

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TIMELY INTELLIGENCE: IMPORTANT AS EVER IN THE POST-COLD-WAR ERA

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to reduce the size of our military forces and their presence overseas, it is imperative that intelligence—this Nation's early warning system—is better than ever in this post-cold-war era. As a combat veteran of World War II, I vividly remember how an intelligence failure contributed to the tragedy at Pearl Harbor in December 1941. Within the Roosevelt administration there were scattered bits of information as to what the Japanese might be contemplating. But, there was no one pulling together and analyzing them as part of a coordinated effort to furnish the President with an intelligence estimate of Japan's intentions.

Indeed, it was the painful lesson of Pearl Harbor that prompted then President Truman to establish after World War II a centralized intelligence organization. We must, therefore, resist efforts to dismantle or cripple U.S. intelligence. U.S. intelligence capabilities are critical instruments of our national power and an integral part of our national security. With that historical background, I would like to offer some observations and recommendations.

THE DOWNSIDE OF DOWNSIZING

I have been told that the downsizing of the intelligence community's work force has been especially injurious in key areas. In some agencies, these reductions have allegedly exceeded 80 percent. For example, most of the seasoned Russian military analysts, including those performing highly complex analyses on strategic missile systems, are reportedly moving on or taking early retirement while the remaining talented young analysts are looking for other job opportunities that promise more advancement. Meanwhile, the intelligence community is being tasked to address a wider range of threats and policy needs, especially in the areas of proliferation, economic competitiveness, environment, drugs, terrorism, and humanitarian relief. Currently, warning of potential regional crises and providing support to NATO and U.N. forces in the Balkans are absorbing major resources. These rapidly increasing demands do not include the day-to-day crises that consume additional collection and research resources.

The upshot is a growing concern that intelligence is being stretched to the breaking point. This could have serious implications downstream. For example, if another Russian crisis were to occur—such as Yeltsin's attack on Parliament in 1993—the intelligence community today would be less able to warn of military mobilization. Informed sources claim, until recently, analysis and collection on the

deception and denial activities of potential adversaries had dropped to dangerously low levels. Purportedly, remedial action is underway. This should be a high priority, as interpreting warnings of attack will become more difficult as adversaries improve their denial and deception techniques. We must remember that U.S. intelligence's highest mission is to support U.S. policymakers in identifying and forestalling threats to U.S. interests worldwide. How to do this in an era of shrinking resources poses real risks and challenges.

The idea that intelligence can stay abreast of new technology, add new missions and still downsize its personnel at a rate of 3 to 5 percent per year is fantasy. Experienced intelligence hands say downsizing must be slowed overall and halted for high priority needs. At a minimum intelligence programs should be reinvigorated in three broad areas to minimize risks to U.S. forces and insure our ability to maintain the capability to act effectively in a major crisis. First, new investment should be dedicated to increasing access to high priority targets including Russia, China, North Korea and the rogue states of the Middle East. We must not forget that Russia and China possess strategic nuclear forces and that their long-term political orientation could turn against the United States if hostile leaders were to gain power again in these megastates. Second, a robust investment program to counter denial and deception should be built to embrace satellite, air, and ground base collection. Such a program must include dedicated analysis of, and attention to denial and deception, especially in areas of highest concern. Third, programmatic and personnel policies must be formed to ensure the brightest talent, with linguistic and cultural expertise, is devoted to the most vital issues that affect U.S. security in the long run, not just to issues of the moment.

COMPETITIVE ANALYSIS—A CARDINAL PRINCIPLE THAT MUST BE PRESERVED

In this era of restructuring, the temptation may be irresistible to eliminate perceived redundancies within the intelligence community. That may be necessary in the hardware and collection areas. But, some competitive analysis must be preserved in the analytical realm, especially in areas like strategic nuclear force analysis where threats to the United States are potentially the gravest. I know I always want a second, and in some instances even a third opinion, when it comes to questions of my health. The Nation's well being often pivots around national security issues. Thus, the President and his key advisors must have a variety of assessments presented to them before they make critical, life and death decisions. Moreover, there should be an established procedure and available resources for pursuing comprehensive challenges to mainstream opinion in any analytical area significant to national security.

COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY

The explosive pace of communication technology is posing new challenges for the intelligence community. Data is moving around the world in greater volumes and at faster speeds than ever before. Maintaining our advantage in understanding secret foreign communications will hinge upon preserving a strong and robust cryptological capability in the face of rapid technological advances. I am concerned, however, about assertions from reliable sources that adequate resources are not being committed to sustaining this capability.

DIRECTORATE OF OPERATIONS (DO)/COUNTER-INTELLIGENCE

The incessant battering the CIA, and the DO in particular, is receiving in the wake of the Ames case has caused morale in the DO to plummet to an all-time low. Much of the criticism is deserved. Nevertheless, there is a real need to be sensitive to this debilitating morale problem as Congress helps the DO remedy the problems cited in the IG's report on the Ames case. I was struck by the serious lack of managerial accountability with respect to the Ames case. Thus, it is very important for the congressional intelligence committees to engage in intensive oversight of what is being done in the counterintelligence area. As far back as 1988, I can recall Dick Cheney joining me in questioning the then DCI, Judge Webster, and others on why the Soviet, Chinese, and Cuba sections of the Operations Directorate were exempted from the Counterintelligence Center scrutiny applied to other areas of the world. In retrospect, it appears that this exemption may have contributed to Ames' going undetected so long. Reportedly, this inexplicable anomaly has now been remedied.

Until recently, there did not appear to be a coordinated counterintelligence mission for the Government as a whole. Consequently, no one determined what priorities and resources should be given to each agency. I understand a national counterintelligence strategy has now been developed. If so, it should include the following: First, a system for identifying which secrets are truly critical to the national security, second, assessing those secrets' vulnerability to intelligence threats, third, mandatory counterintelligence training for all intelligence officers, and fourth, establishing professional counterintelligence services within all appropriate agencies and departments.

It is my understanding that the DO is withdrawing to a large extent from certain parts of the world. Budgetary constraints may make this necessary, but it should be very carefully watched. We do not want to repeat the mistake of the late 1970's when the CIA withdrew its presence from key areas of the world only to find shortly thereafter that it had to be reinstated. Therefore, the DO must maintain a surge capability to ensure it can rapidly respond to unexpected emergencies. And for this to be possible, a core network of agents

● 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.

must be sustained in those places deemed momentarily quiescent and unimportant to U.S. security interests.

Recently, there have been disturbing press accounts indicating the CIA is considering new screening criteria for recruiting foreign agents. The general impression conveyed is that henceforth future foreign assets must have the pedigree of Mother Teresa or St. Francis of Assisi. Hopefully, these are exaggerated stories. To expect someone with the moral purity of a saint to penetrate the Cali Cartel is wholly unrealistic. Unfortunately, the harsh reality is that the only way to infiltrate the tightly controlled Colombian drug networks is to recruit someone who has ties to them. The same holds true for terrorist cells. We live in an imperfect world, and we sometimes must join forces with individuals with less than pristine personal histories. After all, during World War II, we allied ourselves with Joe Stalin, one of history's all-time mass murderers, to defeat Hitler.

In an experiment that bears watching, the DI, Directorate of Intelligence, and the DO have begun to colocate their personnel. In other words, the operators and the analysts are working side by side. Given the historical antipathy between these two sharply contrasting cultures, everyone is watching to see if they can work together congenially. If they can, the overall intelligence effort should benefit immeasurably, especially in the area of counterintelligence where—as spy scandals in recent years have demonstrated—there has been a crying need for better analysis. In this partnership, it is crucial that the DI maintain rigorous objectivity to preclude charges that intelligence analysis is being politicized. This problem can only be avoided through strong agency management.

COVERT ACTION

Since the mid-1970's covert action has been seen as an atypical procedure for the conduct of foreign policy. It is imperative to rebuild the consensus within the United States that once saw covert action as a regular, legitimate means of bolstering the realization of foreign policy objectives. It must not be seen, nor used, as a last resort, panacea, or substitute for policy. Rather, covert action should be employed as a normal tool of U.S. statecraft, designed to work in support of and in conjunction with government's other diplomatic, military, and economic efforts both against traditional and nontraditional targets.

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Congress obviously must play a very substantial role in any proposal to restructure and oversee the U.S. intelligence community. In this regard, I first introduced a joint intelligence committee bill in 1984 and a congressional oath of secrecy proposal in 1987 that was inspired by a similar oath taken by Ben Franklin and four other members on the Committee of Secret Correspondence of the Second Continental Congress. The latter has now been adopted in the House, thanks to the efforts of one of my congressional colleagues, PORTER GOSS of Florida.

What prompted these confidence building measures was a desire to make congressional oversight more secure and effective. That can only be accomplished if the membership of the

congressional panels trust the intelligence agencies and vice versa. If they trust each other, then both sides can be candid with each other. As former advisor to President Eisenhower, Bryce Harlow, reportedly once said, "Trust is the coin of the realm." Leaks destroy that trust and do great damage to the whole oversight process. Moreover, they can jeopardize lives, as well as vital relationships with foreign agents and friendly intelligence services.

A joint intelligence committee, composed of a small number of key Members from both Chambers of Congress, would substantially reduce the risks of leaks. The fewer people in the loop, the less likelihood of damaging disclosures. Our forefathers clearly recognized this fact of life as they limited knowledge of Revolutionary War secrets to only five Members. Moreover, each of those individuals took his oath of secrecy very seriously. None other than Thomas Paine, the author of "Common Sense," was fired as a staffer of the Secret Correspondence Committee for leaking information concerning France's covert help to our Revolutionary War effort. We should not hesitate to emulate our forefathers and punish those who violate their secrecy pledges and betray the trust bestowed upon them.

INTELLIGENCE PURITY

Periodically during my tenure on the House Intelligence Committee, there were assertions that intelligence assessments were cooked to buttress certain foreign policy objectives. Immunizing the integrity of intelligence is of paramount importance. Thus, I am opposed to any measures that would even smack of tainting objective intelligence. In this connection, two things come to mind. First, is the proposal to abolish the CIA and fold its functions into the Department of State. That is a recipe for cooking intelligence if I ever saw one. Inevitably, there will come a time when the diplomats will pressure their intelligence colleagues down the hall to color an intelligence assessment to justify a foreign policy initiative. Moreover, the more controversial the policy, the greater the risk of politicized intelligence. Second, and related to the question of cooked intelligence, the Director of Central Intelligence [DCI] must not be viewed as essentially a political operative. Clearly, it is beneficial to the intelligence community if the DCI has the President's confidence, but he or she should not be a policy maker, as are Cabinet members. Rather, he or she should be the President's ultimate intelligence advisor. In short, there must be a firewall erected between intelligence and policy which often is driven by political considerations.

INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO LAW ENFORCEMENT

As chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, I am cognizant of the significant role intelligence plays in supporting law enforcement efforts. I am also very much aware of the tension that often develops between intelligence and law enforcement officials as to how and when intelligence can be used.

Protecting sources and methods is the transcendent concern of every intelligence officer. Prosecutors, however, are looking for information that can be used at trial. If security reasons preclude the use of relevant intelligence, then the prosecutor is left with something that is, at best, of marginal utility. Moreover, con-

stitutional standards of due process and the right to confront one's accusers further complicate the relationship between the intelligence community and law enforcement.

Prosecutors are constitutionally bound, in a criminal trial, to provide all exculpatory evidence and any other evidence that might tend to diminish the government witnesses' credibility. Any information given to law enforcement by the intelligence community is subject to disclosure, for these very reasons. The Classified Information Procedures Act [CIPA] model works quite well for criminal cases countenancing the government's Hobson's choice between prosecution for criminal misdeeds and the protection of sources and methods of confidential national security information. In that context, the difficult choice is rightfully upon the government. But, in nonpunitive circumstances, such as with deportation of individuals shown through classified information to be a threat to the national security if they remain in the country, the same tension exists under current law.

How to reconcile the competing needs and concerns in a deportation matter is a real challenge and one I have attempted to address in the "Comprehensive Antiterrorism Act of 1995" (H.R. 1710). In that bill, we address the frustrating situation where the intelligence community has identified an alien as engaging in terrorist activities while in the United States, but because of the current deportation laws, we cannot expel the alien from the United States without disclosing sensitive information—which could jeopardize lives and the security of this Nation.

In response to this dilemma, a procedure has been developed whereby the alien would get only a declassified summary of the classified evidence against him. All other non-classified evidence is, of course, discoverable.

Unlike CIPA cases, when a situation exists where the provision of a summary to the alien would risk irreparable and significant harm to others, or to the United States, no summary is required and the deportation procedure of the terrorist alien can proceed. The classified evidence, without disclosure to the alien, can be utilized. Because this is not a criminal case, we allow the Government action to proceed without disclosure of the classified evidence. The liberty interests of the alien are significantly less than those of a criminal defendant, and the national security interests of the United States must be superior to the interests of any noncitizen.

In criminal cases, the defendant stands to be punished—to lose either his life or his freedom for a period of time. The result of a deportation is simply exclusion from the United States—to continue one's life freely and unencumbered, elsewhere. To Americans, life outside the United States may seem oppressive, or certainly less than optimal; but, it is not punishment.

A greater tension exists, however, when the United States is faced with a classified allegation that a legal permanent resident alien is engaging in terrorist activities, and a declassified summary cannot be provided without creating larger risks of harm to others or to the United States. These aliens, as recognized by the Supreme Court, have a greater liberty interest in remaining in the United States than

do other nonpermanent aliens. Thus, additional procedures to safeguard the accuracy of the outcome, and the fairness of the procedure, must be established. To that end, in our antiterrorism bill, we established a special panel of cleared attorneys who will be given access to the classified information supporting the terrorism allegation so that they can challenge the reliability of that evidence. This is done to help the court in its determination of whether it should ultimately order the alien's deportation based on the classified information. The cleared attorney would be subject to a 10-year prison term for disclosure of the classified information. Hopefully, this new procedure, when enacted, will facilitate greater sharing of classified information between our intelligence and law enforcement officials, without unduly risking disclosure of sensitive information.

In summary, the world remains a treacherous place in this post-cold-war era. The increasing threat of terrorism, especially against U.S. targets both home and abroad, is just one very important reason for maintaining a robust intelligence capability around the world. To do less ignores the lessons of Pearl Harbor, and all that implies for the security of this great nation.

THANKS TO MAYOR WILLIAM LYON

HON. JAY DICKEY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, when the Government shut down the first time this year, all of us heard from our constituents about the effects upon them. Let me take this opportunity to recognize a local hero in my district who responded to the shutdown with swift professionalism.

Knowing the shutdown would affect hunters in the region by keeping them from hunting in the Felsenthal Wildlife Refuge, Mayor William Lyon of Fordyce, AR, responded with swift professionalism.

A November 18, 1995, article from the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette highlights well the work of Mayor Lyon:

TAKE A STAND NEAR FORDYCE, HUNTERS TOLD

Need a place to hunt after being tossed out of your stand on a federal wildlife refuge?

Mayor William Lyon of Fordyce has just the place for you.

Call Fordyce City Hall at 352-2198 and a friendly employee will arrange for you to hunt at one of the many deer camps operating in Dallas County. There's no charge for the service.

Lyon said Friday there are an estimated 1,000 deer camps within 50 miles of Fordyce.

"I read in the Democrat-Gazette about what they had done to those people," Lyon said of an article in Wednesday's newspaper about hunters being told to leave the federal refuges. "I thought how I would feel if I was a teen-ager going hunting with my father. I thought about how my grandsons would feel."

The partial shutdown of the federal government has resulted in the closings of seven national wildlife refuges in the state and the displacement of many hunters.

Lyon said he knows most of the people running deer camps in the county and can easily put hunters in touch with them.

It's probably going to create some problems with a lot of moving around, but we are willing to help," Lyon said. It's possible we might find some good people that would like to come back and pull some industries down here."

Joe Pennington, 55 of Fordyce leases land for his deer camp and said he mainly hunts within a five-mile radius of town.

"There's not room for a whole abundance of people," he said. "But I have some spots where I can put a few people. There are a few others that will take a few for a day or two.

"It's a goodwill gesture," Pennington said. "Most sportsmen try to get along."

"We think it's very generous what the mayor has done," said Joe Mosby, spokesman for the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission. "We're tickled to death by it."

Mosby said the closing of federal refuges will not affect the majority of hunters in the state. "But the refuges are very popular," he said. "Those hunters have a real good chance of getting a deer in the refuges."

Lyon said his offer is a result of local officials trying to build on the momentum of their successful Fall Hunting Festival, held Oct. 27. Fordyce Chamber of Commerce President Jim Phillips, County Judge Troy Bradley and Lyon have been meeting to discuss ways to promote Fordyce as "the Hunting Capital of Arkansas," Lyon said.

For this effort, we congratulate and honor Mayor Lyon. Perhaps many of us in Congress can learn from his dedication and ability to ensure—despite bureaucratic obstacles—that our constituents are well-served.

MEDICARE REFORM

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, the following op-ed by Pamela G. Bailey ran in the Wall Street Journal on December 19, 1995. As the debate over Medicare intensifies, I commend Ms. Bailey's op-ed to my colleagues:

SEVEN DOLLARS OF SEPARATION

(By Pamela G. Bailey)

The Medicare debate reached a new low last week, if such a thing is any longer possible, as the AFL-CIO uncorked a giant media and grassroots campaign to attack 55 House members who support the Republican on Draconian GOP "cuts" in Medicare and suggest that there is a huge difference between the Republican plan and the one supported by President Clinton.

What you would never guess from the AFL-CIO campaign is that the division between the two sides comes down to roughly \$7 a month in Medicare premiums. Combined with other reforms, the higher premium for seniors proposed by Republicans will save today's average seven-year-old more than \$140,000 in income taxes over the course of this working life. Congress wants to protect our children from this additional tax hit—after all, they'll already be paying \$300,000 in Medicare payroll taxes over their lifetime. But the president is willing to trade these taxes on our children for a \$7-per-month break for seniors.

Despite this superficial difference, the president's new budget has moved to a near

embrace of the Republican position on Medicare. Like the Republicans, Mr. Clinton wants to open a failed government program to the choices of the marketplace. And with notable exceptions, his overall budget numbers are within talking distance of the GOP's. It couldn't have come a moment too soon.

As most people have heard, Medicare Part A—the mandatory, payroll-tax-funded program that pays insurance costs for retirees' hospital, home health, nursing and hospice services—is hurtling toward insolvency and effective shutdown by 2002. And costs for Medicare Part B—the voluntary insurance program that pays doctor, lab, and equipment fees out of general federal revenues and beneficiary premiums—have been rising far faster than the rate of inflation for many years. In its present form, Medicare is quite simply unsustainable, either for the taxpayers who finance it or for the elderly Americans who depend on it. Not much controversy there. And neither, despite all the political noise, is there much controversy over what to do about it.

Congress's plan to preserve Medicare and restrain its costs involves \$1.65 trillion in spending over the next seven years. The president's current plan forecasts \$1.68 trillion in spending during the same period—a \$30 billion, or less than 2%, difference. Both proposals involve better-than-inflation increase in Medicare spending on every enrolled retiree; the Republican budget allows a 62% jump in total spending (to \$7,101 per beneficiary per year), for example. And where the basic structure of the program is concerned, the White House and congressional budgets mirror one another in nearly every essential respect. Except one.

Congress spreads its necessary Medicare savings across every category of program expenditure. The Republican plan brakes projected spending growth on hospitals, doctors, home health providers, nursing homes, lab tests, and medical equipment. And it asks retirees—America's wealthiest age group—to make their own, modest contribution, in the national interest, to the program that benefits them alone. How modest? In the year 2002, at the point where the two competing Medicare proposals most sharply diverge, Congress would have beneficiaries pay a monthly Part B premium \$7 higher than the administration plan envisions.

This is a very small amount of money with very large potential consequences. If the president's current veto holds, and Medicare's structure is left unreformed, its Board of Trustees reports that a steep payroll tax increase will be required to pay for future medical services. The current rate, 2.9%, shared evenly between employees and their companies, will necessarily more than double.

Today's first or second-grader, who enters the labor force in 2010 at age 22, and earns average wages until retiring in 2053, will pay \$450,314 over his working lifetime in Medicare payroll taxes. And by the same accounting assuming revenues needed to keep Medicare in long-term balance, this hypothetical worker will pay over \$200,000 more in lifetime payroll and income taxes under the president's plan—taxes that are unnecessary under the Medicare reform endorsed by Congress. More than two-thirds of this tax difference, or \$140,691, is directly attributable to that \$7 monthly Part B premium increase.

Undeterred by these undeniable facts, the AFL-CIO is sending a million pieces of mail into the districts of its 55 targeted congressmen, placing 500,000 phone calls, handing out

leaflets and staging rallies—all designed to punish these elected officials for approving fictitious "massive cuts in Medicare" when they voted for the Republican budget. The labor federation has spent more than \$1 million to put individualized television ads on the air against 22 of these House members. Each spot, over video of a worried elderly woman, ominously (and dishonestly) reports that "he voted to cut Medicare." But no one has voted to cut Medicare this year.

With a provision entirely unrelated to the push for a balanced budget—this treasured program must be fixed and saved whether the budget is balanced or not—Congress has voted to spare the grandchildren of current and future Medicare beneficiaries enough money in taxes to pay for four expensive years of college, or purchase a first home. Is there a grandparent in America who would not pay \$7 a month for that?

Find me one, and I'll eat my hat.

MR. STUDDS IS LEAVING CONGRESS

HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] not to seek re-election next year saddened and distressed many of his colleagues. His announcement means that this body will lose one of our very best, and most capable, Members.

Mr. STUDDS made his decision public at his open meeting at the Old Whaling Church at Edgartown, MA. I was greatly moved by his words of farewell to the people of his district, and I should like others to have the opportunity to read those words.

No one, Mr. Speaker, can read the gentleman's remarks and not appreciate how special and valuable a really good Member of Congress is.

No one can read the gentleman's remarks and not gain some insight into the best of this Congress, and the best of our constituents.

No one can read the gentleman's remarks and not gain some understanding of the close and healthy relationship that develops between Members of Congress and their constituents when there is the kind of trust and mutual respect that has clearly developed between the gentleman and the people he has represented so well these past 23 years.

I urge my colleagues and others to read these wise and humane words of a Member of Congress of great magnanimity and decency.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN GERRY E. STUDDS
AT OLD WHALING CHURCH, EDGARTOWN, MA

Good morning. From the warmth of your welcome, I can only conclude that you've forgotten where I work.

Those of you who have been to our Open Meetings in the past already know that these are totally informal settings in which the only rule is that there are no rules. In the unlikely event that this is your first, perhaps you can ask your parents—or grandparents—since we've hosted well over a thousand in the last 23 years. In fact, our very first Open Meeting was right here on Martha's Vineyard, during my initial visit home after taking office in 1973.

I want to test your patience by amending the second rule that has always governed these meetings—the one that forbids me from speechifying. We'll get on with the Open Meeting in a moment, but first: I learned in Politics 101 always to show up prepared to make news.

There's no reason for melodrama. You must have suspected there was some reason that, after 23 years of these gatherings, we finally offered coffee and donuts.

Throughout my tenure representing this District, we have enjoyed a remarkable rapport that is based on one fundamental principle: mutual respect. We have looked each other in the eye, and talked directly and civilly about matters of importance. Over time, that trust has been more important than any single vote or issue or campaign.

That is why I want to take some time this morning to talk with you about why I have decided that this will be my last term in the United States Congress.

It will be my privilege to continue to represent this District vigorously for the next 14 months. Then I will move on to other fields of battle.

When this news spreads, I suspect some will ascribe it to the results of last November's elections—although it is a little unclear why we ought to be dissatisfied with 69 percent of the 1994 vote.

It's true that I have less than unbridled enthusiasm for the wrecking ball of the 104th Congress, and that I am as deeply troubled by the direction we're heading as when I first had the then-original idea of challenging an entrenched incumbent. But the basis for my decision goes much deeper.

Every two years, I have considered afresh whether I could summon the energy and enthusiasm to give the people of this District the kind of effective representation you deserve. Contrary to conventional political wisdom—since we have rarely observed political convention—I have always been entirely open and candid about these reassessments.

To everything, as the Biblical verse goes, there is a season—a time to plant and a time to harvest.

It is now time for me to chart a new course: by no means to retire, but to find new endeavors, both public and private, that will allow more than an occasional weekend or evening to catch up on thing neglected for a quarter century, like reading and writing and actually using my tide chart; to be a better partner, brother, uncle and friend; and to be a useful human being in new ways that the demands of elective office have precluded for most of my adult life.

There are few jobs on the fact of this earth which offer as much to, and require as much from, the right person. The work of a Congressman, if done properly, is all-consuming. If it does not take every ounce of strength—intellectual, emotional and physical—then it probably isn't being done right.

That's why our renowned grassroots army has endured even in the age of overpriced media campaigns; and why, year in and year out, after successive late-night Congressional sessions, we'd barnstorm the District for weekends of constituent meetings squeezed between field hearings, issue forums, plant tours, testimonials, press interviews and political events.

Perhaps that is what John Randolph, who preceded even me as a Member of Congress, was thinking two centuries ago when he said that "Time is at once the most valuable and the most perishable of all our possessions."

Since embarking on this improbable journey, I have been very conscious that each of

us is allotted only so many hours and so many days on this earth.

Together, we have worked our hearts out; together, we have overcome odds and obstacles that would have discouraged most others; and together, you and I have strived to make many things better than we found them.

I never anticipated serving for 24 years, and it's probably divulging no great secret to admit that I do not thrive on what some consider indispensable parts of the job.

I am not by nature a particularly gregarious person. I get annoyed by frequent interruptions. I get tired of hearing myself talk.

And there are already far too many people in Washington who confuse themselves with the monuments.

In recent years, some of my political opponents have wondered—that's a polite way to put it—about a bill I apparently authored early on to limit the years of Congressional service. I've tried for several years to explain to them that, because term limits are such a good idea, I'd better stick around as long as it takes to see them enacted into law.

So I suppose, with the new majority in the House and Senate, I can now rest easy on that front. In fact, perhaps we should limit Members of Congress to a single term. That way, the freshman Republicans can go home still knowing everything.

Last November, the American people, or at least the few who voted, sent those freshmen to Washington.

Hard-working taxpayers—and not just "angry" white males—feel their government is more responsive to 'special interests' than to the real problems of ordinary Americans—which was the very reason I first ran for Congress.

Of course, the special interests I ran against are the ones the Republicans have put back in charge. When the House earlier this year gutted the Clean Water Act, the bill was drafted by the very industries it was supposed to regulate. The NRA and the Christian Coalition are riding high, and the House is so efficient that we frequently hold committee hearings after enacting bills into law.

One of my committees this month managed to dismantle Medicare in 48 hours. Jesse Helms and Strom Thurmond have been transformed from fringe caricatures into committee chairmen.

The changes underway at this moment in Washington are based on the dangerous misperception of this country and its people. Perhaps you heard one Republican Congressman say this week that the proposed \$500-per-child tax credit to families earning up to \$200,000 was not a tax cut for the rich.

They're not rich, he said, they're lower-middle-class. He went on to define "middle-class" as an annual salary of \$300,000 to \$750,000, and anyone above that as "upper-middle class".

When the time comes, I will join you in doing what I can to require our next Congressman to be more tightly tethered than that to the planet the rest of us inhabit.

A great deal has happened since 1992, when I came very close to the decision I'm announcing today.

We had barely escaped alive from the previous, unusually vitriolic campaign, only to be greeted that summer by the chain-saw of Congressional redistricting. The new lines removed a third of the electorate, and half of the Democrats, by amputating our New Bedford family from this District for the first time since the founding of the Republic.

Suddenly we faced a tough primary, seven weeks away, in a substantially new District—as the price of admission to a hotly contested general election.

Had it not been for the prospect of a young presidential candidate named Clinton, working with a Democratic Congress and a new Committee Chairman named Studs, I would probably be sitting with you in the audience today.

But that constellation seemed so well aligned—and the opportunity to make a real difference so clear—that Dean and I committed ourselves to yet another all-out reelection campaign and, if successful, to work through the first term of a Clinton Presidency.

I envisioned two years to launch the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on an aggressive new course and two more to work with the Administration to complete that agenda, before returning home.

One out of two isn't bad.

Still, while I have deep—nearly unfathomable—reservations about the direction the new Congressional majority is pulling this nation, my decision is at its core personal, not political.

I chose to discuss my plans here on Martha's Vineyard because, in a way, this is where that special trust I mentioned earlier began—in that first Open Meeting in 1973.

This is how you and I have always done our business—together, without fanfare, taking time to ask and explain and maybe even argue a little, and then rolling up our sleeves to get back to work.

That first trip home was a three-day swing through the Islands. In case your grandparents failed to mention it, we returned home that winter day feeling pretty good. In losing the 1970 election by the thinnest of margins, we have failed to carry a single town on either Nantucket or the Vineyard; in fact, we have won a total of one town in all of the Cape and Islands.

Then came the electoral earthquake of 1972. Not only did we win, again by a handful of votes, but we astonished everyone by taking Provincetown, Truro and West Tisbury!

I think it's fair to observe that times have changed.

What has not changed are the bedrock principles of wisdom, honesty and friendship on this Island, personified for me by two people who are not with us today: Betty Bryant, who could drown you in Portuguese guilt if you spent less than 20 of any 24 hours improving the lives of others—because she never had such days; and Gratia Harrington, proud Yankee daughter of an Island sea captain, whose strength, dignity and wit reserved her a front-row-center seat at every one of our Vineyard Open Meetings, well past her 100th birthday.

As everyone here knows, Betty took personal responsibility for our showing at the polls on the Vineyard and everywhere else. On the night of the 1992 primary, she colored me to report that we had won in Gosnold by 33-0 and in Chilmark by 251-2—and that she had already identified the misguided Chilmark couple.

Both Betty and Gratia would understand the reason I brought my news to this Island today, just as I will bring it to friends in Quincy, Hingham and Hyannis tomorrow: that by ever measure—geographical, historical, commercial, cultural and spiritual—this Congressional District is about the sea.

From the Irish moss I gathered off Cohasset and Scituate ledges as a boy and the lobster traps I pull these days in Provincetown Harbor, to the marine environmental notches on our proud legislative belt, nearly everything of consequence that you and I care about derives from a deep love and respect for the ocean.

If you visit the Race Point visitors center in the Cap Cod National Seashore, you may hear a recitation of these words from Harry Kemp, poet-laureate of the Cape:

There is battle here.

There is clean and vigorous war.

There are bivouacs visited by night's every star.

There are long barren slopes of enchantment burned clean by the sun, and ramparts of strange new dreams to be stormed and won.

Here the five-petaled wild rose blossoms more sweet

Because the earth is barren

and the heat intolerable for lush domestic grass.

The ocean shines like many discs of brass,

Or between white hollows it lapses great and green

Where solitude sifts slowly in between

the hills of sparkling waste that rise and fall.

Hills whose one music is the seabird's call.

And there is all space that ever I can see.

The ocean completing all immensity,

and the sky—mother of infinity,

Where greatness on smallness jostles till both are one,

And a grain of sand stands doorkeeper to the sun.

Not everyone, however, shares our devotion to salt water.

You may have noticed, for example, that the new majority has not only eliminated the Congressional Committee that makes oceans policy, but also targeted the federal agency that administers it.

The kind of "reform" will undermine everything from Pacific tsunami warnings to the million-dollar-a-year whale-watching industry on Stellwagen Bank. And just think—a lot of the damage was done in a legislative vehicle called Reconciliation.

But we are not new to changes in the political tides. You and I know a little something about real reform. In 1970, we took on a Republican supporter of the Vietnam War in a District that had never before elected a Democrat to Congress—assembling a textbook grassroots campaign, before there even was a textbook for these things.

The stakes were so high, the commitment so deep and the coffers so empty that, by election day, we had 60 people working full-time on an entirely volunteer basis, directing our organization in every community in this District—often reaching down to the ward and block level.

My mother converted our modest home into a 24-hour staff hotel, restaurant and laundromat. For countless weekends, my sister Gaynor commuted from Buffalo to campaign in New Bedford supermarkets with my brother Colin, who carried a card, in Portuguese, saying "Eu sou o seu irmao"—"I am his brother."

My dad, a talented architect who kept his Republican roots very private, was working entire function rooms by the end of that race. One of my few regrets is that he was no longer with us by the time I was elected.

Dad was with us as we waited—and waited, until the afternoon following the election—for the Hingham totals, only to learn that we had fallen short by a half of one percent of the District-wide vote.

After a few hours of sleep, we started right back in. Two years later, after re-living our all-night vigil for Hingham's final count, ours was again the second closest race in the nation. This time we had prevailed.

That spring, when the House voted 202-202 to defeat an amendment on Vietnam War

funding, every single person who had stuffed an envelope, held a sign, or contributed a dollar knew their work was helping to keep youngsters from Weymouth or Falmouth or New Bedford out of harm's way.

Since the original thrust for our candidacy was the appalling lack of official candor about Vietnam, it seemed self-evident that a Representative should actually engage his constituency in an ongoing dialogue about things that matter.

We pioneered the idea of weekly reports on every vote and twice-a-year Open Meetings in each of our four-dozen communities. For the first time in its history, we opened offices in each of the three regions of the District; in fact, we now have four.

Since you can do only so much well, we chose our battles carefully and developed expertise to carve out a national leadership role in coastal and marine issues. The philosophy has always been to stress the practical over the purely rhetorical or partisan, so our work would relate directly to the lives people lead, the places we work and the schools we attend.

And we somehow got by without poll-driven, consultant-crafted sound-bites.

As disorienting as Washington can be, there is no way you would ever let me drift too far off course. All it takes is a stroll through Quincy neighborhoods like Squantum or Hough's Neck, where people understand the real meaning of roots and family values.

And not too long ago, I came from Washington to Vineyard Haven in order to tour a marine pump-out facility—that's sort of a politically correct porta-potty on the water. The event was ripe for pretentious pomp, since the project was funded under a law I had written. Leave it to Jay Wilbur, the town harbormaster to flash a half-smile while pointing to the vessel's name: the PUE-2.

Then there was the elderly gentleman who rose after a particularly lively Open Meeting in Harwich, pointed his finger at me and said: "Young man, I disagree with everything you just said, and I want you to know I intend to support you as long as I live!"

I wasn't quite sure what to make of that comment until coming across—of all things—the words of a Republican. Theodore Roosevelt wrote that "the most practical kind of politics is the politics of decency".

You don't hear him quoted too often these days on the House floor or on the campaign trail.

I still subscribe to the notion that public discourse and political campaigns are supposed to help articulate and illuminate matters of importance so citizens can make intelligent decisions in their lives and at the polls.

Many of our political adversaries over the years have agreed, which is the source of our longstanding tradition of challenging them to debate the issues. In one memorable campaign, my opponent and I had so many debates—13 in all—that we joked that we knew each other's positions so thoroughly we could just as well trade places.

It is increasingly difficult today to imagine sharing a laugh, a constructive exchange, or anything else remotely genuine with a political opponent. Attack, distortion and demagoguery are now the tools of the trade.

In this era of pandering, pontificating and potential third parties, it occurs to me that the rationale for our first candidacy remains hauntingly relevant. As I said in announcing our 1972 candidacy:

"The people of this District—like the people of this country—are far ahead of the politicians who are supposed to represent and lead them.

"The basic assumption seems to be that we, the American people, are too stupid to know and too heartless to care what our country is doing and what it is leaving undone. They count on our being too apathetic to insist that our government represent the best that is in each one of us, rather than pander to the worst. They think we will accept conventional politicians playing the cowardly game of conventional politics.

"There is a hunger in this country. It is a hunger for leadership—for candor, for courage, and for compassion. It is a hunger for leaders whose vision extends further forward than the next election and whose memories go further back than the last."

If working with six Presidents has taught me anything about leadership, it is that the world is not divided into good guys and bad guys. Human nature is not that simple.

We all have the capacity for insecurity, prejudice and fear. It is to this darker side that the demagogue plays.

Each of us can also evince strength, tolerance and compassion, and it is on these "better angels of our nature" that the leader calls.

I am making my decision public today, more than a year before the next election, to ensure plenty of time for voters and—brace yourselves—potential candidates to assess its consequences.

At the same time, I want to underscore my commitment to our full plate of issues for the coming year.

When I see assaults on education, child nutrition and Medicaid; plans to revive Star Wars, build B-2 Bombers and legalize corporate raids on employee pension funds; and "reforms" that increase taxes only on people with annual incomes under \$30,000; you can be assured that my voice will be as strong as ever.

I will continue to affirm our highest priorities—restoring shipbuilding to the Quincy Shipyard and cleaning up toxic pollution at the Massachusetts Military Reservation.

I will give special attention—as a Member of Congress, and then as a private citizen—to realizing our dream of making the Boston Harbor Islands a national park.

And as one who marched 30 years ago with Dr. King from Selma to Montgomery, I will advance, in every way I can, the cause of civil rights for all Americans—black and white, gay and straight.

When confronted each day by life's crises, there are always two basic responses—despair or determination. Despair sometimes seems more logical, but determination is far more productive and far better for the soul.

Many of my colleagues were shocked when, nearly ten years ago, I sent a copy of Surgeon General Koop's Report on AIDS to every household in this District. (That, incidentally would be moot today; aside from curtailing use of the Congressional frank, the House recently voted to abolish altogether the position of Surgeon General.)

I did so because 20,000 American—including 800 Massachusetts residents—had already died from the epidemic. President Reagan had yet to even utter the name of the disease, and Dr. Koop was told to let his life-saving information gather dust on a warehouse shelf.

Too many people in my own life have been touched by HIV. For Dean and me, there are periods of time when our most common social gatherings are funerals of friends who have died far too young.

The concerns of the gay community, like those of a Congressman who happens to be gay, are far broader than AIDS. To me, how-

ever, it is impossible to look back at the last quarter-century, or ahead to the next, without considering why this public health emergency has been handled so negligently.

My colleagues called the District-wide mailing political suicide—until I started sharing the overwhelming response. What you told me was, "What took so long?"

This constituency has always had a keen understanding that actions in Washington have consequences at home—that if you gut environmental protections, you can smell and taste dirty air and water in Plymouth and Yarmouth; that if you decimate education programs, kids in Brockton and Wellfleet may never be able to afford college; that if you are too timid, too closeted or too bigoted to confront a public health epidemic, you could pull the plug on AIDS housing in Provincetown and Marshfield.

At one Open Meeting in New Bedford, one young man got up, visibly shaking. He said that his wife had lost her job and that he was scared to death of losing his own: "You've got to do something," he said. "I've got kids. How am I going to stand it?"

Apologizing for taking too much time, he then added that he wanted to leave me with a letter. It wasn't until later that I read it—an impassioned plea to stop U.S. involvement in El Salvador.

It was a demonstration, reflected over and over across this Congressional District, of people's capacity not simply to experience their own pain, but to reach out and see beyond it.

I'll never forget the words of the Mayor of Cordova, Alaska, at a Congressional hearing on the oil spill in Prince William Sound. He told members of the Subcommittee that the two most beautiful places in the world were his home—and each of ours. "Whatever you do," he said, "go back and never let what happened here occur where you're from."

This District is a microcosm of the nation—rich in human resources and rich in human problems. We are cities and suburbs, countryside and islands—and we are a living reminder of the origins of us all, with a substantial and continuing immigration of new Americans, whether they arrive speaking Portuguese or Vietnamese.

Never has an elected representative been so blessed by the beauty of his District and by the decency and common sense of his constituents. You have stood with me in times of triumph and in times of extraordinary personal challenge. For that I am profoundly grateful.

In turn, you and I both owe another debt of thanks to a small number of remarkable people whose labor, by definition, goes unnoticed and unheralded. The truth, however, is that so very much of the real work is done by—and the real credit for the considerable success we have enjoyed belongs to—the members of my staff.

I could not name a single accomplishment over the last two decades that would have come to fruition without the competence, creativity and sweat of these dedicated individuals. They are devoted public servants, who spend inhuman numbers of hours to see that the potential of this region is realized in the federal arena. These are my friends and my colleagues, whom it has been a privilege to work beside. They have meant more to the cities and towns of this District than will ever be fully acknowledged.

As I gathered my thoughts to chat with you today, I thought a lot about an Island resident who taught many of us about things of lasting value, Henry Beetle Hough. Because my favorite of his book was "Tuesday

Will Be Different," I would always ask him whether he was really sure the next one would be different.

As if this surprises anyone, Henry now gets the last word. For me at least, the first Tuesday of November 1996 will be very different indeed.

For the privilege of being allowed to speak and vote in your name—for the last 23 years and over the next 14 months—I thank you with all my heart.

GEORGIA MEDICARE ADVISORY GROUP, SENIOR CITIZEN TASK FORCE REPORT FINDINGS

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, in the Sixth District of Georgia, we formed a Medicare Advisory Group and a Senior Citizens Task Force to help make policy recommendations to preserve the Medicare Program. Part of the learning process for us was developing a Communications Team that went out to the people of the Sixth District and asked for their ideas based on first-hand experiences. Our findings were not surprising, but were different from what we had heard from those who had initiated a scare campaign against seniors.

The truth was that when the public knew the facts, they overwhelmingly supported Republican efforts to reform Medicare. One finding that you will not hear the scare tacticians using is that 79 percent of those we asked believe that seniors should have greater choices in health care. Compare the findings which the Communications Team presented to me on July 9, 1995, with our Medicare Preservation Act of 1995, and you will see that our plan reflects the beliefs of a majority of those we polled.

I am submitting for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the findings of the Report that I believe represent what my colleagues are hearing all over the Nation.

MEDICARE ADVISORY GROUP AND SENIOR CITIZEN TASK FORCE COMMUNICATIONS TEAM SUMMARY REPORT

In July 1995 Congressman Newt Gingrich appointed a group of citizens to The Georgia Sixth District Medicare Advisory Group and Senior Citizens Task Force. The purpose of the group was to obtain grass roots input and feedback on issues related to strengthening and improving Medicare, thereby allowing the citizenry to be actively involved in upcoming legislation related to Medicare.

The group was composed of thirty-eight constituents, consisting of the following:

1. Senior citizens;
2. Doctors, nurses and other health care providers with experience in dealing with Medicare and with senior citizens;
3. Senior service experts, particularly directors or representatives of community-based programs, such as senior service centers;
4. Government officials familiar with the current Medicare program;
5. Representatives from private industries who could provide knowledge regarding medical costs or novel solutions, particularly employing innovative technology; and
6. Volunteers and advocates for senior citizens.

The entire group met with Congressman Gingrich on four occasions, to ask questions and to provide feedback to him. Following their initial meeting with Congressman Gingrich, it was decided by the group members that they would divide into four working groups, which would meet separately, to tackle the four areas they considered most vital. These were: Medicare Fraud, Medical Technology, Alternatives to Medicare, and Communication. Each group reviewed information and sought input from citizens throughout the district, prior to producing and submitting its final report to Congressman Gingrich on September 9, 1995.

The Communication working group was made up of 12 members, 6 of whom were senior citizens. The group was chaired by Laura Linn, a registered nurse currently employed as a clinical specialist.

The group developed a questionnaire, which they administered to 565 seniors throughout the Sixth District. In order to collect data, several senior centers throughout the Sixth District were visited. In addition to administering the questionnaire, the group also made available a letter from Congressman Gingrich and a Contract with Seniors. Those materials, along with results of the questionnaire, are included with this report.

An analysis of the questionnaire results reveal the following:

a) More than 75% of those questioned knew that Medicare was going bankrupt;

b) More than 75% were very concerned about Medicare going bankrupt, and more than 93% thought that Congress should take steps to save Medicare;

c) In terms of the changes that should be made, 67.8% said that some changes should be made but that the program should be preserved, while 11.2% wanted a complete redesign. Only 10% thought that there should be no changes in the current program;

d) While 48% preferred getting a Medicare policy directly from the government, 15% would approve of a voucher or check to purchase private insurance and nearly 37% were undecided;

e) More than half favored reduction in payments to hospitals and doctors and thought that seniors should receive incentives for identifying fraud;

f) Personally 77.2% would be willing to check their bills for fraud and abuse, 53.5% would be willing to engage in preventive and educational programs to stay healthy, and 47.5% would be willing to engage in cost-pricing to locate the most economical, quality provider;

g) Nearly 75% thought that fraud and abuse is a serious problem that needs to be addressed when Congress reforms Medicare, while 52.7% thought that lack of incentives for finding affordable care is a serious problem in the current system;

h) While 16% claim that they always shop for economical treatment, 55% said that they would if there were incentives for doing so;

i) Seventy-nine percent of respondents believe that senior citizens should have greater choice in their medical care programs, assuming that Medicare would be one of those choices.

The Communications group presented these findings to Congressman Newt Gingrich on July 9, 1995. Reports from the Medicare Fraud, Medical Technology and Alternatives to Medicare groups were also presented at that time. All information was reviewed by health care policy staff and considered in the drafting of subsequent Medicare legislation.

A CONTRACT WITH OUR SENIORS TO SAVE, STRENGTHEN AND PRESERVE MEDICARE

1. The Clinton administration's trustee's report warns the Medicare Trust Fund starts to go broke next year. The Program is Bankrupt by 2002.

2. The House Republicans will save, strengthen, and preserve Medicare through new technologies, new management and new approaches.

3. Medicare is growing at 10.5% a year, more than twice the rate of private health care spending. We can make Medicare solvent by slowing the rate of growth.

4. We will increase Medicare spending over 7 years from \$4,800 per beneficiary today to \$6,700 in 2002.

5. Medicare and Medicaid are government-run health care programs filled with waste and fraud—tens of billions a year (GAO). We'll crack down on this waste.

6. And we'll empower seniors to fight waste and fraud if we pay them a share of any waste they find in their own bills.

7. We will preserve the current Medicare system for those who want it.

8. We will engage in a dialogue with seniors since we believe the best ideas come from the Grass Roots.

9. Together we can create a system that offers the best care at the lowest cost with seniors having the greatest control over their own health care.

TOGETHER WE WILL STRENGTHEN MEDICARE SO IT CAN BE SAVED AND PRESERVED

SAVING, STRENGTHENING & PRESERVING MEDICARE: A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SENIORS; (N=565)

Gender of Sample=35.8% Male; 45.3% Female; 18.9% No response.

1. Did you know that President Clinton's Board of Trustees reported that Medicare will be bankrupt by the year 2002?

A. Yes 75.9%

B. No 19.6%

No response 4.4%

2. How concerned are you about Medicare going bankrupt?

A. Very concerned 75.2%

B. Somewhat concerned 13.5%

C. Not concerned at all 3.5%

D. Undecided 4.2%

No response 3.5%

3. Do you think that Congress should try to save Medicare?

A. Yes 93.1%

B. No 1.2%

C. Undecided 2.8%

No response 2.8%

4. Do you think that Congress should (check one):

A. Completely redesign Medicare 11.2%

B. Make some changes in Medicare but preserve the program 67.8%

C. Leave Medicare alone, even though it is going broke 10.1%

D. Undecided 5.3%

No response 5.5%

5. Would you prefer to (check one):

A. Get a Medicare policy directly from the government 48.3%

B. Receive a check or voucher to purchase private insurance 15%

C. Undecided 28.5%

No response 8.1%

6. In order to save Medicare, which of the following would you favor (check all that apply):

A. Have wealthy senior citizens pay a higher premium 37%

B. Reduce payments to physicians and hospitals for care they provide 50.4%

C. Provide incentives for seniors to join managed health care plans 24.4%

D. Provide seniors with incentives for locating fraud and abuse in their bills 59.1%

E. Raise the premiums for all Medicare recipients 15.4%

F. Raise payroll taxes 9.6%

G. Reduce benefits offered to seniors 5.7%

H. Raise the age of Medicare eligibility from 65 to 67 beginning in the year 2000. 34.5%

7. In order to save Medicare would you personally be willing to (check all that apply):

A. Check your bill for fraud and abuse 77.2%

B. Engage in preventive or educational programs to learn how to stay healthy 53.5%

C. Engage in cost-pricing to locate the most economical, quality provider 47.5%

D. Pay more money in terms of higher taxes or premiums 11%

8. As Congress looks at improving Medicare, what do you think are serious problems that ought to be addressed (check all that apply):

A. Excessive amounts of paperwork 62.8%

B. Inability to understand rules/regulations 43.7%

C. Fraud and abuse 74.3%

D. Lack of incentives for seniors to locate affordable care 52.7%

E. Issues related to long-term care 52.7%

9. Do you ordinarily check your Medicare bills for accuracy?

A. Yes 77.9%

B. No 11.3%

No response 10.8%

10. How often do you find out the cost of Medicare procedures prior to having them done?

A. Always 19.3%

B. Usually 21.4%

C. Occasionally 20.5%

D. Never 25.7%

No response 13.1%

11. How often do you shop for more economical treatment of comparable quality?

A. Always 16.6%

B. Usually 16.5%

C. Occasionally 17.5%

D. Never 34.3%

No response 15%

12. If you were rewarded monetarily for finding more affordable treatment of comparable quality, would you?

A. Yes 55%

B. No 11.5%

C. Undecided 19.8%

No response 13.6%

13. Have you ever suspected fraud or abuse on your Medicare bills?

A. Yes 38.5%

B. No 48.5%

No response 12.6%

14. If you find instances of billing errors on Medicare bills, do you do anything to rectify the situation? (If so, give details and the usual outcome)

A. Always 31.9%

B. Usually 14%

C. Occasionally 10.1%

D. Never 12.4%

E. Not applicable 16.5%

No response 15.6%

15. Would you try to locate and report instances of fraud and abuse on your Medicare bills, if there was a financial incentive for doing so?

A. Yes 72%

B. No 6.9%

C. Undecided 9%

No response 12%

16. Do you think that senior citizens should have greater choice in their medical care programs, assuming that Medicare is one of the choices?

A. Yes 79.5%

B. No 4.2%

C. Undecided 7.8%

No response 8.5%

17. What are your major concerns regarding health care?

18. If you could tell Newt one thing about saving Medicare what would that be?

KILDEE HONORS LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, in January, 1996 we will be celebrating national School Board Recognition Month in this country. In honor of this occasion I rise today to pay tribute to the contributions local school boards make to our education system.

As a nation we place a high premium on the benefits to be gained from pursuing educational goals. Local school board members are elected by the community to ensure that everyone is given the opportunity for self-improvement through education. School boards seek community input and involvement in the education process. They are the liaison between the community and our schools. The members of school boards have accepted the responsibility of shaping the education of future generations and thereby the future of our Nation. School boards must assess the needs of their communities and provide the learning opportunities to meet these demands. They play a vital role in safeguarding students and schools.

The theme for 1996 is "Uniting Communities through Public Education". This spotlights the role local school boards have in bringing together persons from all walks of life. They help unite us into one nation. Through the dedication of local school boards, all Americans can learn and work together. School board members speak for all schoolchildren regardless of their background or goals.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House of Representatives join with me today in honoring these dedicated individuals who have accepted the challenge to provide quality education to every schoolchild. They play a historic role in carrying on public education's proud tradition.

TRIBUTE TO JIM MILLS' 40 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE MIDDLETOWN COMMUNITY

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, for 40 years, Jim Mills has served the Middletown area through his local reporting and editorial writing at the Middletown Journal. Jim began his career at the Journal in 1955 starting off as a reporter covering local government. In 1957, he was appointed Sunday editor and moved to city editor in 1960. From 1972 until 1981 Jim

was the managing editor of the paper. Ultimately, in 1981, he headed the newsroom and retained the title managing editor.

Jim and Middletown, OH have seen many important news stories over the last four decades. Some of the local highlights include the growth and restructuring of Armco to its present organization as AK Steel, creation of the City Centre Mall, and redevelopment of the downtown area, State championships for area high schools, and the change Middletown and its business community have undergone.

Jim and the Middletown Journal staff were always conscientious to bring the local angle to national news items ranging from the John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, and Robert Kennedy assassinations, the Vietnam war, the Iranian hostage crisis, Desert Storm, and the explosion of the Space Shuttle *Challenger* explosion.

Jim has received several awards for his dedication and continuous service. Among them are an award from the Associated Press Society of Ohio for exemplary service to the news-gathering business and his assistance to the Xenia Daily Gazette publish and report the news when its' offices were destroyed in a 1974 tornado. For coverage of the devastation the Gazette won a Pulitzer Prize.

During the past four decades, Jim has worked with hundreds of reporters and local officials. They join me in saluting Jim for his work and wishing him the best in his retirement.

A TRIBUTE TO HELEN BEST

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article to my colleagues:

Whereas, Mrs. Helen Best, should be recognized for celebrating her 80th birthday on December 14, 1995; and,

Whereas, Mrs. Helen Best, should be honored for her achievements, including her membership to the Carroll County Precinct Committee for forty years, deputy director and director of the Carroll County Board of Elections, and committee chair of the Subcommittee on Elections and Candidate Services; and,

Whereas, Mrs. Helen Best, has demonstrated her commitment to Carroll County and the surrounding area; and,

Whereas, the county owes Mrs. Helen Best a great deal of gratitude for her selfless, devoted service; and,

Whereas, I join the residents of Carroll County, with distinct pleasure, in celebrating Mrs. Helen Best's 80th birthday.

ADDITIONAL SUPPORT FOR H.R. 1020

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be the sponsor of H.R. 1020, the Integrated

Spent Nuclear Fuel Management Act of 1995, a bill that will make the Federal Government live up to its promise of building and operating a high-level nuclear waste repository by January 31, 1998. While nearly 200 of my colleagues have cosponsored H.R. 1020, there are several that were unable to do so after the bill was put on the House calendar. I would like to acknowledge the following Members as supporters of doing what is right, making the Government live up to its promises: CHARLES BASS, HELEN CHENOWETH, BARBARA CUBIN, JAY DICKEY, VAN HILLEARY, MARGE ROUKEMA, MAC THORBERRY.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I don't know what we need to do to get a clear budget plan from the President, but with each day it becomes increasingly obvious that he just doesn't have one.

Our Republican negotiators need an explicit budget plan from the President. The plan submitted over the weekend is at least \$75 billion out of balance. It is a phony. We cannot come to an agreement when all the White House is prepared to offer are superficial numbers severely deficient in detail.

Mr. Speaker, the President must give Republicans a specific plan with specific reforms and numbers. And, he needs to make sure it reaches balance in 7 years. My Republican colleagues and I have a plan, a real, honest balanced budget on the table. We are prepared to remain in Washington through Christmas to achieve an agreement, but we need the President and his Democrat colleagues to get serious and get to work.

TRIBUTE TO DON MACCULLOUGH, "MR. EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING" IN SOUTH FLORIDA

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a true pioneer in public television, Mr. Don MacCullough, who will be retiring in a few weeks after over 30 years with WLRN-TV in Miami—the past 22 years as general manager.

Throughout his career, Don MacCullough exemplified all that is right with educational television. A tireless worker, his determination helped keep WLRN based in Miami when others wanted to move it elsewhere. His dedication and skill helped the station grow in prestige over the years. His creativity and willingness to try new approaches brought in legions of new, loyal viewers, and helped make WLRN the community institution that it is today. Finally, the reputation he built over the years made him a leader in the industry. When Don MacCullough speaks, people listen.

It is difficult to think of public television in south Florida without Don MacCullough. However, the legacy he created will continue to enrich the lives of public television viewers for years to come.

I know that my colleagues join me in congratulating Don MacCullough on a remarkable career and thanking him for a job well done. We wish you every success in your future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO LYNETTE FREEMAN

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, We often read stories about young people across America who possess remarkable talent and ability. Most impressive are the stories we read about school students who have set goals for themselves, and exhibit the determination to reach those goals. I rise today to salute a young student who is one such individual.

Lynette Freeman is 12 years old, and a seventh grade student at Andrews School in Willoughby, OH. Lynette is president of her seventh grade class and a member of the Environmental Club, the Literary Magazine, the Language Club and the Riding Club. These extracurricular activities are in addition to a challenging academic schedule, which includes life science, honors algebra, French and Spanish. For Lynette, however, her first love is the theater. She started acting at the age of three. Her stage credits include Annie Get Your Gun, Penelope, Pride of the Pickle Factory, as well as productions at Cuyahoga Community College.

Mr. Speaker, the Plain Dealer newspaper in Cleveland, OH, recently profiled Lynette Freeman. The paper examined how this young student has developed effective time-management skills that enable her to succeed academically and socially. In whatever field she pursues, it is obvious that this young woman is headed for success. I take pride in saluting Lynette Freeman. I am also pleased to share the Plain Dealer profile with my colleagues. The article is certainly worthwhile reading.

[From the Plain Dealer, Dec. 11, 1995]

SEVENTH GRADER AHEAD OF HER TIME AT JUGGLING SCHOOL, ACTIVITIES

(By April McClellan-Copeland)

WILLOUGHBY.—Twelve-year-old Lynette Freeman talks about time management as if she is the CEO of a major corporation.

That's because it takes the time-management skills of an executive for the Andrews School seventh-grader to fit all of her extracurricular activities into a 24-hour day.

Lynette is president of the seventh-grade class and a member of the Environmental Club, the literary magazine, the Language Club and the Riding Club.

She plays tennis with her mother, Ruth; takes piano, singing and ballet lessons; and even makes time to write poetry and short stories in a journal.

Lynette, an East Cleveland resident, also reserves enough time to take part in her favorite hobby: performing in plays at the East Cleveland Theater, where she has studied for several years.

And she fits all of these activities around a challenging academic schedule, which includes life science, honors algebra, French and Spanish.

"I do some of my school work ahead of time," said Lynette, as she used her lunch period to talk to a visitor and munch on onion rings and a cheeseburger in the Andrews cafeteria. "I do as much in class as I can and in study hall. I manage my time. All of my activities are like studying for school. This is all a commitment I make."

Lynette said her parents, Ruth and Linton, don't push her to participate in so many activities. She said these are all things in which she has shown a natural interest.

But when the going gets tough, as sometimes it does when she has to finish an English paper at 1 a.m., Lynette's parents give her the pep talks that keep her motivated.

"This is all my choice," Lynette said. "Sometimes I want to quit. But my parents say, 'You made this commitment.' They give me this extra boost."

Lynette grins as she talks about how ballet makes her feel strong and about her trip to Europe next summer through the U.S. government-sponsored People Program student ambassadorship.

But mention the theater and a smile spreads across Lynette's face so broad it makes her squint.

"My favorite activity is when I'm acting in the theater," Lynette said. "I get to be someone else and I get to go into character. I like drama and theater because of opening night. I get to put on a costume and make-up."

Lynette most recently played the character Jessie, the sister of Annie Oakley, in a production of "Annie Get Your Gun" at the East Cleveland Theater.

She talks incessantly about her stage successes, as well as some of her blunders. The experiences are funny to her, but they remind her that drama is hard work.

But perhaps her fondest memories are reserved for humorous scenes like the one in the East Cleveland Theater production "Penelope, Pride of the Pickle Factory."

Reciting some of the tongue-twisting alliterations in her favorite scene in "Penelope" reduced her maturity to a gaggle of giggles only a child could appreciate.

"In the first scene, we are talking about what we had for lunch," Lynette said, pausing to let out a hearty laugh. "I had to say I had a pickled peanut butter sandwich."

Lynette started acting when she was 3 years old. She has also performed in productions at Cuyahoga Community College.

"My parents would take me to see different plays. I'd say, 'Gee, I want to have that lead part.' As I cleaned my room, I was acting like I was in a play. My cat was my audience."

A FRIEND OF MORE THAN THE COURT

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, our judicial system is critically dependent upon the people who toil on behalf of the public interest. This is certainly true in our criminal justice system, and is equally true in our civil justice system, particularly in our family courts. Nothing can

be more traumatic than the intervention of the courts in our day-to-day activities, but in some matters there is no choice but the court's involvement. It is at times like these that we should be particularly thankful that caring and skilled people, like Leonard Portnoy, have spent their careers on behalf of those who must deal with our court system.

After 20 years of serving as friend of the court, Leonard Portnoy of Bay City, MI, is retiring next week. A thoughtful gentleman who never spared in his generous consideration of the difficulties faced by people dealing with the court, he is known by many as a patient, helpful, and dedicated individual who has the delicate task of dealing with people at a very tense time in their lives. He is in charge of making recommendations to the court about child custody, visitation rights, and support payments. He also has to operate as a mediator regarding the safeguarding of these rights. And he also must serve as the enforcer who must deal with any violation of the court's orders.

Leonard Portnoy has been in our community since 1969 in response to an ad for a staff attorney position at the Bay-Midland Legal Aid Society. He then became assistant Bay County prosecutor for Eugene Penzien, who himself is retiring as a Bay County circuit court judge next month. He became acting friend of the court in 1974, and then was officially appointed by Governor Milliken in 1975 following the death of Maxine Clarey, the prior friend of the court.

Over the years, friend of the Court Portnoy had to deal with a never-ending and demanding caseload. He had to deal with the likely stresses associated with having to sort out difficult situations at often less than friendly and objective times. He has had to administer an office that annually must oversee millions of dollars in support payments for the people under the court's jurisdiction.

Even in this important and often trying profession, Leonard Portnoy is known for having maintained his sense of humor, and for being perhaps the best target for April Fool's Day jokes in the friend of the court system. That spirit, along with the balance of convictions, has made him among the best of friends of the court that I have ever encountered.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and all of our colleagues to join me in wishing Leonard and his wife Irene the very best as he enters retirement. His career has been of great value to thousands of people. He leaves big shoes to fill.

TRIBUTE TO ANDREW GIBBS

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding East Texan, Andrew James Gibbs of Mabank, TX, who died recently at the age of 79. Andrew Gibbs was a dear friend and long-time business and civic leader of Mabank who devoted a lifetime to the betterment of his community.

Born on January 11, 1916, in Elm Grove, to J. Cullen and Ella Higginbotham, Andrew grew

up in Elm Grove and married his hometown sweetheart, Arlene McAfee. At the age of 19, he began working at Tri-County Ford and at his father's bank. During World War II he served in the U.S. Navy and then returned to Mabank, where he purchased Tri-County Ford and raised cattle.

During the following years and until his death, he was a prosperous businessman who also devoted much of his time and energy to his community. He was active in virtually every civic activity in the region. He served as president of the Chamber of Commerce, Mabank Industrial Foundation, and Cedar Creek Hospital Board; member of the Mabank Independent School District Board of Trustees and the Trinity River Improvement Association; chairman of the board of Elm Grove Methodist Church and Elm Grove Cemetery Committee; president of Mabank Roping and Riding Club and organizer and president of the Cedar Creek Country Club and was a Mason with Roddy Blue Lodge. In 1977 he was named Citizen of the Year by Henderson, Kaufman, and Van Zandt counties in recognition of his extraordinary contributions.

Andrew also was an ardent supporter of higher education in the area. In 1970 he was appointed to the Board of Trustees of Henderson County Junior College, now Trinity Valley Community College. During his 20-year tenure and as board president, he saw enrollment grow from 1,000 to almost 5,000 students and the college expand from the Athens campus to Palestine, Terrell, and Kaufman campuses. On April 6, 1995, the Andrew Gibbs Academic Building was dedicated—a fitting tribute to his leadership, dedication, and countless hours of service on behalf of the college.

Andrew is survived by his wife, Alene; daughters, Andrea and Bettie, sons-in-law, and grandchildren, plus numerous friends and associates. He also leaves behind a powerful legacy of public service—a legacy of generosity and dedication to his family and his community. As the local newspaper, *The Monitor*, stated, "Men of his stature are often referred to as 'pillars of the community.' Andrew Gibbs was more than that, he was the foundation."

Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to pay a final tribute to this outstanding American and my good friend, Andrew Gibbs, whose life was an inspiration to all those who knew him and whose memory will survive for future generations.

IN HONOR OF DAISY VONDRAK

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a fine resident of the Third Congressional District who passed away on Sunday, December 17, 1996. Mrs. Daisy Vondrak, 80, a resident of the Chicago Lawn neighborhood, died on Sunday in the Brentwood Nursing Center in Burbank, IL.

Mrs. Daisy Vondrak was the cofounder of Vondrak Publications. For almost 40 years, she coowned and operated with her husband, Edward, the Southwest News Herald and four

other local community newspapers. Mrs. Vondrak handled the bookkeeping and finances of the newspaper, while her husband was in charge of the editorial operation. She watched the books closely; her attention to detail and strong work ethic pulled both the couple and the newspaper through many tough times.

During the Depression, Mrs. Vondrak and her husband purchased a small paper, the Gage Park Herald, that primarily provided neighborhood news to servicemen away from home. Deciding to broaden their publishing efforts in 1946, they attempted to purchase the Southwest News. Her husband was then an editor for the Life newspapers. They had to borrow all they could from friends and relatives and neighbors. It was a big chance for two young adults to take but they did it. Mr. and Mrs. Vondrak started out with just the two of them and ended up with 52 employees. The Vondraks retired in 1987 and initiated a humorous publication, the Chuckle Town Times.

The weekly newspapers the Vondraks co-published covered such southwest side communities as Chicago Lawn, Gage Park, Clearing, and Marquette Manor and the suburbs of Oak Lawn, Evergreen Park, Justice, Bridgeview, and Hickory Hills. The newspapers provide both national and neighborhood news to their subscribers. By faithfully watching the books and taking care of business, Mrs. Vondrak guaranteed that her neighbors would know what was going on around them in the community, the Nation, and the world. She provided a wonderful community service and will be sorely missed.

I first met Mrs. Vondrak in 1959, when I worked as the physical education instructor at Marquette Park. Every Monday night, I would submit stories to her or her husband Ed about activities at the park that would appear in the Thursday edition of the Southwest News Herald. I knew her personally and saw each week how dedicated she was to keeping the local publications up and running.

Mrs. Vondrak is survived by her two sons, James and Edward, a sister, a brother, and six grandchildren. I would like my colleagues to join me in offering sincere condolences to Mrs. Daisy Vondrak's family. She was a hard worker and strong businesswoman who will be missed by the entire community.

TAX RELIEF AND THE RIGHT TO
WORK FOR OLDER AMERICANS

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend the House of Representatives for passing H.R. 2684, the Senior Citizens' Right to Work Act of 1995, which ends the practice of punishing older Americans who want to work.

Earlier this year, I promised the one million working, older Americans financial relief from the punitive Social Security earnings limit which is wrongly imposed on them. H.R. 2684, fulfills my promise by increasing the earnings limit to \$30,000 by the year 2002. Today,

many people across the Nation want or need to work beyond the age of 64 because a fixed Social Security income alone cannot provide adequate financial resources.

This Nation has a tremendous amount of talent available in its older Americans. Younger people in the workplace gain a lot through the experience of these individuals who continue to work. Simply put, lifting the earnings limit is the right thing to do because it is good for all of us.

When fully phased in, the Senior Citizens' Right to Work Act will exempt about 50 percent of the people who currently have to comply with the earnings limit. These individuals have worked hard to pay into the Social Security trust fund. This legislation keeps our promise to lift the earnings limit for older people so they can continue to contribute to our Nation.

DEDICATED, PROFESSIONAL, AND
CARING

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the greatest need that all of us have throughout our lives is for food. And contrary to some accepted myths, it doesn't just magically appear on the grocery store shelves overnight. Food gets from farm to table through the professional and skillful efforts of many people who have spent their careers in agribusiness. Ronald W. Stebbins is one of these committed professionals who after having been involved in agribusiness for the past 40 years is about to retire.

Born and raised on a dairy and potato farm in Kalkaska County, MI, and having attended Michigan State University, over his career Ron Stebbins has worked for private industry, for cooperatives, and for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. He has worked throughout Michigan, and has developed a very impressive international marketing capability. He is well respected as a leader in agribusiness, and has served as an officer of several different professional agricultural associations, including the Michigan Grain and Agri-Dealers Association, the Michigan Bean Shippers Association, the Michigan Grain and Agri-Dealers Association, St. Paul Bank for Cooperatives, the Bank of Alma, and Valley Marketing, Inc.

In his capacity as president, secretary, and treasurer of the Michigan Agri-Business Association, Ron has helped to increase the professionalism and capability of Michigan's men and women in agribusiness. Educational events, informative meetings, legislative activities, insurance and other services have all been provided by this association, and Ron Stebbins has helped develop and improve many of these efforts.

Ron is very well known to many farmers in Michigan agriculture. Certainly his work as a grain trader has brought him in contact with many farmers, as did his work as supervisor for USDA's grain storage program many farm bills ago. His work over the years specifically with dry beans has made him a world leader in one of the most vital commodities for the economic well-being of our area's agriculture.

His work with advisory committees has helped him to maintain a close eye on the moods and needs of our producers. Many farmers and traders alike know that when they speak with Rob Stebbins, they are getting an informed and dependable assessment on important agribusiness conditions.

This gentleman has also maintained significant involvement with his community over the years, including his service as a member of several area groups in Ithaca and Gratiot County, as well as having served as a councilman for the city of Ithaca and a director of the Gratiot County Hospital Board. Together with his wife of 38 years, Mary Kay, his three children and five grandchildren, Ron continues to offer the kind of role model that all of our children should see. Commitment to family, dedication to professionalism, concern about his community, all of these factors of which Ron can be proud, and examples for the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of 40 years of devoted expertise and consistent professionalism, I urge you and all of our colleagues to join me in wishing Ron and his family the very best on his retirement.

IN MEMORY OF TOBY FARMER

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during this holiday season our thoughts naturally turn to children—our own children and grandchildren, children of our friends, children in our community, children in need. I would like to tell my colleagues about a special child, Andrew Michael "Toby" Farmer, a child who died of cancer on December 2.

Words are inadequate to convey our sense of grief and compassion in the loss of a child. Andrew was 10 years old, the son of David and Janet Farmer of Stafford County and brother to Allison Marie Farmer. He was a fifth-grade student at Garrisonville Elementary School. And he was a fighter. His mother wrote to me, "Andrew had a tough time, but he never, ever complained. He was and is the strongest person I have ever known."

Such courage in the face of death—particularly such courage in a young boy—humbles and saddens us, Mr. Speaker, but also should inspire us to work harder to find the elusive cure for a disease that prematurely ends too many lives each year. We must be sure that programs vital to biomedical research are protected and strengthened where needed. One of those programs, Mr. Speaker, is the international space station, and I commend this body for supporting funding of the space station earlier this year. The weightless environment of the space station has enormous potential for medical research—research that could lead to cures or better treatments for cancer and other diseases—and I urge my colleagues to continue support for such programs in the years to come.

Our hearts go out to Andrew's parents, sister, grandparents, and his many friends, and I ask my colleagues also to join me today in paying our last respects to this brave young

man. Andrew "Toby" Farmer lived the remaining days of what should have been the normal life of a 10-year-old boy by displaying extraordinary strength and courage. Mr. Speaker, he is an inspiration to all those who knew him and loved him—and he will be missed.

BRINGING THE TERRORISM BILL TO THE FLOOR

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Republican leadership reversed itself again on the terrorism bill. Repeatedly, the leadership had promised to bring this legislation to the floor. First they said they would do it by Memorial Day. Then they said it would come up before August recess. Finally, they pledged a vote by the end of the year.

Yesterday afternoon, however, the bill was abruptly yanked from this week's floor schedule.

Yesterday, I also received a letter from Ms. Victoria Cummock of Coral Gables, FL. Ms. Cummock's husband was killed 7 years ago when Pan Am Flight 103 exploded over Lockerbie, Scotland. As a victim of this random, senseless terrorist attack, she had dearly hoped that the House would finally move toward passage of the terrorism bill. Once again, her hopes have been dashed by the leadership's pandering to the far right.

I would like to enter Ms. Cummock's statement in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate to all of my colleagues how important this legislation really is. I share her hope that Congress will move urgently to pass the anti-terrorism bill right away, rather than waiting for another tragedy to spur action.

I ask unanimous consent that her letter appear directly following these remarks:

FAMILIES OF PAN-AM 103 LOCKERBIE,
Coral Gables, FL, December 13, 1995.

Re H.R. 1710/sub.H.R. 2703 counter-terrorism legislation.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,
House Judiciary Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHUMER: I am the widow of John Binning Cummock, a 38 yr. old American father of three, who was killed by terrorist, abroad Pan Am 103 over Lockerbie Scotland. Additionally, I am the Vice President of the Pan Am 103 Families group representing over 180 next-of-kin. I am writing in support of HR 2703 substitute for HR 1710. I feel that this current legislation is the most comprehensive and proactive approach to protect Americans from terrorism that I have seen come out of Congress in the last seven years.

After the bombing of the Murrah building in Oklahoma City, Congress vowed to get tough and pass this legislation by Memorial Day '95. Quick progress was made on the Senate side but sadly the House seems to have come to a screeching halt on debating this bill. Now that the media focus has faded from the Oklahoma City bombing, my fear is that Congress will recess before enacting this badly needed legislation. It is imperative that Congress does not forget its responsibility, not only to protect the American

people, but to support the law enforcement agencies who are trying to respond to the escalating and changing threats.

In less than seven years, I have looked into the faces of hundreds of American families that have been devastated by terrorism, after the bombing of Pan Am 103, the World Trade Center and most recently after spending 11 days in Oklahoma City under the sponsorship of the American Red Cross. I know all too well what they have been sentenced to live with under the current system. We owe it to our children and to future generations to be able to live in a safe and secure America. American children must not grow up feeling like they are walking targets to potential terrorist attacks, both domestically and internationally. Unfortunately, the children of the victims of terrorism remember all too well the questions of who is protecting them and where is justice? Let us not afford more consideration and rights to illegal aliens, felons or potential terrorists, than we do to our children who daily pledge allegiance to the American flag.

Specifically, for the Pan Am 103 families the FSIA Amendment within Section 804 is of particular importance. This will provide victims of terrorism an avenue to pursue terrorist sponsoring Nations, where none existed before, by waiving Sovereign Immunity for specific acts of terrorism against America. Clearly, history has shown that the current system, of diplomacy takes decades and only serves to re-victimize the victims' families by providing little or no remedy. In our case, as the KAL 007 flight which occurred over 12 years ago, no progress is in sight. A failure to achieve swift and adequate resolution only to continue the emotional pain, and anguish of the families, especially the children. Victims' families are not entitled to access the mental health and other areas of support currently available to other American victims of violent crimes. Hence, America turns its back on the families of those who made the ultimate sacrifice for being Americans. To potentially receive compensation after 40 years can not buy back my children's childhood, especially if they have been too traumatized to be able to learn how to read or sleep through the night.

I hope that we can count on your full support when this bill is placed for a vote. I can be reached at (305) 667-7218 or Skypage 1 (800) 592-8770. My hope is that it will not take another incident to refocus Washington's priorities on counter-terrorism, and other Americans can be spared our fate. Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

M. VICTORIA CUMMOCK,
V.P. Pan Am 103 Lockerbie,
Widow of John B. Cummock.

ENGLISH: LANGUAGE OF OPPORTUNITY IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to share with the Members of this distinguished body and the good people of this country an account which reveals a great deal about legislation which I have introduced to establish English as the official language of the Federal Government. I have a good friend to thank for passing along this story to me, and I am pleased to now present it to you.

As you know, I have been a principal sponsor of legislation to establish English as the official language of the Federal Government since the 101st Congress. I have studied the official English issue at length and have explored its tremendous potential to contribute to the well-being and prosperity of this country. However, even though I have become very familiar with the comprehensive reports, the historical lessons, and the compelling logic which confirm the need for this kind of legislation, I am still struck by the experiences and straightforward wisdom of folks who have visited the question of a common language on the most personal of levels. Anthony Macchiaroli, an immigrant from Italy, is one of these individuals, and it is his inspiring story that I would like to relate to you today.

It is my hope that we will learn from the dedication, the workmanlike approach, and the ultimate success of this proud American. His example tells us quite a bit about the economics of official English legislation, demonstrating that new members of this great democracy must have use of the English language in order to get ahead and become fully productive citizens. It is clear from the experience of Mr. Macchiaroli that the linguistic welfare of multilingual government is nothing short of a handicap to individuals entering our country. Regrettably, the handicap of multilingual government affects all Americans, resulting in severe social and monetary costs. I commend to you the story of Mr. Macchiaroli, as it appeared in an article in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette on September 3 of this year.

I WORKED HARD—BUT IT NEVER HURT ME

Tomorrow we pause to pay tribute to the workers who built this country. Many of those workers were immigrants, who came to America seeking a better life.

Anthony J. Macchiaroli is such a worker. The 60-year-old North Versailles resident quietly operates his New Eastland Mall store Valley Shoe Repair, where soles are mended Italian style—by hand.

"Tony," who came to the United States from Salerno, Italy, in 1953, says hard work has kept him in business at the mall since 1963.

Macchiaroli stepped off a boat in New York at age 17 with 35 cents. He went to live with an aunt and uncle in East Pittsburgh, and later opened a shoe repair shop, got married, and was able to send his two children to college. One of his sons is a physician in Johnstown, the other an electrical engineer in Florida.

He doesn't plan to retire but says instead he'll shorten his work week in coming years. "I really enjoy what I'm doing," he says. "I don't think I'll ever retire because I do enjoy talking to the people, and my customers need me too. It's a lost art—fixing shoes."

Macchiaroli talked with free-lance writer Beth Trapani about his work and his life in America.

America was a dream. It was like I could never come here. I used to pray a lot to God to let me see that I could go to America. My

uncle and aunt used to send me letters with stamps of the Statue of Liberty on them. Whenever I'd get those letters, I'd wonder if I'd ever really get to see her.

I've been here 42 years, and America has been good to me. If you have ambition, you can do anything here. It truly is the land of opportunity—believe me. If people set a goal here, they can achieve it.

I came to America March 10, 1953. I was not quite 18 yet and was an orphan. My father died when I was 17 months old and my mother died when I was 3½. Before she died, my mother had written to her brother in Pittsburgh and said, "If anything happens to me, I'd like my son to come to America near you." I still have that letter today. She died in a hospital in Naples, and left me in a convent with nuns until my father's sister could take me out. She raised me until I came to the United States.

I wanted to come here because it was a new land and I had heard so much about the country, that it was so great. But it wasn't like today where you can come right away or come as a tourist. You had to wait. Three times my papers expired before I could go. Finally my uncle and aunt, Vito and Anna Parente, were able to get me. They had to guarantee me a house and job, and they didn't have a house themselves and had to buy one because of me. It was almost like they were adopting me. I'll never forget them, that's for sure.

In the small towns like Bellosguardo in Salerno, where I grew up, you always learn a trade. I had bad feet from an accident where I was burned as a baby, so I wanted to be a shoemaker. In Italy, you sit while working as a shoemaker, but here you do the work standing up.

My first job here was in Homestead with a shoemaker. I got \$8 a day, six days a week, 12 hours a day. My boss justified my wage by saying, "You can't talk English and you can't run the machines." We made all handmade shoes in Italy, so I didn't know how to operate the machines. But here I could still rip shoes apart, wash windows, shine shoes. . . I worked hard—but it never hurt me. I learned a lot.

Five years later, I opened my own shoe repair business in the Great Valley Shopping Center. I was there five years and moved to the Eastland Mall in 1963 when it was being built, and I've been here ever since.

I had difficult time at first because I couldn't speak English. But people were wonderful to me. I went to night school for five years to learn to speak English. I can read good English, but I still can't write good.

In 1957, I went to the hospital to have surgery. I met a nice girl, a student nurse Rosemarie Billey, from United, near Mount Pleasant. And there was my fortune.

We got married in 1959 and had two sons. In 1969 I brought her and my children back to my hometown and traveled through Italy for three weeks. While we were there, my wife asked me if I ever wanted to go back there to live. I said, "No, No way." I'll never forget that I was born there, but America is my country now, and I'll fight for it.

In America there is so much opportunity. It seems everything I wanted came true. I

wanted to get married, have a family and educate my children, and I did. I'm very appreciative. If I die tomorrow, I'll die a happy man.

THANK YOU, GERALD L. BOOMS

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the education of our young people is most vital if our Nation is to continue its history of accomplishment into the future. And nothing is more vital to education than the people who are dedicated to providing the type of services that are essential to the successful operation of our schools. Uby Community Schools has been blessed over the past 33 years with the committed service of Gerald L. Booms. He is being recognized on December 27 for his generous service to the young people of his community at a retirement dinner.

Gerald Booms started as a bus driver in 1962, which he continued until 1972. He also worked as a part-time custodian, making sure that not only would students arrive at school safely, but they also would have a safe and well-tended school to attend. For the last 20 years, he has served as director of transportation for Uby Schools, again overseeing the effective operation of this system.

During his time with Uby Schools, Gerald Booms has remained involved with several other activities. He has been a member of the Michigan Association of Pupil Transportation, serving as a regional representative for 10 years. He also holds membership in the Uby Community Club.

He has been very involved with his religious convictions as a member of St. Mary Catholic Church of Parisville, and its men's club. He also was president of its parish council. He is a member of St. John the Evangelist Catholic Church of Uby, and the Ruth Knights of Columbus Council No. 3823.

Gerald and his wife, Georgeann know the importance of education to young people, being the proud parents of 7 of their own children, and the grandparents of 21 children. He has taken the care that he has for his own family, and extended it to the other children of his community who have benefited from safe transport to and from school.

Mr. Speaker, we need to remember and honor those who make it possible for our young people to receive the education they deserve and that our Nation needs. Gerald L. Booms has earned our thanks for his years of service. I urge you and all of our colleagues to join me in thanking him for his career of caring, and wish him and his family the very best in retirement.