH PRODUCTS

### HON. WALTER R. TUCKER III

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the U.S. Pharmacopeial Convention, Inc. [USP] and Leiner Health Products. The congressionally mandated USP has spent 2 years developing voluntary standards for vitamins and minerals to give consumers the ability to identify products that have been produced to exacting standards. Leiner Health Products has become the first and to date, the only company to produce products to meet these pharmaceutical-level standards.

The USP is a nongovernmental, voluntary organization that has been setting standards to ensure the integrity and uniform quality of drug products since 1820. Recognizing the growing importance of nutrition and supplements to the Nation's health, USP began 2 years ago to develop the first quality standards ever established for vitamins.

USP is to be commended for this move to protect the consumer and Leiner Health Products should receive particular recognition for becoming the first company to bring these standards to the marketplace. There have been debates in this chamber about labeling requirements for nutritional supplements, but there can be no argument about the need for consumers to be assured that the products in the package are manufactured to the highest standards of purity, potency, disintegration, and dissolution. The USP standards mean that consumers can be sure that the formulation is precise and that product performance and quality will be at the levels usually reserved for pharmaceutical products.

This did not come without a commitment. Leiner recently invested \$40 million in upgrading its facilities in Garden Grove, CA, and is opening a new facility in Carson, CA which will eventually provide some 700 new jobs. Leiner Health Products plans to invest another \$10

million in its quality control laboratories to meet the new standards.

GENERAL WAX: "I'D LIKE TO HAVE ABOUT 200 C-17S RIGHT NOW"

### HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, as the House prepared to debate on an amendment to restore the line for the C-17 military transport plane in the fiscal year 1995 defense authorization bill from four to six planes, I spoke on the House floor about the important capability that the C-17 will provide for our forces well into the next century.

In my statement, I quoted virtually every senior civilian and military leader as they emphasized the need for the C-17, both to meet the requirements of our military personnel as they project force throughout the world and to fulfill critical humanitarian missions. A chart, which the Air Force had developed, starkly showed just how much more could be done with the C-17 than could be achieved by other alternatives. And senior military officers cited examples of the additional capability the C-17 could have provided in Somalia or Bosnia.

The unique capabilities of the C-17 which make it so valuable, particularly in less developed parts of the world, include its ability to land on shorter, austere airfields and the ability to get the critical cargo off the plane and to those in need. And the C-17 does all of this far more quickly than do other transport aircraft.

The tragic situation today in Rwanda provides another example of the difference the C-17 could make in an emergency. In the July 25, 1994, USA Today, Brig. Gen. Charles Wax, commander of the worldwide control center for U.S. transport and tanker planes, made it clear that he anxiously awaits the C-17 and the critical capability it provides.

USA Today reporter Steve Komarow, in the article, "U.S. Gears Up for Major Relief Effort," writes:

Wax says Goma [Zaire] is an example of where the not-yet-ready C-17 transport would be useful. "One C-17 would represent about 3½ to 4 C-141 loads," he says. "I'd like to have about 200 of them right now."

The action by the House and Senate in approving the President's request for six C-17's in fiscal year 1995 is an important step toward providing the size C-17 fleet our military commanders say they need to meet their military and humanitarian missions. I hope that House and Senate conferees now working to resolve differences in the two versions of the defense bill will provide necessary funding and settlement language so that our troops in the field will have the airplane they say they need—the C-17—to meet their needs both now and well into the future.

General Wax would like 200 C-17's, and he would like them as soon as possible. He is not alone. The C-17 is a top priority for the Air Force and the Department of Defense. As General Wax's statement about the Rwandan

refugees so clearly reflects, it should be a top priority for all of us as we seek ways to assist those who would benefit from the capability it provides.

SALUTING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KANSAS CITY CALL

### HON. ALAN WHEAT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, on July 22, the Kansas City Call, a minority-owned newspaper in Missouri's Fifth District, celebrated its 75th anniversary. Known for its commitment to social justice and racial equality, the Call has been a mainstay in Kansas City's black community for four generations and has gained national recognition for maintaining the highest standards of journalistic integrity.

The editor and publisher of the Call, Miss Lucile Bluford, is a national figure in her own right, known for her commitment to civil rights and her voracious pursuit of the truth. Miss Bluford began her career in journalism more than half a century ago. In the 1920's, when she was beginning to decide on a career, Miss Bluford opted to pursue her dream of writing for a newspaper, even though opportunities for black women at that time were few and far between.

A champion of equal rights for all people, Miss Bluford continues to use the Call as a voice for social change. As she stated in her editorial printed in the Call's 75th anniversary edition, "Our job over the years has been not to print news about the happenings in the community, but to advocate and to campaign for justice, first-class citizenship, democracy and fairness."

And, Mr. Speaker, Miss Bluford is joined by Donna Stewart, who must also be commended for the energy, commitment, and intelligence she has displayed as managing editor of the Call.

Over the span of 75 years, the Call has covered the issues at the heart of the community. From its anti-lynching campaigns of the 1920's, to its successful fight against racist policies at the University of Missouri in the 1930's, to its present-day battle against black-on-black crime, the Call has kept readers abreast of each of these pressing social issues week in and week out. It will surely continue to be a voice for social justice for many years to come.

After 75 years of not missing an issue, the Call's commitment to serving the community continues undaunted. For as is noted in its diamond anniversary edition, the Call will continue to speak "for the right of every citizen, regardless of color, to have decent housing, employment, good schools, and equal opportunities."

I am proud to convey my best wishes and warmest congratulations to the Call on its 75th anniversary. As the Call looks forward to its next 75 years, I am confident that it will continue to build on its established record of seeking truth and social justice, and serving as a shining light and moral compass for our community.

IN TRIBUTE TO CHARLES R.  
MATHEWS**HON. MARGE ROUKEMA**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 28, 1994*

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, our communities and our country have always relied on the contributions of individuals who rise above and beyond the call of duty to make a difference in the lives of others. I pause today to join the town of Newton, NJ, in paying tribute to one such hero, Charles R. Mathews. On July 1, Charlie Mathews retired after serving as an elected municipal official in the town of Newton for over 40 years.

Since 1952, Charlie Mathews has dedicated his energies and efforts to improving the quality of life in the town of Newton. He began his service as town clerk, registrar of vital statistics, and court clerk. During his first years in office, Charlie clearly demonstrated his desire to serve the public good. In 1956, when the residents of Newton adopted a new, council-manager form of government, Charlie Mathews was instrumental in helping the town to adjust to the growing pains associated with changing the form of government. At the same time, he also assumed the duties of finance director. Charlie served Newton in these offices for a total of 8 years before he resigned to enter private business.

In 1962, Charlie Mathews decided to return to public service in the capacity of elected office. That year, Charlie won his first 4-year term on the town council. The following year he accepted his first term as mayor. In the 30 years since, Charlie Mathews was reelected to 4-year council terms a total of eight times and also served as mayor eight times.

Whether in elected office or appointed position, Charlie has worked tirelessly to improve the quality of life for his friends and neighbors in Newton. He oversaw the development and improvement of housing and transportation services for the town's senior citizens. He was instrumental in the planning and construction of new recreational facilities, a municipal building and fire house. He encouraged the expansion of the region's education facilities including the relocation of the Sussex County Community College in the town of Newton. Charlie's dedication and abilities have been recognized throughout the State of New Jersey and in 1984 he was inducted as the president of the NJ State Leagues of Municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Newton, NJ, owe a debt of gratitude to Charlie Mathews for his hard work and friendship. On Friday, July 29, they will gather to recognize and salute his 40 years of service. I ask my colleagues in the House to join with them and me in saying a simple "Thank you and Godspeed" to Charlie Mathews. He has made us all proud.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

STISSING MOUNTAIN 11TH GRADERS  
LEARN FROM WORLD WAR  
II PARTICIPANTS**HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 28, 1994*

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I recently came across more detailed information about an event that intrigued me when I first heard about it last spring.

The students of U.S. History and Government II H Class at Stissing Mountain Junior-Senior High School in Pine Plains, NY held a day-long seminar with veterans of World War II.

Teacher William Brewer wanted to familiarize his students with the causes and effects of America's isolation between the world wars, the threat posed by totalitarian aggression to U.S. security, the personal impact of the war on various participants, the domestic adjustments made during and after the war, and the post-war efforts to maintain the peace.

During the seminar, the students met with veterans of United States forces and of the German Wehrmacht who moved to this country, and to several survivors of Holocaust. These individuals shared their experiences and memories with the students, who were fascinated with the first-hand accounts they heard.

This is the third year Mr. Brewer has organized these seminars for 11th graders. The students collect essays of their impressions in albums and present them to the school library, providing future students with a valuable study resource.

Mr. Speaker, this outstanding project makes history come alive in a way that teaches students the sacrifices and heroism the World War II generation displayed to preserve our freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members to join me in praise of Mr. Brewer and his students for their participation in this worthy school project.

RAILGRADE CROSSING SAFETY  
ENHANCEMENT ACT**HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 28, 1994*

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation—with all of my House colleagues from Indiana as original cosponsors—that is critical to the safety of people in the Hoosier State, as well as across the country. This bill, the Railgrade Crossing Safety Enhancement Act of 1994, is identical to legislation, S. 2286, which was introduced in the Senate by my colleague from Indiana, Senator LUGAR.

The Railgrade Crossing Safety Enhancement Act of 1994 would give States that do not have seatbelt and helmet laws on the books the flexibility to use Federal surface transportation funds diverted to nonconstruction safety education programs for the installation of warning devices at rail crossings.

Under section 153 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, States that do not have laws enforcing seatbelts for motorists and helmets for motorcycle riders must devote 1.5 percent of their Federal surface transportation funds to nonconstruction safety education programs beginning in fiscal year 1995. This percentage increases to 3 percent in fiscal year 1996 and in future fiscal years. This provision limits States' ability to apply these funds for other legitimate safety enhancing projects.

While I support safety education programs, I believe that public safety would be further enhanced by providing States the flexibility to use these diverted funds for one specific, additional purpose: the installation of protective warning devices at rail crossings.

I have a great deal of personal interest in this issue because, several years ago, my mother was involved in a serious rail crossing accident. This year alone, several hundred people across the country will be killed and thousands more injured as a result of vehicle-train collisions. While rail crossing accidents declined last year, the number of fatalities from these accidents increased in 1993 by 8.1 percent.

This problem is particularly acute in Indiana, which ranked third in the country in crossing accidents in 1993, and fourth in people killed. These statistics are especially dire for the communities I represent in northwest Indiana because of the concentration of railroads traversing the area. In 1992, 33 people were killed at crossings in Indiana, one-third of which were in the northwest region of the State. Between 1986 and 1992, 68 people died at railroad crossings in our area. Given these statistics, it is difficult to deny the serious safety hazard posed by unsafe rail crossings.

This legislation is not designed to undermine the safety regulations contained in ISTEA. Railgrade crossing improvements differ from other highway safety projects because they provide a visible and quantifiable return on investment. The sole purpose of safety improvements at grade crossings is to reduce accidents and save lives.

States with a high number of rail crossings and crossing accidents would benefit from the additional flexibility this bill provides. In 1993, 40 percent of grade crossing accidents in the United States—and 31 percent of fatalities—occurred in States that did not meet the Federal safety belt and helmet law requirement in ISTEA.

With this legislation, Governors could request that all or a portion of the diverted surface transportation funds be used to install protective devices at hazardous rail crossings as part of a comprehensive, statewide rail safety improvement and rail safety education initiative.

The purpose of section 153 of ISTEA is to improve safety on our Nation's highways. Because the only conceivable purpose of rail crossing safety equipment is safety, I believe this measure conforms to the original spirit and intent of section 153.

This critical legislation was developed with the full cooperation and support of the Indiana Department of Transportation and the Northwest Indiana Planning Commission. I would

like to thank all of my Indiana colleagues for joining in this effort to give greater flexibility to States' safety initiatives. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you and the rest of my House colleagues to cosponsor this important bill and work together to see that this crucial provision is signed into law.

**INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL  
AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT  
ACT 1994 AND THE MARINE  
AQUACULTURE ENHANCEMENT  
ACT OF 1994**

**HON. GERRY E. STUDDS**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 28, 1994*

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, fish stories are generally about the one that got away. Fortunately, this one is not. It is about fish farms, or aquaculture, an industry that has developed despite the indifference of the Federal Government and an industry that, with a little encouragement, has the potential for tremendous growth.

In Massachusetts, aquaculture has expanded to such a degree over the past decade that shellfish farms have become commonplace on Cape Cod, the islands, and the south shore. With the decline in many traditional commercial stocks and the depletion of haddock and cod, fishermen, who have been leery of aquaculture, are beginning to realize what the Massachusetts aquaculture pioneers already knew: for many, it can be a way to earn a living and support their families while continuing to supply fresh seafood to the American public.

While the success of the industry has been laudable, there are obstacles to even greater growth. Today I am introducing two bills intended to remove these obstacles and promote the development of the aquaculture industry in the United States.

The National Aquaculture Development Act of 1994 is a comprehensive response to problem areas identified by the industry. These include the need to clarify Federal agency responsibilities and authorities for aquaculture; streamline and coordinate regulations and permits; provide greater access to programs available to more traditional farmers; and offer better education and information.

In addition, the bill reauthorizes the National Aquaculture Act of 1980 for an additional 3 years and authorizes appropriations for the three agencies with primary responsibility for aquaculture—Agriculture, Interior, and Commerce—to carry out their responsibilities under the act.

The second bill, the Marine Aquaculture Enhancement Act of 1994, is directed at specific problems faced by the salt water segment of the industry. A 1992 study by the National Academy of Sciences concluded that mariculturists face a host of problems unique to the environment in which they operate—our oceans and bays. These include conflicts with other users, the potential for environmental impacts on the marine environment, and the establishment of economically feasible operations.

Many of these conflicts result from a lack of resources at the State level to plan for and develop regulatory frameworks to guide aquaculture development in the coastal zone. In addition, no Federal regulatory framework exists to govern aquaculture in Federal waters. My bill addresses these issues by providing incentives for States to develop programs in the coastal zone and establishing a framework for issuing permits in Federal waters that will minimize conflict with other users while ensuring that the marine environment is adequately protected.

The bill also establishes a marine aquaculture research and extension program within Sea Grant to provide grants that will encourage the development of new technology that can make operations more economically productive and minimize environmental impacts.

Enactment of the National Aquaculture Development Act and the Marine Aquaculture Enhancement Act will remove many barriers to the growth of a thriving national aquaculture industry, an industry, that, if encouraged, can provide many Americans with good jobs and good food. I urge Members to support and cosponsor these initiatives.

**CONTROLLING COSTS ARE THE  
KEY TO TRUE HEALTH REFORM**

**HON. MICHAEL A. ANDREWS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 28, 1994*

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the deadline for health care reform quickly approaches, it seems that Congress is deadlocked on how best to remedy the ailing health system. In a recent article by the Progressive Policy Institute, David Kendall writes that the core reason for this impasse is due to the displacement of the true goal of reform: controlling costs. I commend the following article to my colleagues:

**BREAKING THE HEALTH REFORM DEADLOCK—  
THE COMPETITIVE PATH TO UNIVERSAL COV-  
ERAGE**

(By David B. Kendall)

The great health care reform debate of 1994 is dissolving into chaos. No less than five Congressional committees are working on different proposals, none of which seems capable of attracting a critical mass of political support. The balkanization of the debate has mystified the public and made it harder to fashion a coherent reform that stands on its own internal logic.

Yet the case for fundamental reform remains compelling: America's health care system is highly inflationary and denies too many people access to affordable care. The Progressive Policy Institute (PPI) believes that President Clinton is right in pressing Congress to enact systemic reform this year.

The Administration, however, has contributed to the impasse by allowing the debate to bog down in the controversy over employer mandates as the means to universal coverage. While universal coverage is a central goal, the first and overriding imperative is to attack the problem at its root: exploding costs. The rapid escalation of health care costs is driving middle-class insecurity about shrinking benefits, the increase in the ranks of the uninsured, the budget deficit,

and lagging corporate investment as health care claims a growing share of business resources.

In "Mandate for Change," PPI defined the central challenge of health care reform:

Far more fundamental is the choice of how to restrain our health system's runaway costs. Many of the political right . . . suggest "the market," without fundamental reform, can cure the health care system's ills. Some on the left suggest that "the market" does not apply to health care, and so the government must step in to set limits on health care prices, and perhaps to become the sole health insurer as well.

This is a false choice. The proper role of government, on health care and elsewhere, is neither to let broken markets run amok, nor to replace the market with bureaucratic mechanisms that set prices and allocate resources. Rather, government's primary role should be to improve the market's ground rules in order to decentralize decision making, spur innovation, reward efficiency, and respect personal choice.<sup>1</sup>

The real danger today is that Congress will concentrate on immediately delivering the most tangible benefits—guaranteed health care coverage and perhaps new additional entitlements as well—while deferring the hard work of restructuring health care markets to constrain runaway costs.

To get health care reform back on track, President Clinton needs to define the common ground on which a broad, bipartisan consensus can be forged. In PPI's view, managed competition is the most plausible common denominator in the health care debate, the least intrusive and most effective means to the end of affordable coverage for all. The essential architecture of the competitive approach can be found in the President's bill and in its two nearest relations: the Cooper-Breaux and Chafee-Thomas bills.<sup>2</sup> The market-based approach is the most likely to constrain medical inflation without government micromanaging of the health care economy and, for that reason, to win broad public backing.

The report examines the three managed competition bills that occupy the vital center of the health reform debate. It also draws on the pioneering work of the Jackson Hole Group, led by Paul Ellwood and Alain Enthoven, especially new refinements outlined in "Managed Competition II."<sup>3</sup> PPI proposes four steps for resolving the key differences among the bills—for illuminating the competitive path to universal health care.

Those steps are:

1. Restrain costs through choice and competition, not government price controls. In health care reform, government's chief responsibility is to fix broken markets, not to set prices and allocate resources. Yet the Administration proposes a shotgun wedding of market incentives and bureaucratic command and control that would undermine the very competition it tries to create. In contrast, true market-based reform decentralizes responsibility for controlling costs to millions of consumers and providers. This is the logic of managed competition, which relies on these key elements: insurance reform to prevent risk-skimming; a standard benefits package; health plan report cards; a cap on tax subsidies for employer-paid health insurance; elimination of the proposed ceilings on employers' health care costs; and the exclusion of inefficient providers by health plans.

<sup>1</sup> Footnotes at end of article.

2. Establish competitive health purchasing groups to organize markets, not regulate them. Market-based reform requires a new institutional framework: purchasing groups that pool the buyer power of small businesses and individuals. The Administration's health alliances have been correctly criticized as new regulatory agencies; the better alternative is to create member-governed purchasing cooperatives that offer a menu of competing plans and report on quality so that consumers can make informed decisions. A network of competing purchasing groups would prevent regulatory encroachment on markets and solve the three key problems facing small businesses: risk-skimming by insurance companies, the lack of health plan choices for small business employees, and high administrative costs.

3. Finance reform on a pay-as-you-go basis, not with unfunded entitlements. A decentralized, market-based approach to health care reform would not create a vast new government entitlement. The history of such entitlements shows clearly that their costs are difficult if not impossible to control: For example, only seven years after they were created, the Medicare and Medicaid programs cost four times more than government projections. Untrammelled entitlement spending is driving the federal budget deficit. Nonetheless, the Administration's bill would create a legal entitlement to comprehensive health benefits and add new entitlements for prescription drugs, long-term care, and health benefits for early retirees. Rather than create entitlements that are likely to be underfunded, we should finance health care reform on a pay-as-you-go basis. We should establish a balanced health security budget that continuously reconciles public spending for health care with revenues designated to pay for reform.

4. Achieve universal coverage step-by-step. From the standpoints of both equity and efficiency, universal coverage is integral to managed competition. But health care reform must end with universal coverage, not begin there. The reason is simple: If we expand demand by adding 39 million new consumers before restructuring markets to make them more efficient, prices will rise dramatically. Yet the Administration courts this danger by insisting on an immediate employer mandate. The following timetable illustrates how a step-by-step approach might work.

1995-1999: Phase in subsidies for needy families gradually as reforms restructure health care markets for greater efficiency. Using a balanced health security budget, savings from the tax cap, and reforms in Medicare and Medicaid would pay for subsidies for low-income households.<sup>4</sup> The priority should be full coverage for those in poverty. Next, those above the poverty line should receive subsidies on a sliding scale; that is, the higher the income, the smaller the subsidy. Subsidies should extend to income levels as high as 240 percent of poverty to allow for a gradual decrease. (Too rapid a decrease might discourage people from working harder to increase their earnings.) When fully phased in these subsidies will extend assistance to about 26 million people or two-thirds of the uninsured. The dramatic result of market reforms and subsidies is that 97 percent of all health care spending would be covered through insurance.<sup>5</sup>

2000: Fully fund subsidies and put in effect an individual mandate. If revenues are not sufficient to ensure full subsidies by the year 2000, Congress would have to act under expedited procedures to make up the shortfall.

Once subsidies to needy families are fully funded, we can in good conscience require everyone to obtain coverage. An individual mandate would add more young and healthy individuals to the insurance pool, thereby lowering everyone's premiums and reducing cost shifting. Those who cannot show proof of coverage (either on their tax forms or when they show up for treatment) would face a stiff sanction of one year's premium plus a 20 percent penalty.

2003: Take additional steps, including an employer mandate if necessary, to achieve comprehensive coverage. Even after market reforms, full subsidies for low-income families, and an individual mandate, some people may still be uninsured. That is because the individual mandate may prove difficult to enforce and may lead some unscrupulous employers to drop coverage for their workers. If by 2003 there is still a significant cost-shifting problem because too many Americans remain uninsured, Congress should take additional steps to capture these remaining free riders. Such steps may include stepped up penalties for free riders, further expansion of subsidies or an employer mandate. The trigger for Congressional action might be the failure to achieve coverage as extensive as Hawaii's (92 percent for the non-elderly). A target of 100 percent coverage is neither realistic nor wise. Instead, we should define universal coverage as reaching that point at which the marginal cost of expanding coverage exceeds the economic benefit of doing so.

The step-by-step approach is preferable to an immediate mandate because it disaggregates America's 39 million uninsured into two groups: Those who cannot get coverage either because they are poor or because insurance companies will not cover them, and free riders who can afford coverage but don't buy it. It is more cost-effective to deal with these groups separately than with a blanket mandate. However, an individual mandate will be necessary to prevent free riders from taking advantage of the system, and the employer mandate should be held in reserve in case the other measures fall short.

Managed competition is not the only school of thought about how to fix America's ailing health care system: There is substantial support among Congressional liberals for a Canadian-style single-payer system. Rather than importing foreign models, however, the challenge facing the United States is to leapfrog the health systems of other advanced countries and create a distinctively American system that combines the best of U.S. medicine and capitalism. Market-based reform would preserve America's status as the world leader in medical technology, leave to decentralized markets rather than public bureaucracies decisions over resource allocation, and give individuals the power and responsibility to control health care costs through their own choices.

President Clinton is right: Americans want fundamental health care reform. What they do not want is a government takeover of the health care system. The President's challenge therefore is to use government's power in a more creative and sophisticated way. Instead of expanding government bureaucracy and regulation—the old Democrat approach—President Clinton should embrace the New Democrat logic that informs many of his other initiatives: using government's power to improve the ground rules for market competition.

The New Democrat approach also avoids the ideological polarization that has so often

frustrated the country's attempts to confront its problems. It holds promise of building a broad coalition in the vital center of American politics. History shows that America's great social reforms have been enacted by wide, bipartisan majorities. Congress passed Social Security by a 10-to-1 margin in 1935 and Medicare by a 3-to-1 margin in 1965. It is time for the President to bring together leaders from both parties to forge a broad, bipartisan agreement for health care reform.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Jeremy D. Rosner, "A Progressive Plan for Affordable, Universal Health Care," in "Mandate for Change," Will Marshall and Martin Schram, eds., p. 108.

<sup>2</sup>Representative Jim Cooper (D-Tenn.) and Senator John Breaux (D-La.) are sponsors of the Managed Competition Act, H.R. 3222/S. 1579. Senator John Chafee (R-R.I.) and Representative Bill Thomas (R-Calif.) are sponsors of the Health Equity and Reform Today Act, H.R. 3704/S. 1770. Senator George Mitchell (D-Maine) and Representative Richard Gephardt (D-Mo.) are sponsors of the Administration's bill, the Health Security Act, H.R. 3600/S. 1757.

<sup>3</sup>Managed Competition II," the Jackson Hole Group, March 18, 1994. See also Paul Ellwood, Alain Enthoven, and Lynn Etheridge, "The Jackson Hole Initiatives for a Twenty-First Century Health Care System," Health Economics, Volume 1, 1992.

<sup>4</sup>The following examples illustrate how the financing might work: According to CBO, the revenue from the tax cap in the Cooper-Breaux bill would range from \$5 billion to \$15 billion in 1999, depending on the size of the standard benefits package. The Medicare savings in 1999 would be \$13 billion in the Cooper-Breaux bill and \$28 billion in the Administration's bill. On average, then, these sources would raise \$30 billion. The cost of the Cooper-Breaux subsidies (to 200 percent of poverty) would range from \$11 billion to \$34 billion over projected Medicaid spending in 1999, again, depending on the size of the benefits. On average, these subsidies would cost \$23 billion, which would leave revenue available for subsidies up to 240 percent of poverty.

<sup>5</sup>Expanding Insurance Coverage Without a Mandate," Lewin-VHI, May 18, 1994.

## UNITED STATES-INDIA RELATIONS

## HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, last month, the internationally known publication *India Abroad* printed an article written by our colleague from New Jersey, [Mr. MENENDEZ], in its Congressional Viewpoints section. Mr. MENENDEZ' article offers a concise and balanced overview of the potential for a new and exciting era in relations between the world's two largest democracies, the United States and India. As Representative MENENDEZ' article points out, the recent visit to Washington by Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao gave added momentum to the general warming trend in our bilateral relations. His article also makes the important point of urging American policymakers—including some Members of this body—to work in a more constructive manner in resolving the differences between our two nations.

As founding members of the congressional caucus on India and Indian-Americans, the gentleman from New Jersey and I are working to promote confidence-building measures that will elevate the Indo-United States partnership on economic, political, and security matters to a higher level. With the end of the cold war and the adoption of sweeping economic reforms by India, there is every reason for India

to be one of our top foreign policy priorities. We are also committed to better representing the needs and interests of our Indian-American constituents, and encouraging their increased participation in the political arena.

I hereby submit our colleague's words for the RECORD.

#### RAO'S VISIT SIGNALS NEW ERA

(By Representative Robert Menendez)

The recent visit to the United States by India Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao will, hopefully, mark the beginning of a new era in U.S.-Indian relations.

Unfortunately, relations prior to the Prime Minister's visit have not been entirely satisfactory. Comments and actions by leaders in both nations have had the effect of straining ties between the world's most populous democracy and the world's oldest democracy.

Rao's trip was the first visit of an Indian Prime Minister to the United States in seven years. I was very impressed with how well he dealt with all of the contentious issues during his meetings in Washington. His meetings with President Clinton and Vice President Gore went well and helped to emphasize the positive aspects in the bilateral relationships.

The Prime Minister took the correct approach when he stressed that we must set Cold War frictions aside and build a new relationship based on a wide range of economic, cultural and diplomatic interests.

In particular, Prime Minister Rao took important steps to expand trade between our two countries. He stressed that India is a natural trading partner for the United States and emphasized his desire to see continued growth in our economic relations. Prime Minister Rao was given the rare honor of addressing a joint session of the United States Congress so that members from both the Senate and House of Representatives were able to interact with him. As a member of the "India Caucus" in the House, I was particularly pleased by the warm reception accorded to him by the Congress.

The Prime Minister's address was most appropriate and set the tone for even better relations in the future. As I listened to his words and reflected upon the improving relations with India that are likely to follow, I was reminded that it was not that long ago that a number of my colleagues, led by Representative Dan Burton (Republican of California), had sought to cut aid to India.

Many of the supporters of the Burton amendment boycotted Rao's speech. I felt that it was inappropriate for these members of Congress to refuse to come to listen to Rao's speech. Even if they disagree with specific policies by the Indian government, they should have shown the courtesy due to a world leader of Rao's stature by attending this session. In addition, they missed a singular opportunity to hear, first hand, how the relationship will develop and grow.

I had opposed the Burton amendment in the past and will do so if it is offered again in the future. My opposition is based upon my belief that this approach would establish an entirely wrong precedent for U.S. relations with India. The aid in question was intended to pay for such programs as health care, childhood immunization against malaria and cholera, and for AIDS education. In addition to selecting the wrong target for cuts, I felt cutting aid to India is a misguided attempt to isolate India at a critical time in its political, economic, and cultural development.

I certainly respect Burton's concern for human rights issues throughout the world.

However, I felt that this approach to addressing these problems was not appropriate. Drastically cutting U.S. assistance to India unless it repeals five of its own domestic security laws will not help the cause of human rights in India. In fact, I am convinced that passing this amendment would only have strengthened the hands of those extremist and fundamentalist groups within India bent on tearing that secular democracy apart.

When the Burton amendment was under consideration by the House, I argued that by punishing and isolating India this amendment will hinder India's efforts to arrive at solutions to the difficult and complex problems in Kashmir and Punjab. These two Indian states face civil insurgencies involving terrorist acts that represent a fundamental challenge to India's national sovereignty.

Additionally, India has the world's sixth largest economy. Only a strong democratic India will be able to secure the recent reforms it has undertaken to open its economy, making it one of the world's most promising markets for U.S. products. Burton's amendments have only narrowly been defeated. He is likely to reintroduce similar measures in the future. Continued vigilance and political activism by the Indian-American community and other friends of India will be required to ensure that these types of amendments are never enacted.

Not all of the actions by the United States government of interest to the Indian-American community involve foreign policy or trade concerns.

For example, I was a strong supporter of the Hate Crimes Sentencing Enhancement Act. This act was modeled on a similar New Jersey law which I helped to draft after a spate of violent acts against Indian Americans in 1987.

The act will increase federal sentencing guidelines, adding an average one-third more prison time for felons convicted of targeting their victims on the basis of race, religion, nationality, gender or sexual orientation. While we can't stop prejudice with a law, we can send a clear message from society that bias crimes are particularly heinous and will be punished accordingly.

I am proud to be a founding member of the recently established India Caucus, a network of House and Senate Members who support strong ties with the Indian-American community and between our nations. I am pleased that participation by Indian Americans at all levels of government is now at an all-time high. It is gratifying that three Indian Americans are now serious candidates in Congressional races and that other Indian Americans are becoming more politically active throughout the country. In the past few years the Indian-American community has certainly become more involved in the American political process. However, the community must continue to become even more active.

As a strong supporter of good relations with India, I was distressed at the relatively sparse attention given to Prime Minister Rao's visit. Certainly the Indian press covered every moment of the trip, but the general media should have done a better job of informing the American people about this most significant diplomatic visit.

In sum, the American government takes many actions that directly affect relations with India and the lives of Indian Americans. Within the next few months, the Congress will consider such issues of direct concern to Indian Americans. The only way to affect how these decisions are reached is to become involved. I applaud the efforts of Indian

Abroad to support this approach and encourage each member of the Indian-American community to expand his or her potential influence by becoming personally engaged in the political process.

(Representative Robert Menendez sits on the subcommittees for International Operations and Western Hemisphere Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.)

#### AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IN THE NEW SECURITY ENVIRONMENT

HON. MARTIN R. HOKE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday I had the privilege of hearing Dick Cheney, the former Secretary of Defense and House Republican conference chairman, deliver some remarks concerning the role of American leadership in the new security environment, and I was very impressed by his insight and vision. What follows are excerpts from this speech.

I commend the speech to my colleagues as both a highly perceptive critique of the current administration's foreign policy and an incisive prescription for American leadership in the 21st century.

#### AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IN THE NEW SECURITY ENVIRONMENT

(By Dick Cheney)

On January 20, 1993, Bill Clinton was given an opportunity any of his predecessors would have envied. He became the first American President to take office as Commander-in-Chief of the world's only superpower.

Under Ronald Reagan and George Bush, we had rebuilt America's defenses. We had won the Cold War. We had rolled back Saddam Hussein's aggression in the Persian Gulf. We had banished the disillusionment of the Vietnam era and restored public respect for the military. We had demonstrated that with sound civilian leadership the magnificent men and women of our armed forces can defeat any adversary. Our military's morale was high and its resources mighty, even with the force reductions after the end of the Cold War.

As the Presidency passed into Mr. Clinton's hands, America had the tools and the credibility to quell crises and capitalize on opportunities. And world peace and freedom depended on it: Nothing was more vital to hopes for peaceful transformation to democracy and free markets in Russia and Eastern Europe than the credibility of American leadership. No efforts to shield the civilized world from the spread of ballistic missiles and nuclear, chemical and biological arms could succeed without American preparedness and American leadership. No deterrent was more effective against powerful tyrannies like North Korea than the clarity and constancy of American leadership.

But in just 18 months, Bill Clinton has squandered the legacy he inherited—and the world has become a more dangerous place. North Korea's communist dictatorship threatens the free world's interests with nuclear proliferation, conventional war in Asia, or both. The development of enduring democratic and market institutions in the former Soviet Union and eastern Europe is in peril. Our strategic relationships with Japan, China, and western Europe have begun to fray. American troops were not adequately

supported in Somalia. And now the President appears ready to send American soldiers into Haiti to install an unstable leftist regime.

The United States faces a full-blown crisis of national security leadership. Bill Clinton has given us one of the last competent administrations in the field of national security and foreign policy that we have had in this century.

The fact is, when Bill Clinton charged into the White House in 1993, he had thought a lot about expanding the domestic powers and costs of government—but when it came to international diplomacy and security, he didn't have a clue.

As I see it, national security leadership has four requirements: vision, strategy, constancy of purpose, and good stewardship of our military forces. Bill Clinton's Administration fails on all four counts.

First comes vision. A leader ought to have moral imagination about the way things ought to be. But national security leadership is not simply a pastime for dreamers. We also have to see realities and possibilities as they are. America has a responsibility to take a practical leadership role in building and expanding zones of peace among the world's democracies, but while doing this, we need to perceive in sharp focus our own priorities and interests—and to advance them proudly. And we must remember two essential points: That peace and freedom in the world depend upon American leadership, and that American leadership depends upon maintaining the world's finest fighting force.

Bill Clinton entered office with gaping holes in his understanding of international economic, political, and military dynamics. More fundamentally, he exhibits no coherent sense of America's purpose and role in the world. Those on his national security team who are not novices are returnees from the Carter Administration. As though the 1980s had never happened, these appointees still nurse groundless notions that anti-Western radicals are our kind of people—just a bit more passionate in political style. They still think that when totalitarians decide to sit down at a negotiating table, they are people just like us. When the President and his national security aides communicate with foreign governments and publics, they project neither the values of the American people nor our common sense. Again and again, Bill Clinton has let domestic political interests drive his foreign policy without any conception of what is in the long-term interests of the United States.

Bill Clinton's second major flaw in international leadership is a lack of strategy. On taking office he let loose a scattershot of initiatives with no apparent regard for context or consequences. His initial policies were about as thoughtful and detailed as bumper sticker slogans.

With Japan, he made trade the be-all and end-all issue. The Clinton team's overheated rhetoric needlessly raised tensions and hurt our political and security relationship with Japan at a sensitive time of change in that country's political history. This, while producing little on the trade front—the one thing Clinton seemed to care about.

In eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, candidate Clinton charged America was not doing enough to aid the transition to democracy and free markets. The presidents of Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary—the most valiant and successful nations in the transformation from Communism—asked President Clinton to support their bid for early integration into NATO. But Clinton rebuffed them, allowing Moscow

to veto this effort to secure their independence.

Meanwhile, the Clinton administration has been inconsistent in its support for economic reformers in Russia itself and throughout the former Soviet empire. Par for the course, Bill Clinton made wildly exaggerated promises of direct financial aid. Then his Deputy Secretary of State, Strobe Talbott, abruptly pulled the rug out from under the known champions of free market transformation in Moscow when he said that Russia needed "less shock and more therapy." Moreover, it is not lost on the men and women laboring to dismantle socialism in their own countries that Bill Clinton's top domestic priority is to collectivize one-seventh of the United States economy—our health care markets.

The third essential quality of leadership in statecraft is constancy of purpose. No one has ever found this to be one of Bill Clinton's strong suits. The President is continually changing his mind regarding important foreign relationships or ongoing foreign crises—and he never fails to keep everyone the world over, friend and foe, informed of his latest vacillation.

The longest-running and most confused set of policy flip-flops has been with regard to Haiti. There is simply no other way to describe the Clinton record on Haiti than as an abject national embarrassment.

Last year President Clinton burned into our consciousness the lingering image of a United States Navy warship, the Harlan County, being chased out of Port-au-Prince harbor by a bunch of demonstrators. It's an unhappy metaphor for much of the Clinton record worldwide: Under Bill Clinton's helm, expect the American ship of state to turn tail at the first sign of trouble.

But worse than last year's fiasco in Port-au-Prince harbor would be an ill-advised use of force. President Clinton will be making a calamitous mistake if he carries out his threats to launch United States forces into Haiti.

While invading the island should not be a difficult exercise for American forces, what would we do with the country once we captured it? The last time American forces invaded Haiti, they ended up having to stay for 19 years.

I take the strongest exception to the Clinton administration's declaration that Haiti is "of vital interest to the United States." Haiti represents no significant threat to our interests nor is it an asset to U.S. policy. Haiti is not a base for international terrorism, nor is it a significant transit point for drugs destined for the United States. This impoverished country has never consolidated the basic institutions for the kind of civil society needed to build democracy—an independent judiciary guaranteeing the rule of law, a press free from government bullying, a free enterprise system untrammelled by government influence and control. Replacing the military regime with the leftist Aristide will not suddenly bring those institutions into being. Risking U.S. soldiers' lives and spilling Haitian blood to enthrone Aristide offers precious little chance of yielding gains for true democracy and human rights in Haiti. Jean-Bertrand Aristide is intolerant of opposition and has spoken approvingly of the use of violence against democratic opponents. He is not—I repeat, not—the Thomas Jefferson of Haiti.

Both Clinton's vacillations around the globe and his apparent determination to take ill-advised military action in Haiti send dangerous signals to outlaw regimes which genuinely threaten our interests.

The most perilous immediate threat, of course, is from North Korea. President Clinton has used bold words to assert that under no circumstances will North Korea be allowed to acquire nuclear weapons. But North Korea's dictators go right along pursuing their nuclear program.

After having observed for a year and a half so much self-defeating American behavior—so many fiascos and flip-flops, so much bluster followed by inaction, so many misplaced priorities—why should North Korea take Bill Clinton's warnings seriously? And can we really accept Jimmy Carter's assurance that "the crisis is over"?

The administration already has squandered vital time and credibility in dealing with the North Korean threat. If the President is to prevent a catastrophe in Korea, he needs to stop the wishful thinking and begin exercising some leadership.

The President should issue a clear, unmistakable warning to the North Korean leadership that any attack upon South Korea will be an attack upon the United States, and will be met with overwhelming military force, resulting in the destruction of North Korea and its government. They must not be allowed to assume that a war on the Korean peninsula will be fought on their terms.

President Clinton should enhance the defenses of South Korea and improve the capability of both South Korean forces and our own forces stationed there. He must get some effective diplomatic work done with China—to assure its cooperation with our effort to isolate North Korea. He must move Japan to cut off the vital hard currency it now allows to flow to North Korea. He must lead the international community to impose airtight sanctions.

A President's most important commodity as Commander-in-Chief is his credibility. Bold talk that is never followed up by bold action leads our adversaries to conclude we do not have to be taken seriously. The cost of reclaiming that credibility once it is lost is likely to be paid in terms of American lives. In these dangerous times, a President must always say what he means and mean what he says.

Let me address the fourth and final defect in Bill Clinton's world leadership: his failure in good stewardship of our vital national security resources—in particular his failure to support an adequate peacetime military capability for the United States. Some people say the problem of the Clinton national security policy is a mismatch between strategy and resources. I don't agree with that. The Clinton strategy and its resources are closely matched. The President has an inadequate strategy—and he has paired it with inadequate resources.

Remember, we already had carried out major reductions in U.S. defense spending before President Clinton took office. Since then, to indulge their appetites for a bigger welfare state, Bill Clinton and the Democratic Congress have made new, far deeper defense cuts. For a five year period, they are cutting an additional \$150 billion more from defense than the significant cuts planned by President Bush. At the same time the Administration is trying to fund activities out of the defense budget that do nothing to improve our military capability, such as "defense conversion" and "U.N. peacekeeping."

The result is a serious erosion in the quality and capability of our military forces. Our field commanders report our troops are not getting needed training hours for lack of funds. Jet engines for the Air Combat Command are going unrepaired for lack of spare

parts. There are increasingly serious shortfalls in readiness and sustainability. Test scores for our recruits are falling. For the first time in a decade, the Marine Corps has failed in two successive months to meet its recruitment quota.

Particularly unpardonable is Clinton's failure to ask for adequate funds for active military cost-of-living pay adjustments. He has sought to curb military pay even as growing numbers of military families are having to turn to food stamps to make ends meet. Maintaining adequate pay and a good quality of life for the troops has to be our Number One defense priority.

We are seeing shades of the shameful days of Jimmy Carter's "hollow military." In 1980 American voters sent a powerful rebuke to the liberal Democratic Congress and the administration responsible for that era of military weakness. But we do not have to wait until 1996 to take corrective action against the Clinton failures in military leadership.

Republicans in Congress this year offered the American people a clear choice—a straightforward plan for making military strength a budget priority. Republicans in the House of Representatives offered a budget alternative that would have spared our military forces the recklessness of the Clinton cuts. The Republican budget resolution provided an adequate cost-of-living adjustment for our servicemen and women's pay. Republicans would have kept adequate funding for training and maintenance. The Republican proposal called for moving forward with a vital program gutted by President Clinton and the congressional Democrats—the program for defenses against ballistic missiles.

The Clinton Democrats are blinded by an ideological animus against President Reagan's visionary Strategic Defense Initiative. Clear perception and leadership demand that we build a ballistic missile defense system as soon as possible. Ballistic missile technology is not hard to acquire: Being one of the world's poorest, most isolated and technologically backward countries did not stop North Korea from becoming a ballistic missile power. Even now, American forces and friends abroad are within range of potentially hostile forces armed with ballistic missiles. The last thing we need is to wake up one morning to an intelligence surprise—to find that a radical regime has acquired a long-range ballistic missile, capable of striking New York or California. I urge the President to move to give our country theater missile defenses without further delay—and then to proceed with national missile defenses.

The President must not let outdated diplomatic instruments get in the way of defenses to protect the people of the United States from missile attack. In particular, it would be a grave mistake to transform the old ABM Treaty into a multilateral affair. Most important, America must pursue in its own national interest the attainment of defenses against ballistic missiles. We must not let anything—including the ABM Treaty—stand in the way.

What resources we will have for the defense budget and who will make those decisions is a matter of greatest timeliness. Americans who want to keep our military from becoming perilously weak do not have to wait until 1996 to make changes. Voters can replace anti-defense Democrats with pro-defense Republicans in Senate and House elections this November. Republican victories this fall protect our defenses from Bill Clinton's worst instincts before he can do

much more damage. Republican majorities in the Congress could even provide some adult supervision on national security for the Clinton White House staff.

Let me say just one other thing about this White House and its treatment of our military men and women. Whenever one gets one's hopes up that the Clinton White House has broken with its practice of demeaning American military personnel, we hear word of another new insult. Earlier this year, it was the spectacle of a uniformed Marine saluting a golf bag when Bill Clinton's director of White House administration misused military helicopters for a trip to the country club. Then last month we heard of uniformed military officers being asked to serve hors d'oeuvres at a White House reception. For a man who campaigned on putting people first, I wish Bill Clinton would find a way to put our troops first for a change.

When Republican leadership returns to the White House, I am confident we will have a Commander-in-chief who understands his responsibility to maintain the morale and combat effectiveness of our military forces, including when to commit them to combat. He will know he must never do so unless he is prepared to do whatever is required to achieve victory.

It is my great honor to be with you today to talk about how we can go about once again giving our country unrivalled strength and standing in the world—strength and standing that will help shape a freer and more peaceful future.

The key is leadership! The men and women of our armed forces deserve it. The nation deserves it. And I deeply appreciate your commitment to bringing it about.

#### TRIBUTE TO BILL SCHWARTZ

##### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a very special friend of the fraternity system, William P. Schwartz. On August 13, he will be honored for 40 years of service with Sigma Alpha Mu fraternity [SAM]. Bill may be considered the dean of the interfraternity system worldwide.

Bill has been on the executive staff of Sigma Alpha Mu since 1955, which is the longest tenure for an executive in the interfraternity world. He served in various positions with SAM until he became its executive director in 1962, the post he currently holds. Since 1973, he also has served as editor of the Octagonian—the international publication of SAM.

Bill has long served other fraternal organizations as well. He is a past president of the Fraternity Executives Association, Cofounder of the Association of Fraternity Advisors, and has held various positions with the National Interfraternity Conference.

For his work with college youth, Bill has been honored by Tau Kappa Epsilon, Lambda Chi Alpha, Phi Kappa Theta, and Theta Chi. From his own Sigma Alpha Mu, he has received the Distinguished Service Award. He also has been awarded the Gold Medal, the highest honor of the National Interfraternity Conference.

Bill was born in Oklahoma City, OK in 1928. After high school, he enlisted in the army and

served with the occupation forces in Japan after World War II. Upon his return to the United States, he entered the University of Oklahoma, graduating in 1952. Since then, Bill has always found time for involvement in a host of civic and religious activities, usually centered around the youth of his community.

Once again, I would like to honor and thank Bill Schwartz for his lifetime of work and dedication for Sigma Alpha Mu fraternity, the interfraternity system and the youth of this country.

#### RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL PARENTS' DAY

##### HON. CHARLIE ROSE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to declare my support for National Parents' Day and the development of national programs to help stabilize the American family.

Our colleagues, Congressman DAN BURTON and Congressman FLOYD FLAKE, introduced House Resolution 236, which the House unanimously adopted on March 11, 1994. This resolution declared today, July 28, 1994, as National Parents' Day in America. This resolution represents the overwhelming consensus that America's families are the foundation on which this Nation was built. Commemorating a National Parents' Day will send a strong message to the American people that responsible parenting is the cheapest and most effective solution to eliminating many present day social ills.

With all the problems facing our communities today, it is no surprise that American families are constantly struggling to stay together. Children are dealing with overwhelming problems such as crime, drug and alcohol abuse, violence, divorce, homelessness, and poverty. The statistics show that these social problems are taking a toll on our children when you look at the dropout rates, teen pregnancy, teen suicide, and the growing number of children on death row. These are just a few of the dilemmas that parents today must face. These problems place tremendous pressures on parents who are trying to juggle dual roles with a full-time job and a full-time family. I hope that many Americans, especially children, will take the time to pay tribute to all parents: biological, adoptive, foster parents, and grandparents that are raising a second generation. These parents are committed to strengthening and sustaining their roles as part of the solution to ending this crisis.

National Parents' Day is an opportunity to recognize and award those parents who have dedicated their time and energy to helping and encouraging strong parenting. This day will honor outstanding parents in our communities all across America, making them visible role models. It also acknowledges and thanks those organizations, community leaders, and people in the media who through their programs and features exemplify the ideals of House Resolution 236.

Earlier today, many television celebrities were honored on the steps of the Capitol for

their acting roles as responsible parents in TV programs. Stars like Bill Cosby and Phylicia Rashad of "The Cosby Show," Florence Henderson of "The Brady Bunch," and Harriet Nelson of "Ozzie and Harriet." Unfortunately, all of these shows are no longer in production although they can be seen in syndication.

The point is this. Our children are influenced by their environment and the things they see every day, including television. It is imperative that more family-oriented programming be added to the nightly lineup so that positive role models are reinforced on the tube.

History has demonstrated that the traditional American family is the cornerstone of our society. But as the times change, so must our definition of family. Who is to say that a single parent is not as good a parent as one that has a partner? Or that a parent that adopts a child does not love that child as much as the natural birth parent? If we are to survive as a nation, we must emphasize moral character and responsibility through family values. Sacrificial love is a key element in the development of these values. An example of this sacrificial love is demonstrated by a family in my congressional district that I helped adopt a child.

Alan and Cathy Cooper adopted an 8-month-old Albanian child in March 1992. Unfortunately, because of the political turmoil in that country, it took several years for the adoption to be finalized. However, through their persistence and sacrificial love for this child, the Coopers were able to become parents and bring their boy home earlier this year. They proved that they would go to the ends of the Earth to see that this child was protected and loved. It is this kind of selfless act, unconditional love, that needs to be restored in many of our families.

Through programs like Big Brother/Big Sister, Project We Care and the National Institute for Responsible Fatherhood and Family Development we are on our way to making the American family a stable and secure environment for future generations. We, as Members of Congress, have an obligation to ensure that our social structure remains strong through these and other programs that encourage family development. Government and private sector business policies should reflect the changing structures of American families so that the children are not penalized. But well-intentioned Government programs are not the only solution. Parents are the answer.

Recognizing a National Parents' Day will remind every individual of the crucial role parents play in shaping the lives of our children. Mr. Speaker, please join me and my colleagues in recognizing July 28, 1994, as National Parents' Day.

IN MEMORY OF ROBERT E. BEST,  
PUBLISHER AND HUMANITARIAN

### HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1994

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the late Robert E. Best, a renowned publisher and community leader from Sullivan, IL. Robert Best left us last fall, but

his community spirit and contributions to the journalism field will not be forgotten. After Mr. Best's death, his newspaper, News Progress, published a fitting tribute to Mr. Best and his work as a publisher and humanitarian. It would be my honor to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this tribute that captured the essence and life of Robert E. Best.

[From the Best Newspapers in Illinois, Inc.,  
Nov. 24, 1993]

#### DEATH OF NEWS-PROGRESS PUBLISHER LEAVES VOID

(By Lisa Muirheid)

The death Sunday night of Robert E. Best, publisher of the News-Progress, leaves a void in the community he served and the profession he loved, friends and colleagues said this week.

Mr. Best, 62, died at St. Mary's Hospital in Decatur after suffering a heart attack about 9:30 p.m. Sunday at his home in Sullivan.

In his 32-year career as an Illinois publisher, he earned many honors. He served terms as president of both the Illinois Press Association and the Southern Illinois Editorial Association. In 1987, he was inducted into the Southern Illinois University Journalism Hall of Fame as a "master editor."

Born to Ellis J. and Nellie C. Murphy Best on July 25, 1931, in Jefferson City, Mo., Robert E. was the oldest of three children.

He earned a bachelor's degree in agriculture from the University of Missouri at Columbia and did graduate work there in journalism. He attended the university on a Navy ROTC scholarship and served three years in the Navy, largely aboard the USS Telfair, a troop transport ship that made tours of Southeast Asia. He left the service as a Naval lieutenant, junior grade.

He married Marion Denny on Dec. 28, 1954, in Evanston, Ill. The two have worked side by side as publisher and editor of a newspaper in Sullivan since they purchased the Moultrie County News in October of 1961.

Marion Best survives along with their two children, Kathleen L. Best, a reporter in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch Washington Bureau, and Robert R. Best, chief pressman and photographer at the News-Progress.

The newspaper will stay in the family. All three members plan to be involved in the transition phase. Marion Best will serve as publisher, R.R. will continue as chief pressman and head photographer and Kathy will help out on the editorial desk during the month of December.

Mr. Best is also survived by a sister, Ann Mattil, of Poplar Bluff, Mo., and brother, Edward Best, of Martinez, Cal.

After 12 years of running the Moultrie County News, which was one of two competing weeklies in Sullivan for 91 years, the Bests purchased the Bethany Echo and the Findlay Enterprise in 1973. In December 1978, fellow publisher Byron Brandenburger sold them the Sullivan Progress, the weekly newspaper they had competed with for advertising and news for 17 years. Two years later they purchased the subscription list of the Lovington Reporter, the only other weekly in the county. In June 1981, all the papers but Findlay were incorporated into the weekly News-Progress.

One year after purchasing the Moultrie County News in 1961, the Bests attended their first Illinois Press Association convention to pick up the first of more than 100 awards the paper has won over the past 32 years. In 1984, the News-Progress was the first semi-weekly to win the Illinois Press Association's Kramer Trophy for editorial excellence.

Mr. Best wrote more than 1,200 columns and 2,400 editorials during those years. He has served as co-chairman of the IPA Legislative Committee after his tenure as president.

"Bob was acutely sensitive to the Illinois citizen's 'right to know' and he was at the forefront in protecting that right," said Joe Firstl, who served as a co-chair on the committee with Bob. "He was a dedicated newspaper man in every sense of the word. He always put himself out for the newspaper publisher and anyone who wanted to know how to get the what, where, when, why and how."

Firstl remembered many weekend days spent on the telephone with his partner.

"We would spend hours trying to figure out what a legislator had in his mind when a bill was introduced and how we could collectively combat the sometimes evil forces which act against the Illinois citizens and publishers. We would go over every bill word-for-word. I will miss that man very, very much."

Mr. Best was also an active member of the National Newspaper Association. He served as the Illinois state chairman and on many other committees, including membership and long range planning.

"I learned so much from him and he was so willing to share all of his knowledge," said longtime friend and former employee Sharon White. "Shortly after I began working at the paper someone asked me if Bob was difficult to work for because he always seemed so gruff. I had to tell her he was the biggest pussycat I had ever known."

A neighbor and confidant for many years, Bill Stubblefield said when he thinks of Mr. Best, he remembers how his neighbor enjoyed "a whole bunch of things."

"He always kind of made me mad because he knew a little bit about everything. Usually when we get into discussions—as we called them—he was right," Stubblefield said, adding he would never have admitted that to Mr. Best's face.

"He enjoyed working, his computers, his family, his stupid cats and gardening. He just seemed to enjoy everything—and he was good at a lot of them. He loved to raise dumb things in the garden then find recipes to cook them in. It never ceased to amaze me the interests he had. There was a really broad scope," Stubblefield said.

"Discussing" was one of the activities Bob Best enjoyed most.

"I knew Bob for over 20 years. We didn't always agree on everything, but we respected each other's opinion. Bob had a way of asking questions about issues that needed resolutions. He started people thinking and soon they were solving the problems," said Sullivan city councilman and businessman Ron White.

"We have been through some miles together, Bob and I, and I am truly sorry we will not have the chance to journey together into the future," White said.

Mr. Best's friendship with the Whites began before their work on Little Theatre projects. Mr. Best was a founding member of the Friends of the Little Theatre on the Square after the theatre's dark season in 1980. According to Sharon White, he literally created the organization.

"One day after Guy Little Jr. announced he was leaving Sullivan and it seemed the Little Theatre on the Square would close, a congressman called Bob from Washington and asked what the community was doing to keep this unique asset from being lost," she explained. "Not wanting the potentially valuable opportunity to slip away, he quickly

ad libbed. I was standing near his desk when he said, 'Yes, there is a grassroots volunteer community organization that could use your help. They call themselves the Friends of the Little Theatre . . . and I believe Sharon White is the president!'

White said her jaw dropped and Mr. Best smiled a mischievous smile. She quickly found out he was willing to help dig her out of the hole he had put her in.

"Bob and Marion—and their checkbook—were always there with their support and encouragement. He believed so much in this community. I don't think anyone even knows how much he did. He's going to leave a big hole in this community," Sharon White said.

Guy Little, whose Little Theatre on the Square was the deciding factor that led Bob and Marion Best to Sullivan in 1961, said the loss of his friend is just another reason why

it is important to not take anything for granted.

"I worked with him so closely when I was managing the theatre. He was always helpful, supportive and patient. It was a terrible, terrible shock," Little said. "We need to treasure and appreciate every moment we have."

While it was generally well deserved, one thing Mr. Best was not fond of was flattery and too much praise.

In 1991, he accepted the Distinguished Service Award from the Illinois Press Assn. He did so after a four-page biography was read to a packed banquet room.

His first response before accepting the award was: "And I know how to edit and somebody should have let me do that."

"Bob was a man who didn't like publicity for the many projects that he helped succeed," said Ron White. "He was a wise and intelligent man who could see solutions be-

hind problems and encouraged his friends and acquaintances on how to come up with solutions for themselves."

White also commended Mr. Best for support of both Sullivan businesses and Sullivan school activities.

"He was proud that he had a part in helping the high school students revive the student newspaper and win many awards in only their first year of publication," White said.

Bob Best was a man with a great deal of knowledge to share. Sometimes he did it quietly and at other times, with the thunder of a bolt of lightning. He knew a lot and he shared a lot. The only thing he didn't teach those that knew him was enough, friends said.

Sharon White said a great deal in one short sentence.

"I wasn't done with Bob Best yet."  
Neither were we.

*[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]*

*[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]*

*[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]*