HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, April 25, 1989*

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, as You have promised to hear the prayers and petitions of our hearts, we ask that You will bless us with the refreshment of Your Spirit, and give us Your peace that passes all human understanding. When we have missed the mark, we have been forgiven. When we have sought to do the good works of justice, Your word has pointed the way. Continue to be with us, O God, this day and every day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLEGATE] will kindly come forward and lead our colleagues in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. APPLEGATE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to recognize the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, and its role in establishing our Nation's system of State Cooperative Extension Services.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 678. An act to make a correction in the Education and Training for a Competitive America Act of 1988.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to designate April 30, 1989, as "National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution Centennial Day";

S.J. Res. 91. Joint resolution designating April 28, 1989, as "Flight Attendant Safety Professionals' Day"; and

S. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Airborne units of the United States Armed Forces.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 85-874, the Chair on behalf of the President of the Senate appoints Mr. MITCHELL to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, vice Mr. HATFIELD.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 85-874, the President of the Senate appoints Mr. HATFIELD to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, vice Mr. WEICKER.

The message also announced that pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 96, agreed to April 18, 1989, the Chair on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. D'AMATO, and Mr. LAUTENBERG, as members of the Senate delegation to ceremonies in New York City on April 29-30, 1989, commemorating the 200th anniversary of George Washington's inauguration.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 93-29, as amended by Public Law 98-459, the Chair on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints Mrs. Mary J. Majors of Iowa, to the Federal Council on the Aging, vice Dr. Russell Mills, effective March 22, 1989.

The message also announced, that pursuant to Public Law 86-380, the Chair on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. ROBB to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, vice Mr. SASSER.

The message also announced, that pursuant to sections 276h-276k, of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. FOWLER, as a member of the Senate delegation to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group during the 1st session of the 101st Congress, to be held in Ixtapa, Mexico, April 27-May 1, 1989.

The message also announced, that pursuant to section 1295(b) of title 46, United States Code, the Chair on behalf of the Vice President appoints Mr. HOLLINGS from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and Mr. INOUYE at large, to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced, that pursuant to section 194(a) of title 14, United States Code, the Chair on behalf of the Vice President appoints Mr. HOLLINGS from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and Mr. DODD at large, to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

The message also announced, that pursuant to section 6968(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Chair on behalf of the Vice President appoints Ms. MIKULSKI from the Committee on Appropriations and Mr. SARBANES at large, to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy.

The message also announced, that pursuant to section 9355(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Chair on behalf of the Vice President appoints Mr. WIRTH from the Committee on Armed Services and Mr. DECONCINI at large, to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy.

The message also announced, that pursuant to section 4355(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Chair on behalf of the Vice President appoints Mr. REID from the Committee on Appropriations and Mr. SHELBY from the Committee on Armed Services, to the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy.

APPOINTMENT AS ADDITIONAL MINORITY MEMBER TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGING

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of clauses 6 (f) and (i) of rule X, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JAMES] as an additional minority member to the Select Committee on Aging.

APPOINTMENT AS ADDITIONAL MINORITY MEMBER TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 103, House Resolution 84, 101st Congress, the Chair appoints the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as an additional minority member to the Select Committee on Hunger.

PRAYER FOR THE VICTIMS ON THE U.S.S. "IOWA"

(Mr. SKELTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I attended the memorial service in Norfolk, VA, for the 47 U.S.S. *Iowa* sailors who were tragically lost on April 19. All Americans join us in mourning this great loss, and we extend our heartfelt sympathy to the

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

families and shipmates who grieve for those who died.

A special word of condolence is for Capt. Fred Moosally, who many of my colleagues remember as Chief of the House Navy Liaison. This loss is personal to me, as I sailed aboard the U.S.S. *Iowa* this past December.

The sacrifice made by these men is a jolting reminder of the dangers faced by those who choose to serve at sea. Too often we forget that military service is an occupation filled with danger. It is sad that it takes a misfortune such as this to remind us that sometimes the ultimate sacrifice must be paid so that the rest of us Americans can enjoy the benefits of liberty.

Our prayer at this sad time can be found in these words from the Navy hymn:

Of all the souls that in her sailed
Let not one life in thee have failed;
But hear from heaven our sailor's cry,
And grant eternal life on high!

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING EXCESSIVE AND LETHAL USE OF FORCE BY SOVIET TROOPS IN SOVIET GEORGIA

(Mr. McEWEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], and specifically his references to the eminent captain of the *Iowa*, Capt. Fred Moosally.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore the excessive and lethal actions taken by Soviet troops on April 9, in responding to the thousands demonstrating peacefully for greater freedom and the restoration of their basic human rights, in Tbilisi, the capital of the Republic of Georgia in the Soviet Union.

Certainly every nation has a right to maintain peace within its borders. However, security cannot serve as an excuse for crack Moscow forces to attack thousands of peaceful demonstrators with clubs, sharpened spades, and, as reported by the Georgian Health Ministry, with toxic chemical agents that cause nerve paralysis, delirium, and death. From the actions of the Soviet troops on that sad day, there were scores of fatalities, and over 200 injuries.

The Soviet Union is a signatory of every major human rights agreement from the Universal Declaration on Human Rights to the Helsinki accords. They must be held accountable for the actions as it responds to the legitimately expressed voice of its people.

Mr. Speaker, I will be introducing a House resolution tomorrow, which condemns the excessive and lethal use of force by the Soviet troops responding to the April 9 demonstration in Tbilisi. It also calls upon the Soviet Government to investigate the allegations that toxic chemical agents were used by the Soviet troops, and if the allegations prove true, to take steps to assure that they will not be used again. Finally, my resolution will call upon the Soviet Union to abide by its commitment made in signing the various human rights agreements, and to heed the demands of the people of the Republic of Georgia for the exercise of their basic human rights and fundamental freedoms.

This is an important message to send to both the Soviet Government, and to all who are standing up to tyranny and calling for greater freedom and change. I urge my colleagues to join me when I introduce my resolution regarding Soviet Georgia tomorrow.

DVA, DOD, AND SSA RESPONDING TO "IOWA" TRAGEDY

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on what my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] said, as well as my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McEWEN].

Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened by the news last week of the tragic explosion on the battleship *Iowa* which cost the lives of 47 servicemen.

I'm sure that many of us will receive inquiries about what the Government will do for the families of those killed.

The Department of Veterans' Affairs, the Department of Defense and the Social Security Administration are providing casualty assistance to the families to help them apply for their benefits.

Social Security death benefits will be paid in some of these cases.

The Department of Defense provides a death payment of 6 months salary, funeral costs, and medical benefits to survivors under CHAMPUS.

The widows and children of the victims may receive any or all of the following benefits from the Department of Veterans' Affairs: Dependency and Indemnity Compensation each month, College Education for the Children of the deceased, and Servicemen's Group Life Insurance of up to $50,000. I am advised that all 47 servicemembers carried the maximum coverage. Furthermore, survivors of those who were participating in the Montgomery GI bill education assistance program will generally be eligible for a death benefit—$1,200.

Mr. Speaker, I have been told that about six of the families live in the Norfolk area and the rest are located throughout the country. I can assure my colleagues that all benefits claims will be processed quickly by all agencies of the Federal Government.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION TO DESIGNATE MAY 29, 1989 AS NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE U.S.S. "IOWA"

(Mr. GRANDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, since the first observances of what we now know as Memorial Day, the ranks of those we honor have swelled with the men and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice while defending this great country. Last week, 47 crewmembers of the U.S.S. *Iowa* joined these ranks when an explosion in their gun turret ended their lives.

On the 29th of next month, the citizens of cities and towns across the country will pause to honor those who have died in uniform, but for some of these cities and towns, this Memorial Day will have added significance—for these are the cities and towns that these sailors called home.

I am confident that I speak for all the citizens of this land when I extend to their families and loved ones our heartfelt sympathies and our deepest appreciation for the sacrifice that has been thrust upon them. It is for this reason that I have along with my colleagues in the Iowa Congressional delegation introduced a resolution today to designate May 29, 1989, as the "National Day of Remembrance for the Victims of the U.S.S. *Iowa*."

We have asked everything of these men and, in return, we can offer comparatively little. But we owe them and their families the simple debt of remembrance—and that we will eagerly give.

We will not soon forget the tragedy of the *Iowa*. A soldier's death is always a tragedy, but the death of the 47 men on the U.S.S. *Iowa* last week is a reminder that freedom and liberty do not come cheaply, be it in peacetime or in war. These men have indeed served their country courageously. We will miss them.

□ 1210

THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST CANNOT WAIT 3 YEARS TO SETTLE THIS MATTER

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, far from these halls a controversy rages in my district. Today the press reports that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has decided to list the spotted owl as threatened throughout its range.

If these press reports are accurate, this settles nothing. Both sides in this dispute are now faced with up to 3

years of uncertainty as the bureaucracy proposes and prepares management plans as to how to handle the management of the spotted owl in our forests into the future.

The people of my district and the people of the Pacific Northwest cannot wait 3 years to settle this issue. It is too important. Perhaps for once the industry who needs the certainty of timber supplies and the environmentalists who want certainty for the protection of old growth have something in common.

I believe they need to get together, sit down at the settlement table, and we in Congress need to urge that these management plans be greatly accelerated and they be put in place as soon as possible so that we can have certainty, both as to the protection of the old growth that the environmentalists want, and the certainty of the protection of the timber supply which is so vital to the industry in the Northwest.

In addition, I renew my request to the President and ask for the support of this body in immediate restrictions on the export of raw logs to Japan. We cannot keep exporting our logs while our mills fall silent for lack of supply.

Finally, I urge the Chief of the Forest Service and the Secretary of the Department of the Interior to expedite my request to develop alternate harvest plans and sale plans throughout the Northwest so that we can have some timber harvested this summer. I will not stand idly by.

These are our forests, these are our future. If it requires congressional intervention, I am ready to make those tough decisions, too.

DEMOCRACY IN NICARAGUA ACT

(Mr. CHANDLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, today I join the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON] in introducing the Democracy in Nicaragua Act.

This bill was introduced in the last Congress and had 86 cosponsors, including 39 Democrats and 9 chairmen.

With the signing of the Tesoro Beach Accord by the Central American Presidents and the bipartisan policy on Central America agreed to by our leadership and the President, we need to come together and state clearly the reforms needed to ensure free and fair elections in Nicaragua next year.

Today marks the first deadline of the Tesoro Beach Accord. Once again, the Sandinistas have promised full democracy, and once again we wait for action without result.

We in Congress need a clear, definitive scorecard for Sandinista compliance with the promises they have made. As the bipartisan accord makes clear: "To be successful, the Central American peace process cannot be based on promises alone. It must be based on credible standards of compliance [and] strict timetables for enforcement."

This bill codifies these commitments, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE OF LEBANON

(Mr. JONES of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on behalf of the forgotten people of Lebanon. As we gather here today, Syrian gunners supplied by the Soviets are attacking the civilian population of Beirut, shelling hospitals and schools, killing women, children, and the elderly.

These attacks are an act of brutality that is barbaric and inhumane, an uncivilized strike at the spirit of a people who wish to throw off the yoke of the Syrian occupiers.

The shelling is a cowardly attack on the defenseless, a shameful act that deserves the condemnation of the decent, freedom-loving peoples of the world. I ask that President Bush take action in response to this unspeakable terror, that the moral position of the United States be clearly stated, and that we denounce in the strongest possible manner this Syrian aggression.

Our friends are calling out to us for help, Mr. President. Deaf ears are not our style. Speak out, sir, please speak out.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN PANAMA?

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, today we vote on funding for the Panama Canal which raises an important question: What is going on down there?

In February of last year, Federal courts indicted General Noriega on drug trafficking charges. Within 2 months, the United States imposed economic sanctions on that generally friendly nation.

What has been the result? Let me tell you:

General Noriega is stronger than ever. He has imprisoned his enemies, consolidated his control over the military, and suspended basic freedoms.

The Panamanian economy is plummeting. People are suffering. The poor segment of the population has increased dramatically, and the GNP declined almost 50 percent last year.

All of this has served to create an increasingly tense and unstable situation. The Soviets and Cubans are smacking their lips in anticipation of another opening for Communist expansion in the Western Hemisphere.

My friends, our policy toward Panama has failed. Our sanctions are starving the Panamanian people, and our "wait and see" attitude fails to do anything about Noriega. The problem is growing worse by the day, and those folks don't know who their friends are anymore.

I don't like the idea of bargaining with drug runners, but even less do I like the thought of another Nicaragua in Central America, and even less do I like the thought of allowing many years of friendship and cooperation between our two nations to go down the drain.

President Bush and Secretary Baker must work out and implement a realistic plan for weaning Noriega from his role as dictator and rebuilding the economy of our beleaguered friends.

IT IS TIME WE STAND UP FOR OUR POLICEMEN AND STRAIGHTEN THIS MESS OUT IN THE "KILLING FIELDS" OF AMERICA

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the murder rate in America is an indictment on Congress. We had 20,000 murders in America last year, and over 185 policemen were gunned down alone.

The sad fact is 50 percent of all cop killers are back on the street in less than 6 years in America. Think about it. That is ridiculous.

What is next? Will judges in America like in Central America, will they be targets? Will they start killing our court officials?

Today I am introducing a bill that would create a Federal death penalty for anyone who murders a policeman or an official of the court. It would also apply to serial killers and mass murderers, and to any criminal enterprise who has a contract murder to further their particular illegal enterprise.

I am asking Congress to go beyond the lip service, and I am asking Congress today to straighten out what has become the killing fields of America, our streets. I think it is time the taxpayers should not be feeding people like Richard Speck, Charles Manson, Son-of-Sam, Donald Harvey, and I think it is time we look at the victims' rights in this country. The criminals seem to have all the rights.

It is time we stand up for our policemen and straighten this mess out in the killing fields of America.

COMMENDING PRESIDENT BUSH ON FORMING A WORKING GROUP ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend President Bush on forming a Working Group on Rural Development within his administration. Agriculture Secretary Yeutter along with many members of the President's Cabinet will be part of this Working Group on Rural Development which will ensure that the needs of rural areas are better served by a more efficient coordination of Federal services.

Chaired by Secretary Yeutter and reporting to the White House Economic Policy Council, the working group will assume a great deal of the responsiblity I have been urging the executive branch to take on rural development in the last several years.

More than 2 years ago, I requested the General Accounting Office to review all Federal programs to determine those that are essentially rural, and to recommend which of those programs could be made more productive by being located in a new Rural Development Administration. That report was delivered to me early this year.

Generally, GAO found that the Federal Government does not have a good idea of how many Federal programs are meant for rural America. Nor does the Government know how many Federal dollars actually get to the more than 2,000 rural counties in the United States.

This is why I believe the President's Working Group on Rural Development is vital to rural America. Evaluating existing programs, developing policy options for Federal, State, and local involvement, and determining how to best leverage the Federal Government's expertise are absolutely necessary steps for rural development initiatives.

In addition to the USDA, the working groups membership will include representatives from the Departments of Treasury, Commerce, Labor, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, Transportation, and the Department of Education as well as the Office of the Vice President, the Office of Management and Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Small Business Administration and the White House Office of Policy Development.

The makeup of the working group accurately reflects the fact that the challenges of rural development are more than just the problems of agriculture; that a governmentwide initiative is needed to improve the lives of the 60 million people who live in rural America.

□ 1220

LESS PROFITS FOR EXXON

(Mr. APPLEGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, the American people are mad as hell and they are not going to take it any more. They do not want the Exxons of the world to screw up the environment and be paid for it.

Today I am introducing legislation that will deny Exxon that right to be able to pass those costs off to the American people. The costs will exceed $600 million of your taxpayers' money. We have already allowed them to be able to increase the cost of gasoline from 10 to 15 cents, and if that is added up over a year's time, that is a billion dollars, for every penny, that is $10 to $15 billion that they are taking from the consumers.

We cannot continue to see the oil leeches, their partners in crime, continue to raise these prices. They are on the backs of the American consumers and they are sucking the lifeblood from them. They can afford it. Let us take that money from their profits, not our pockets.

Join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

CATASTROPHIC SURTAX IS DISCRIMINATORY

(Mr. ARCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, recently Senator LLOYD BENTSEN suggested that the Treasury Department concurs in the revised estimates of the Joint Committee on Taxation which indicate that revenues from Medicare catastrophic surtax exceed original projections by nearly $5 billion, the amount the tax should be reduced.

Senior citizens should not be deluded by this temporary relief. Costs of the program will escalate over time and the surtax will go up again. There is only one way to eliminate discrimination against the elderly and that is to abolish the surtax as the method of funding.

The Tax Reform Act of 1986 promised a maximum tax rate for Americans of 28 percent. Now, as a result of the catastrophic illness legislation, we have broken that promise to the elderly by increasing their tax rates to a maximum of 38 percent, the highest level paid by any group of Americans. With the interaction of Social Security earnings limitation and the tax on 50 percent of Social Security benefits, many older Americans will pay marginal tax rates as high as 110 percent.

I urge my colleagues to avoid falling into the trap created by the suggestion that all we need to do is reduce temporarily the surtax. Let us focus instead on the real problem and find an acceptable alternative to the discriminatory catastrophic surtax. I continue to lead the effort in that regard.

NUCLEAR STANDARDIZATION BILL

(Mr. CLEMENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that amends the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to encourage the development and use of standardized plant designs and to improve the nuclear licensing and regulatory process.

As many of my colleagues know, utilities have not ordered new nuclear powerplants for 10 years and are not expected to until conditions affecting the nuclear power industry improve.

Our Nation is presently over 40 percent dependent on foreign oil. If current trends continue, that figure will rise to an alarming 60 percent or more by the turn of the century. Oil imports for electric generation could rise by a million barrels per day by 1990, and by three million barrels per day by 1995. Standardization will reduce the capital cost of a facility by 55 percent.

It is time that the United States reexamine its policies on nuclear power. The severe drought last summer forced our Nation and the world to consider ways to prevent further ozone depletion, global warming and the greenhouse effect.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor my legislation and push for its quick passage.

EXCLUSIONARY RULE

(Mr. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the rule of evidence called the exclusionary rule imposes a single, inflexible, and drastic sanction without regard to the nature, circumstances, or degree of police misconduct. Whether an honest mistake or outrageous misconduct, the result is always the same—exclude the evidence even if it means immunity from prosecution. Indeed, in those cases where a police officer, in a good faith effort to comply with the law, conducts a search or seizure which is later found to be technically insufficient, the drug evidence is excluded and the accused goes free.

As a former judge it seems clear to me there can be no rational basis for applying the same sanction to an honest mistake and to outrageous mis-

conduct. As former Chief Justice Burger stated:

> I submit that society has at least as much right to expect rationally graded responses from judges in place of the universal "capital punishment" we inflict on all evidence when police error is shown in its acquisition.

The exclusionary rule has needlessly contributed to the problem of delay in our courts. Time-consuming hearings on motions to suppress often consume as much court time as the trial itself.

That is why Congressman JIM COURTER, of New Jersey, and I have introduced H.R. 1239, to permit evidence seized in good faith to once again be used in our courts. I urge your support for the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1989.

ANOTHER HOSTILE TAKEOVER

(Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the hostile takeover wars in America have now taken flight. The big shot speculators' latest target is Northwest Airlines, and it's the same old game, they use a lot of debt, they buy the assets, take them over, take them apart, sell them and make money quick.

The problem with it is a few people make a lot of money, and everyone else gets hurt.

Northwest Airlines is being pursued by a speculator who will borrow nearly $3 billion to buy it. Saddled with this debt, the company will have an annual interest cost of $300 to $400 million a year.

This is a good company, a healthy company, but it has never had profits over $200 million a year.

If we don't stop this hostile takeover binge at some point, it will threaten airline service in the northern Great Plains and it will certainly increase airline ticket costs.

I think it is time for Members to tell the Department of Transportation to, "Stop shivering in your boots; stand up and be counted on these issues." It's time for Congress to understand we better do something to stop the proliferation of junk bonds and hostile takeover to take apart our corporate structure.

The attack on Northwest Airlines is an attack on a healthy company and threatening airline service in an important region of this country.

□ 1230

LESSONS FROM THE "IOWA" TRAGEDY

(Mr. PICKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Bush joined the crew of the battleship *Iowa*, their families, the families of those who were lost, and many others for a memorial service at Norfolk in honor of the 47 young sailors who perished aboard that vessel last week.

Being there, seeing the grief on the faces of children and young widows, was a vivid reminder of the high price this Nation pays for freedom. Even at peace, when it is easy to think of the world as safe, America's soldiers and sailors live in danger. The sacrifices which they and their families make are enormous, and this we must never forget.

The tragedy aboard the *Iowa* has again tested the character of Navy families. Grief has been a shared emotion in Norfolk this week. But beneath the compassion and sorrow, there is a quiet determination to carry on, to fulfill and maintain their duty to the U.S. Navy, and perhaps most important right now, to fulfill and maintain their duty to care for one another. The Navy has displayed great sensitivity and compassion in getting its people through this ordeal. Community help and support for the families of *Iowa* crewmembers has been no less impressive.

But I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that all of this would not have been possible without the prayers and support of the American people.

LET US ENCOURAGE MARRIAGE

(Mr. DREIER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is not every day that a marriage inspires me to introduce a bill in Congress but that's exactly what I am going to do today. Albert Quintanar and his wife Bernadette of Clarmont, CA, both disabled adults, have discovered that marriage is not cheap—in fact they discovered that our Government actually penalizes people with disabilities from marriage.

Current law holds that a Social Security adult disabled child can retain their childhold disability benefits if they marry another adult disabled child. If they marry a supplemental security beneficiary, a means tested program, they forfeit their Social Security benefits.

To end this inequity, the legislation which I am introducing will allow a Social Security disabled child to continue receiving their Social Security benefits upon marriage to a supplemental security income beneficiary.

Let us stop discouraging marriage. I urge all Members to cosponsor my bill.

BUDGET FAKERY

(Mr. MOODY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, the Congress enacted Gramm-Rudman to force the White House and the legislative branch to make tough choices, bite the bullet, and get serious about deficit reduction. I argued at the time that there was no institutional substitute for political courage and that if instead we showed political cowardice, Gramm-Rudman would only spawn bookkeeping gimmicks to avoid sequestration.

Nowhere is that more evident than in the recent budget summit agreement for fiscal year 1990. It pretends to meet the Gramm-Rudman deficit target of $100 billion for fiscal 1990.

But it is a sham. A hoax. This is the most disingenuous budget I've seen since coming to Congress.

The summit blandly accepts the economic assumptions of the earlier Bush budget which are so rosy as to be ridiculous: 3.4 percent real growth in GNP, a drop in inflation all the way down to 1.5 percent by 1994, short-term interest rates down from 9 percent now to 5.5 percent in 1990.

The Congressional Budget Office—who we in Congress are supposed to believe—is projecting totally different numbers: Real GNP growth at barely 2 percent, inflation at nearly 5 percent and interest rates at realistic levels.

With the save of the magic wand of economic assumptions the summit agreement cuts the CBO deficit projection by $19 billion.

Even the few "hard numbers" in the summit agreement are suspect. Its $13.8 billion in spending "cuts" include $2 billion by taking the Postal Service off budget. Another billion dollars is "saved" in agriculture payments by pushing them into fiscal 1989. Another $4 or $5 billion is produced by sale of public assets—all done in order to avoid raising real revenues.

This is blue smoke and mirrors carried to a new height. But why should the Congress be a willing accomplice to this kind of budget fakery? If it does, it should come as no surprise when the actual 1990 deficit turns out to be much higher than we promised the people it would be.

Let's get on with real budget deficit reduction. It's the only way we can do our jobs and be honest with the country.

INTRODUCTION OF THE STRATOSPHERIC OZONE LAYER PROTECTION ACT OF 1989

(Mr. BATES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the first thing I would like to do is to endorse the statements of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY]. I completely agree with his comments on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I will soon be introducing legislation to address the serious damage being done to the world's stratospheric ozone layer by chlorofluorocarbons and halons.

My legislation, the Stratospheric Ozone Layer Protection Act of 1989, would freeze the production of nine major chemicals that deplete the ozone layer at 1986 levels, followed by a phaseout schedule that would prohibit the production of these chemicals by 1995.

The bill also prohibits the importation of major chemicals from nations that have not established a phaseout schedule at least as stringent as ours. Finally, the legislation encourages reclamation and recycling of CFC's, promotes safe alternatives, and requires the use of approved recycling equipment and properly trained employees in the maintenance of automobile airconditioners.

Mr. Speaker, the Stratospheric Ozone Protection Act does many other things. I hope my colleagues will take a serious look at the bill and consider becoming a cosponsor.

INTRODUCTION OF BYRON/CHANDLER BILL—DEMOCRATIZATION IN NICARAGUA

(Mrs. BYRON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce with my colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. CHANDLER], legislation that specifies several important standards for evaluating democratization in Nicaragua under the Guatamala Peace accord.

We all applaud the House leadership's role for initiating the recent Bipartisan Accord on Central America that passed the House last week and we are encouraged by the signing of the Tesoro Beach accord by the Central American Presidents. However, it is extremely important that we state clearly the reforms needed to ensure free and fair elections in Nicaragua next year.

Among the standards we believe necessary are separations of the party from the State security forces and Army, the rights of opposition parties to meet and organize, full freedom of the press, and equal rights for Atlantic coast and Indian peoples. It makes achieving these steps in Nicaragua the policy of the United States and the legislation states that these principles should be adopted by all countries in the region.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation so we can ensure fair and free elections in Nicaragua. We have seen democracy move forward in the neighboring countries and now is the time for Nicaragua.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR IMPEACHMENT OF WALTER L. NIXON, JR., JUDGE OF THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. BROOKS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 101-36) on the resolution (H. Res. 87) impeaching Walter L. Nixon, Jr., judge of the U.S. district court for the Southern District of Mississippi, for high crimes and misdemeanors, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

FIRE CHIEFS ENDORSE FIRE SAFE CIGARETTE ACT OF 1989

(Mr. MOAKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sincerest thanks to the National Fire Protection Association and the International Association of Fire Chiefs for their endorsement of the Fire Safe Cigarette Act of 1989.

The NFPA is the leading fire service organization dedicated to promoting fire safety, through research and the development of standards and the IAFC has long been concerned over the problem of fires resulting from a carelessly discarded cigarette. I commend both organizations for taking a lead on the issue and lending their support to the effort to develop a cigarette that would not ignite furniture.

Each year thousands of people are killed, maimed, or permanently disfigured from fires caused by a discarded cigarette, according to a recent publication by the NFPA. In 1986, 231,200 cigarette-initiated fires resulted in 1,506 civilian deaths, 3,559 civilian injuries, and $402 million in property damage. T' e statistics are quite alarming. As a result I, along with Senator CRANSTON and Senator HEINZ introduced legislation which would direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate fire safety standards.

I am delighted that the NFPA and the IAFC have demonstrated their full support for H.R. 293, the Fire Safe Cigarette Act of 1989 by wholeheartedly endorsing the bill. I would like to thank all members of both organizations, their dedication and hard work is truly appreciated.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BATES). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

□ 1240

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 1486, MARITIME ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1990

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have until 5 p.m. today, April 25, 1989, to file the report on H.R. 1486, the fiscal year 1990 Maritime Administration authorization, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BATES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION AUTHORIZATION, 1990

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 840) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1990 for the Federal Maritime Commission, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 840

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

SECTION 1. In fiscal year 1990, $16,350,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the use of the Federal Maritime Commission.

SEC. 2. (a) The Federal Maritime Commission shall require that complete and updated electronic copies of the Automated Tariff Filing and Information data base are made available (in bulk) in a timely and nondiscriminatory fashion, and the Commission shall assess reasonable fees for this service consistent with Section 552 of Title 5, United States Code.

(b) The Commission shall impose reasonable controls on the system to limit access usage by any one person.

(c) The Commission shall provide that any information from the Automated Tariff Filing and Information System that is made available to the public may be used, resold, or disseminated by any person without restriction and without payment of additional fees or royalties.

SEC. 3. The first paragraph of section 2 of the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933 (46 App. U.S.C. 844) is amended—

(1) by inserting in the third sentence after "on board each vessel", the words "that carries passengers";

(2) by striking in the seventh sentence ", if filed as permitted by this section and framed under glass and posted in a conspicuous place on board each vessel where they may be seen by passengers and others at all times,"; and

(3) by striking in the seventh sentence "on board each vessel" the second time it appears.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 840, as amended, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal Maritime Commission, and other purposes. The small amount that we are authorizing here will allow the Federal Maritime Commission, an independent agency, to carry out its regulatory responsibilities to enforce various shipping statutes affecting ocean commerce.

The Commission continued to work on establishing an automated tariff filing and information system to facilitate the receipt, retrieval, and publication of tariffs. A computerized system will provide a remote retrieval function which will permit the public to dial into the system—by modem—and obtain a particular carrier's rates on a requested commodity in a given trade.

H.R. 840 authorizes appropriations of $16,350,000 for the regulatory programs on the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal year 1990. The bill is identical to the President's budget request.

The Merchant Maritime Subcommittee held a hearing on the bill on February 9, 1989, and it was reported unanimously out of full committee with an amendment by Representative SHUMWAY, and with an amendment I offered.

My amendment requires the Commission to:

First, make electronic copies of the data base—in bulk—available in a timely and nondiscriminatory fashion, and at a price related to the value of the service;

Second, impose reasonable controls on the system to limit remote access usage by any person; and

Third, provide that any information obtained from the automated system may be used, resold, or disseminated by any person without restriction or payment of additional fees or royalties.

Mr. SHUMWAY's amendment eliminated a meaningless and outdated requirement in the 1933 Intercoastal Shipping Act that bills of lading and contracts of affreightment be framed under glass aboard nonpassenger vessels.

Finally, let me commend Elaine Chao for her excellent work as Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission. Her leadership has been outstanding, and it has been a pleasure for our committee to work with her. I wish her well in her new capacity as Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

With the President's designation of Jim Carey as Acting Chairman, the leadership of the FMC remains in hands with which we are most comfortable. It pleases me to congratulate Commissioner Carey on his appointment, with the knowledge that the spirit of cooperation between the FMC and the committee will continue.

Mr. Speaker, we have crafted a fair, bipartisan bill that deserves the support of the entire House of Representatives. The administration supports the funding levels in H.R. 840 and does not object to the proposed limits on the remote retrieval system. I urge the bill's passage.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 840, the annual authorization bill for fiscal year 1990 for the Federal Maritime Commission [FMC].

The FMC is an independent regulatory agency whose primary function is to regulate the practices of international and domestic ocean common carriers. While it does not establish tariff rates in international transportation, it does enforce laws that prohibit discrimination and unfair pricing.

H.R. 840 authorizes $16,350,000 for the FMC—an increase of $2,765,000 over the appropriation for fiscal year 1989. The authorization for fiscal year 1990 is the same amount as requested by the President in his budget.

The Merchant Marine Subcommittee, of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, held a hearing in early February on this authorization request. We received testimony from the Chairman of the FMC, the Honorable Elaine L. Chao, recently sworn in as Deputy Secretary of Transportation, as well as from representatives from the domestic shipping industry and other interested public witnesses.

The subcommittee had an extended discussion at the hearing on the FMC's proposed Automated Tariff Filing and Information System which has been under development for the last several years. This new system will put all of the tariff filing information currently required under the Shipping Act of 1984, as well as other statutes, into a single computerized operation. We received testimony from a vendor of private tariff information who expressed concern that the FMC's remote retrieval system might unfairly compete with his private services. The FMC is well aware of this concern and took steps in its proposal to minimize any unfair competition. Neither the FMC nor any of the Members of the Committee want to see the agency directly competing with private companies.

As a result of information obtained during the hearing, the committee modified H.R. 840 during the markup process and added a provision that clarifies the way in which the FMC will implement the remote retrieval aspect of the Automated Tariff Filing and Information System. All parties affected by this new computerized operation have agreed to the additional language and I believe this bill addresses the concerns of the private vendor and meets the needs of the FMC to develop a workable automated system.

In addition, when the bill was approved by our committee, we added another minor amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHUMWAY) that eliminated an outdated requirement that merchant vessel owners post their bills of lading under a glass in a conspicuous place aboard their vessel. Due to modern methods of handling cargo, this requirement is no longer needed, and, in fact, is meaningless because individuals are no longer permitted to walk through the container handling areas in order to climb aboard a vessel to look at the bill of lading. These documents are maintained in the corporate offices of the shipping companies and are, of course, available for public review at those locations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has crafted a good piece of legislation that will fund the programs of the Federal Maritime Commission and enable it to implement its statutory requirements. I urge my colleagues to join with the Members of our committee and approve this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to Chairman JONES for the excellent job he has done in moving this bill to the floor so early in the session.

With respect to the budget request, the largest single item of increase is for the funding of the Automated Tariff Filing and Information System. While this started out as a con-

troversial issue, I am confident that with the amendment offered at the full committee, which was supported by the Federal Maritime Commission, we have resolved the problems presented to us by the private sector. Our goal is to assure that we do not have a Federal agency competing with the private sector to provide a particular service—a service which the private sector is fully capable of performing. Elaine Chao, Chairman of the FMC at the time of the hearing and now Deputy Secretary of Transportation, assures us of support for the approach we have taken.

With this issue resolved, I am hopeful the FMC can move to implement this automation project without further delay.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEISS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 840, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1990 for the Federal Maritime Commission, and for other purposes".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1250

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 840, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEISS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION MARINE FISHERIES PROGRAM ACT AUTHORIZATION THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 1992

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1223) to authorize appropriations to carry out the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Marine Fisheries Program Act through fiscal year 1992.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1223

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Marine Fisheries Program Act (Public Law 98-210; 97 Stat. 1409) is amended—

(1) in section 2(a) by striking "$26,500,000" and all that follows through "fiscal year 1988, and" and by inserting "and $30,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1990, 1991, and 1992" immediately after "1989";

(2) in section 3(a) by striking "$35,000,000" and all that follows through "fiscal year 1988, and" and by inserting "and $30,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1990, 1991, and 1992" immediately after "1989"; and

(3) in section 4(a) by striking "$10,000,000" and all that follows through "fiscal year 1988, and" and by inserting "and $15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1990, 1991, and 1992" immediately after "1989".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1223 authorizes appropriations for the next 3 years for the National Marine Fisheries Service to carry out a broad array of not otherwise authorized programs related to fisheries research, enforcement, conservation, and management. The activities covered by the bill include the collection and scientific analysis of information needed for the management of sport and commercial fisheries and for the protection of marine mammals, endangered species, and their habitats.

The bill is, to my knowledge, without controversy. It is supported by commerical and recreational fishing organizations, the administration testified in support of the bill, and it was approved within our committee by unanimous voice vote. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1223 and urge its adoption. This bill is a simple authorization of those NOAA fisheries programs which are not authorized under the law. Passage of this legislation will enable the National Marine Fisheries Service to continue its excellent work in conserving and managing our nation's marine resources.

This bill was unanimously reported by both the subcommittee and the full committee and is supported by the administration. With this lack of opposition, I urge its speedy adoption.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1223, a bill to reauthorize the NOAA Marine Fisheries Program Act at current levels. H.R. 1223 reauthorizes a wide range of existing NOAA fisheries activities that deal with fisheries data and conservation. These activities are of great importance to the stewardship of our Nation's fishery resources and enjoyed unanimous bipartisan support within the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 1223.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1223.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANADROMOUS FISH CONSERVATION ACT AUTHORIZATION THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 1992

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1224) to authorize appropriations to carry out the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act through fiscal year 1992.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1224

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(a) of the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 757d(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (1); and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) $8,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1990, 1991, and 1992.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1224 authorizes appropriations for the next 3 years to carry out the provisions of the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act of 1965.

For almost a quarter century, this act has helped to conserve and enhance our Nation's anadromous fishery resources, including salmon, striped bass, walleye, shad, sturgeon and steelhead trout. As I'm sure all Members know, anadromous species

are those that ascend rivers and streams for the purpose of creating more anadromous species. These fisheries are found in the waters of 32 coastal and Great Lakes States as well as in the Federal Exclusive Economic Zone.

In recent decades, most anadromous species have been heavily and adversely affected by human activities in and around coastal areas. Freshwater and estuarine habitats have been degraded. Physical barriers have been created that impede the ability of some species in some areas to complete their upstream journey to spawn.

H.R. 1224 authorizes funds to continue Federal-State cooperation in efforts to conduct research and fisheries enhancement projects for anadromous species. Funds are provided to States on a matching basis. The amount authorized to each of the next 3 years is $8,000,000, approximately the current level.

This legislation was strongly supported before our committee by representatives of the regional marine fisheries commissions and by representatives of the recreational and commercial fishing industries. The bill was reported from our committee by a unanimous vote and I urge Members to support it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1224, a bill to reauthorize the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act and urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides an authorization for a State grant program that enables States to work cooperatively with the Federal Government in conserving and managing anadromous fisheries. Anadromous fish species can be found in most of our coastal States, including the Great Lakes States, and provide significant benefits to the commercial fishing industry and to recreational fishermen.

This bill was unanimously reported by both the subcommittee and the full committee and is supported by fisheries and resource management organizations throughout the country. I urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1224, a bill to reauthorize the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act through fiscal year 1992.

This act has more than a 20-year record of valuable contribution to the management, conservation, and enhancement of the Nation's important resources of striped bass, salmon, shad, steelhead, and other migratory species of great economic and social importance.

I have long been convinced that this program makes a uniquely valuable contribution to our Nation's fisheries, and I urge my colleagues to support passage of this reauthorization.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1224, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act.

At the outset, I want to commend Chairman JONES, and subcommittee Chairman STUDDS, my colleague from Massachusetts, for their leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor early in the session. I also want to acknowledge the hard work and leadership of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, Congressman BOB DAVIS, the ranking member of the full committee and DON YOUNG, our leader on the Fish and Wildlife Subcommittee. It's always a pleasure to work with the leadership of the Merchant Marine Committee on conservation issues, especially those affecting fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes $8 million for the anadromous fish conservation programs administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service. These funds are used to finance cooperative agreements and grants to the States for the restoration, enhancement, and conservation of anadromous fishery resources. The program is designed to encourage interstate cooperation in the management of anadromous fish that migrate through and fall under the jurisdiction of two or more States.

One of the most ambitious multi-State programs is the restoration of Atlantic salmon to the Connecticut River. For 20 years, I have worked with Federal, State, and local agencies to piece together a regional effort to restore the mightly salmon to the Connecticut. Once abundant and plentiful, the salmon population was forced out of the river system in the last century by the Industrial Revolution. The river was dammed all along the main stem, and the water was polluted beyond recognition. In fact, in the early 1960's, the Connecticut was often called the most beautifully landscaped sewer in the Nation.

Today, however, things have changed. The water is cleaned. The fish passage is opened for hundreds of miles up stream, and stocking efforts are underway. It's a major environmental rebirth for New England.

Although this program is a massive undertaking by the Federal Government, the Anadromous Fish Grant Program allows States and other entities to supplement this and similar efforts on a smaller scale. It's a great bang for the Federal buck. Between one-third and 10 percent of the project costs are shared with the States.

Mr. Speaker, this is a cost-effective program with enormous environmental benefits. I join with my colleagues in supporting this reauthorization, and I hope that they will assist me in securing adequate funding for the program when the fiscal year 1990 appropriations process begins.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, as our chairman has mentioned, H.R. 1224 would reauthorize the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act, which was first passed by Congress in 1965. In the ensuing 23 years, over $50 million has been provided to coastal and Great Lakes States to support projects on anadromous species. These Federal funds, matched by funds from States and other non-Federal entities, have been directed largely at resources experiencing the most severe problems. In the Great Lakes, lake sturgeon have been reestablished along with spawning runs of steelhead trout. In Michigan, these funds have been used to enhance fish passage facilities to allow salmon upstream migration.

Mr. Speaker, I support reauthorizing this act. It has stimulated State activity, increased interstate cooperation, and has shown significant accomplishments with our anadromous fishery resources.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, twenty-four years ago Congress enacted the first Anadromous Fish Conservation Act as an effort to combat the serious fishery problems facing our Nation at the time.

In spite of the program's success, many areas of the country, including my district in northern California, still confront serious challenges to the natural habitat of our valuable fisheries resources. The winter run of the Chinook Salmon in the Sacramento River is on the verge of being listed as an endangered species, which could seriously damage not only our fishing industry, but our recreational sportfishing community.

Most importantly, however, it points to the need that we have to continue to ensure that our rivers, lakes, and streams, are managed to the best of our ability. This legislation would do just that. Its stated purpose is to manage, conserve, and enhance the Nation's Anadromous fishery resources, helping endangered species recover, and keeping healthy populations viable.

The bill is a needed tool in our effort to protect our fisheries, and I urge my colleagues to support it this afternoon.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1224.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERJURISDICTIONAL FISHERIES ACT AUTHORIZATION THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 1992

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1225) to authorize appropriations to carry out the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986 through fiscal year 1992, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1225

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

SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF APPORTIONMENT LIMITATION.

Section 304(c)(3)(B) of the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986 (16 U.S.C 4103(c)(3)(B)), hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Act", is amended by inserting "which are managed under an interstate fishery management plan" after "fishery resources".

SEC. 2. FEDERAL SHARE OF ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT WITH ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 308(b) of the Act (16 U.S.C. 4107(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking "; and" and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) the Federal share of the cost of any activity carried out with an amount appropriated under the authority of this subsection shall be 75 percent of the cost of that activity.".

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 308 of the Act (16 U.S.C. 4107) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "fiscal years 1987, 1988, and 1989." and inserting "the fiscal years 1989, 1990, 1991, and 1992.";

(2) in subsection (b) by striking "fiscal years 1988 and 1989," and inserting "the fiscal years 1989, 1990, 1991, and 1992,"; and

(3) in subsection (c) by striking "fiscal years 1988 and 1989" and inserting "the fiscal years 1989, 1990, 1991, and 1992".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1225 authorizes appropriations to implement the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act for the next 3 years.

This act was originally approved in 1986 to insure the protection of the Federal interest in interjurisdictional fishery resources. These resources include nearshore fisheries which occur both in State and Federal waters; fisheries that migrate within the waters of the various Great Lakes States; and fisheries for which an interstate management plan exists.

The purpose of the program is to encourage the effective conservation and management of species for which that is impossible without cooperation among States, or between the States and the Federal Government. The program provides grants to carry out interstate agreements and to conduct research necessary for the management of interjurisdictional fisheries. It also provides funds for the three regional fisheries commissions on the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts.

Finally, the act authorizes a small amount of money to help States respond to marine resource emergencies. Under H.R. 1225, these funds would be provided on a matching basis.

H.R. 1225 is strongly supported by the Representatives of coastal States, and by the commercial and recreational fishing industries. It was reported unanimously by our committee and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, may I take this time to congratulate the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] for his extraordinary contribution to this debate.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1225, a bill to reauthorize the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act and urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes grants to States and interstate fisheries commissions to conserve and manage stocks of fish which are present in both State and Federal waters. Grants made under this program have been highly successful in managing a number of fisheries on both the east and west coasts. Preservation of the program is especially important now that we are concerned over the long-term effects of the recent Prince William Sound oil spill on fish stocks on the west coast. Programs such as this will help provide the scientific data we need to ensure that those fisheries can continue to operate.

Mr. Speaker, this is a noncontroversial bill which was supported by both the subcommittee and the full committee and I believe it should be passed.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1225, a bill to reauthorize the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986. This act provides a major underpinning of national fishery conservation and management through cooperative State and Federal research and statistics programs. I am aware of very few programs that enjoy such widespread support from the States and management bodies. This support was reflected in the unanimous bipartisan support for H.R. 1225 in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1225, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986 through fiscal year 1992, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1990

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1763) to authorize expenditures for fiscal year 1990 for the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1763

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1990."

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF EXPENDITURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Panama Canal Commission is authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to it and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as may be necessary under the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.) for the operation, maintenance, and improvement of the Panama Canal for fiscal year 1990, except that not more than $52,000 for fiscal year 1990 may be made available for official reception and representation expenses, of which—

(1) not more than $12,000 may be made available for such expenses of the supervisory board of the Commission,

(2) not more than $6,000 may be made available for such expenses of the Secretary of the Commission, and

(3) not more than $34,000 may be made available for such expenses of the Administrator of the Commission.

(b) PURCHASE OF PASSENGER MOTOR VEHICLES.—Funds available to the Panama Canal Commission for obligations shall be available for the purchase of passenger motor vehicles (including large heavy-duty vehicles) used to transport Commission personnel across the Isthmus of Panama, which may be purchased without regard to price limitations set forth in applicable regulations of any department or agency of the United States or by other law.

SEC. 3. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

The Panama Canal Commission shall provide written advance notification to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate regarding—

(1) any proposed change in the rates of tolls for use of the Panama Canal;

(2) any payment estimated to be due Panama under paragraph 4(c) of Article XIII of the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977, as provided by section 1341(a) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3751(a)); and

(3) the initiation of any major capital acquisition or construction project exceeding $10,000,000, which was not specified in the budget estimates submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year in which the project will commence.

SEC. 4. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) PAY INCREASES.—Funds for the Panama Canal Commission may be apportioned notwithstanding section 1341 of title 31, United States Code, to the extent necessary to permit payment of such pay increases for officers or employees as may be authorized by administrative action pursuant to law which are not in excess of statutory increases granted for the same period in corresponding rates of compensation for other employees of the Government in comparable positions.

(b) EXPENSES IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAW.—None of the funds authorized in this Act for the Panama Canal Commission may be expended unless in conformance with the Panama Canal Treaties of 1977 and any law implementing those treaties.

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act is effective on October 1, 1989.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DYSON] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DYSON].

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1763 provides a single year authorization for the Panama Canal Commission. Under this authority, the Commission is allowed to spend revenues from the canal's revolving fund for the purpose of maintaining and operating the Panama Canal.

The Canal Commission anticipates collecting $486 million in tolls and related fees in fiscal year 1990. During this same year, the Canal Commission will expend $481 million on operations, administration, and improvements. The remaining $5 million will be used to recover losses accrued over the past 2 years.

The reauthorization runs for a single year. It carries no budgetary impact on the Treasury and makes no changes in Canal Commission policies. It is being cosponsored by all members of the subcommittee and has the support of the Canal Commission and the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to point out that the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal has serious concerns about the ability of the Canal Commission to continue operations given the deteriorating conditions in Panama. I know that other Members of this House share these concerns, and I will take only a minute to address them here today.

U.S. nationals working for the Commission, and their dependents, have been subjected to an often brutal campaign of harassment and intimidation launched by General Noriega as retaliation against U.S. economic sanctions. These were imposed last year, in part at the request of the legitimate Government of Panama and in part as a consequence of General Noriega's indictment on drug trafficking and money laundering charges.

In addition to the campaign of personal assaults and intimidation, General Noriega has initiated legal action against all Panamanian employees who are delinquent in their taxes.

He knows full well that every Panamanian employee of the Canal Commission is tax delinquent and has been for the past year. This too is a blunt effort to coerce the United States into dropping the economic sanctions.

The tax issue is particularly troublesome. Under the sanctions, the Canal Commission is prohibited from turning over to Panama the taxes it withholds from the earnings of its Panamanian employees. Even though the employees may be making their own individual tax payments to Panama, the Canal Commission can't turn over the "employer's share" of those taxes, nor that portion that reflects the employee's withholding. That makes every Panamanian employee of the Commission tax delinquent, and puts them at the direct mercy of General Noriega.

I have given my assurance to the members of the Panama Canal/OCS Subcommittee that we would begin to investigate this issue and develop an appropriate response at the earliest opportunity. It may be that the Commission will require new authority in order to cope with the situation. That remains to be seen.

What is certain is that the Commission must be authorized to collect tolls and spend revenue for the canal's operations and maintenance, and this is accomplished by H.R. 1763.

Before reclaiming the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a minute more to say a few words about William Gianelli, the Chairman of the canal's Board of Directors. Bill Gianelli has held this post for the past 8 years, first in tandem with his position as Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, and on a full-time basis for the past 4 years.

Bill Gianelli is a truly dedicated public servant. He has managed the near impossible feat of keeping the canal running despite Noriega's harassment. He has done a remarkable job of keeping the canal out of Panama's domestic political turmoil. He has worked valiantly to minimize the canal's role in United States-Panamanian bilateral relations. And during this entire affair, he has had to respond to the difficulties his work force faces and reassure the international shipping community that the canal would always be open and running.

Bill Gianelli submitted his resignation earlier this month and will relinquish his position as Chairman of the Canal Commission on May 1, his absence from the Canal Commission will be sorely felt. His leadership is well known and widely respected. I had looked forward to working through this difficult period in the canal's history with Chairman Gianelli. In the coming months I will see to it that Bill has the chance to share his insights and experience with the subcommittee as we continue to deal with the changing situation in Panama.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman JONES; ranking minority member, Mr. DAVIS, as well as Mr. DYSON, chairman of the Panama Canal-Outer Continental Shelf Subcommittee, and its ranking minority member, Mr. FIELDS, for their outstanding leadership in bringing H.R. 1763 to the floor today.

This bill authorizes the continued operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal for fiscal year 1990. The Panama Canal is a strategic waterway for the movement of U.S. and international cargo, in addition to its national defense importance.

Operations of that waterway have been placed under extreme stress during the past year due to the strained relations between our Government and the illegal government of Gen. Manuel Noriega.

I want to commend William Gianelli, the outgoing chairman of the Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Commission and Gen. Dennis McAuliffe, Administrator, Panama Canal Commission, and all of the men and women employed by the Commission—Americans and Panamanians—who have continued to maintain the canal and keep it functioning efficiently, while having to endure extreme hardships at the hands of General Noriega.

We have heard that there are some quarters who would like to have the Panama Canal Treaty abrogated, and in his statement, the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS], says that he does not agree with this approach. Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show that I am one of those who feels strongly that turning the canal over to Panama in view of what is happening in that country today is the wrong thing to do, and we should take it back.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1763 is a very important piece of authorizing legislation, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], who has some questions on the Panama Canal.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Maryland for yielding time to me, and would like to echo her comments and her sentiments about control of the Panama Canal. Many of my colleagues who have been down there are concerned that our interests in that part of the world will not be well served if General Noriega and his ilk takes over the canal in 1999.

Toward that end, I would like to suggest that my colleagues look at legislation which is jointly sponsored by myself and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE], which would regain control of the canal and keep control of it, at least militarily, in perpetuity because of the risk involved down there.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DYSON], chairman of the subcommittee, a couple of questions, if I might.

On page 2 of the legislation at line 17 it says:

(b) PURCHASE OF PASSENGER MOTOR VEHICLES.—Funds available to the Panama Canal Commission for obligations shall be available for the purchase of passenger motor vehicles (including large heavy-duty vehicles) used to transport Commission personnel across the Isthmus of Panama, which may be purchased without regard to price limitations set forth in applicable regulations of any department or agency of the United States or by other law.

Why is there no price limitation, and why is it circumventing other U.S. law? Is there some reason, that there is an extraordinarily high price to be paid for this kind of use?

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, this language is required so that the Canal Commission can purchase larger types of vehicles equipped to transport pilots through the Canal Zone.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I understand that, but it says it will be without regard to price limitations. So there are no parameters set forth whatsoever on the price of these vehicles. That is kind of unusual, I think, and I was just wondering if there was a reason.

Mr. DYSON. This is traditional language that the administration has always asked for.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. This is language that administrations have asked for?

Mr. DYSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the staff would do me a favor, I would like for them to find out from the administration why they are not giving us parameters on these things. I would like to know for my own personal information.

Mr. DYSON. Both the administration and also the Congress have accepted this language in past years as a traditional way of enabling the Commission to purchase transport vehicles.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I understand, but when we are talking about budget constraints and trying to reduce the deficit, when we have open-ended costs, it concerns me when there is no price limitation set forth and that this kind of circumvents other laws that we have. It concerns me.

Mr. DYSON. If the gentleman will yield further, as he knows, there are not appropriated funds. Perhaps the reason why the administration has requested this language is because the Canal Commission would be spending only its own toll revenue income for the purchase of these vehicles.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. These funds are appropriated by our Government to run the Panama Canal.

Mr. DYSON. No. These funds come exclusively from toll receipts or other user fees. These funds are not appropriated.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. These funds come from toll receipts?

Mr. DYSON. The gentleman is correct. This has no budgetary impact on our budget.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. So these trucks are purchased with toll receipts from the canal?

Mr. DYSON. Exactly.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I also understand that there are certain GSA and Department of Transportation regulations that have to be followed in the purchase of these vehicles.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The next question I have is on page 3, line 2, where it says:

The Panama Canal Commission shall provide written advance notification to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate regarding—

Then going down to section 3 it says:

(3) the initiation of any major capital acquisition or construction project exceeding $10,000,000, which was not specified in the budget estimates submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year in which the project will commence.

I do not understand that. What if the project is $9.5 million?

Mr. DYSON. If the gentleman will yield, that still is not from appropriated money that we are talking about. We are still talking about revenues that the Commission generates through the operation of the canal.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I understand the gentleman is saying we should not be concerned about that, but this country appropriates an awful lot of money to the Panama Canal in addition to the tolls they get. It seems to me if we have open-ended legislation, and it is being paid for by the tolls, maybe we could reduce the amounts of money we are spending down there for other purposes if those tolls can be utilized in a more favorable way.

□ 1310

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DYSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, no taxpayers' funding goes into the canal or the Commission's capital budget. What we are doing here, and what has been traditional, is we are asking to require the Canal Commission to notify the Congress before initiating any capital improvement that costs more than $10 million.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. But it is only about $10 million. I cannot envision a project being higher than $10 million down there without review. That kind of surprises me since we have control over the canal until 1999.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Mrs. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on that $10 million I have been informed that up to last year there was no cap at all. The $10 million was inserted last year as a cap on the amount that could be spent on capital expenditures without approval.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Without approval.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Without approval. Prior to that there was no cap at all.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I understand but it does concern me that there is no approval process.

The last question I have is on section 4 where it says:

(a) Funds for the Panama Canal Commission may be apportioned notwithstanding section 1341 of title 31, United States Code, to the extent necessary to permit payment of such pay increases for officers or employees as may be authorized by administrative action pursuant to law which are not in excess of statutory increases granted for the same period in corresponding rates of compensation for other employees of the Government in comparable positions.

Does that mean that they are going to allow them to give pay increases? What does this mean, "notwithstand-

ing section 1341 of title 31, United States Code"?

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DYSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, that still has to be approved. Again that language is pretty standard language that we have here in the bill.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It says "notwithstanding." There must be some exclusion in section 1341 of title 31. I did not get a chance to read it. This money can be spent notwithstanding that section. I just wondered why there was an exclusion.

Mr. DYSON. Section 1341 sets guidelines for overall compensation. If there is any change in Commission salaries, section 4 will guide how that comes about.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 1763, the Panama Canal Commission authorization for fiscal year 1990. This legislation authorizes expenditues for the smooth and continued operation of the Panama Canal.

As I am sure Members know, the Panama Canal Commission is an agency of the U.S. Government. The Commission has had a difficult mission in Panama in the last 2 years. Conditions for the operation of any business in the Republic of Panama have been made more difficult by the Panamanian Government and the internal strife within the country. Conditions for the operations of the canal have been even more difficult. The unrest which began almost 2 years ago continues today, and the conditions in Panama have made travel hazardous for employees who must travel across Panama to get to work. This continuing unrest has caused many American employees of the Commission to leave or consider leaving Panama.

Despite the hardships that the employees have endured, the Commission has maintained a high degree of professionalism and has kept the canal running smoothly and efficiently. The Commission deserves our high regard for their dedication to their mission even in the worst of times.

The legislation we are considering would authorize the continued operation of the canal through fiscal year 1990. It is important that we send the world's shippers and the government of the Republic of Panama the clear message that the United States Congress supports the continued business-like operation of the canal despite the internal problems that continue in Panama.

Mr. Speaker, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee will continue to keep an eye on the situation in Panama and its effects on the Panama Canal. The upcoming elections in Panama may or may not change the outlook for the future of the smooth operations of the canal; however, this legislation is vital to the continued operation of the canal and should not be viewed by Members as a chance to send a message to Panama. The only message sent by defeating this legislation would be that Congress does not want the canal to be operated in a professional business-like manner or to remain open to the world's shippers.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation and urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Panama Canal Commission and their mission in Panama.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 1763, I rise in strong support of this legislation and compliment our subcommittee chairman, Mr. DYSON, for his leadership in moving this authorization bill in such an expeditious fashion.

H.R. 1763 is a simple, straightforward, noncontroversial authorization bill which will allow the Panama Canal Commission to spend its own self-generated revenues to operate the canal during the next fiscal year.

While the bill does provide a number of category limitations for such things as the Supervisory Board, the Secretary of the Commission, and the Administrator, H.R. 1763 does provide the Commission with sufficient flexibility to meet its financial needs. The bill does not, however, make any permanent changes in U.S. law.

As my colleagues well know, the Panama Canal Commission is a unique Federal agency which is required to pay its own way and is prohibited from making a profit. In addition, the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (P.L. 96-70) is a law that requires that Canal tolls and other revenues cover all operating and capital expenses of the Commission.

During the past 10 years, the Commission has done an outstanding job of complying with both the letter and spirit of that law. This legislation is a continuation of that extraordinary record and, like prior year authorization bills, this one allocates no U.S. taxpayer money.

While I know there are Members of this body who would like to renegotiate some, if not all, of the Panama Canal treaties of 1977, this authorization bill is not the proper vehicle for that debate.

I am, however, confident that our subcommittee will be holding a series of oversight hearings on the problems facing the canal and its work force caused by the prolonged political crisis in the Republic of Panama.

I am sure any interested Member will be given an opportunity to articulate their views on the canal, the Panama Canal treaties, and the Panama Canal Act of 1979.

I would hope, however, that we would approve this legislation which I view as a simple housekeeping measure and that we would resist the temptation of sending a message to General Noriega. I can assure you there will be plenty of future opportunities to send such a message.

As Chairman DYSON has indicated, this bill was the subject of an extensive hearing on Thursday, March 16, and it was approved without dissent by both the subcommittee and the full Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. It is an essential bill which should be overwhelmingly adopted.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding, I would like to pay tribute to the Chairman of the Board of the Panama Canal Commission, Bill Gianelli, and the Administrator of that agency, Phil McAuliffe.

Despite constant threats and harassment from the illegal Noriega regime, they have succeeded in keeping the canal operating safely and efficiently. The American people and the world shipping community owe them and the more than 8,500 employees of the Panama Canal Commission—who have my great admiration—a tremendous debt of gratitude.

While regrettably Bill Gianelli is resigning as Chairman of the Board of the Commission at the end of this month, he will leave a legacy of accomplishments. During his 8 years as Chairman, Bill Gianelli has not only worked tirelessly to ensure that the Canal remains one of the world's most efficient waterways but he has been instrumental in improving the operation of the Panama Canal. For instance, the Congress has enacted, with Bill Gianelli's strong leadership, a fundamental change in the financial structure of the Panama Canal Commission. As a result of this change from an appropriated fund agency to that of a revolving fund account, the Commission simplified its accounting procedures and is now able to respond more quickly to changing business and shipping conditions. By so doing, this change has also helped to prevent the payment of millions of dollars to the illegal government of General Noriega.

In addition, during Bill Gianelli's stewardship, the Congress improved the Commission's vessel accident claim procedures, established a fund to compensate injured PCC workers in the post-2000 era, and we reformed the interest payment provisions in Public Law 96-70 so that the taxpayers of this Nation now receive a more equitable return on our original investment in the Panama Canal.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Gianelli has been a superb Chairman. He will be solely missed by all of us who have been privileged to work with him during the past 8 years.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that with the enactment of this bill, we can begin to work with the Bush administration in an effort to improve the quality of life for both American and Panamanian employees of the Panama Canal Commission.

In my judgment, these employees are being held hostage in a dangerous and escalating game of tensions between the United States and General Noriega.

It is time for our Government to resolve the issue of employee tax payments, educational fees, automobile registration, and a host of other matters which have caused such concern for thousands of PCC employees and their families.

Mr. Speaker, there is much to be done but we must start this process by overwhelmingly approving this legislation. I urge by colleagues to vote aye on H.R. 1763.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEISS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DYSON] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1763.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)

the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1763, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

CELEBRATING BICENTENNIAL OF INAUGURATION OF GEORGE WASHINGTON, FIRST PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 92) to invite the houses of worship of this Nation to celebrate the bicentennial of the inauguration of George Washington, the first President of the United States, by ringing bells at 12 noon on Sunday, April 30, 1989, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object but I ask the gentleman from Ohio if he would be kind enough to explain his measure.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the spokesman on behalf of this measure, the distinguished majority leader, is approaching the microphone at this point.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

(By unanimous consent Mr. FOLEY was allowed to speak out of order.)

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, April 26, 1989.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2072, DIRE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the Republican leadership, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report providing for the consideration of H.R. 2072, dire emergency supplemental appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, but as I understand, the rule that would be filed would allow for an hour of debate on the supplemental appropriation, an hour on both amendments, one being offered by Mr. CONTE and one being offered by the distinguished majority leader, and that normal motions to strike are regularly in order under the appropriations procedures and would be permitted under this rule; is that the procedure?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. This is essentially the rule that will be filed later on today?

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I also take this time to thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding and to applaud the committee for bringing this matter to the attention of the House in an expedited way.

We are undertaking an important recognition of the bicentennial of the Presidency of the United States, and the prompt and expeditious action of the committee is, I know, a matter that will be approved by the House and have the gratitude of the House to the committee on both sides.

This is an important year in our country's history, not only because of the bicentennial of the Congress of the United States but because of the bicentennial of the Presidency.

As as been explained here, the date of April 30 is particularly important because it will signal that national recognition.

So, again, Mr. Speaker, I fully support this resolution and I applaud the committee for bringing it to the attention of the House.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 92

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

(1) the houses of worship of this Nation are invited to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the inauguration of George Washington as the first President of the United States,

(2) such houses of worship are requested to ring bells at 12 noon (12 o'clock antemeridiem eastern daylight saving time) on Sunday, April 30, 1989, the date of such anniversary, and to continue, as a tribute to the first President of this Nation, such simultaneous ringing of bells for two full minutes, and

(3) the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation acknowledging such celebration.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEWISH HERITAGE WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 25) to designate the week of May 7, 1989, through May 14, 1989, as "Jewish Heritage Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I rise in strong support of the measure pending before us. House Joint Resolution 136, designating May 7-14, 1989, as "Jewish Heritage Week," is the annual commemoration by Congress of a number of events of major significance to the Jewish community.

As our colleagues may know, the months of April, May, and June contain among them, passover, the Jewish holiday of redemption from Slavery in Egypt, the anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising, Holocaust Memorial Day, and Jerusalem Day. Also, this year on May 10, the State of Israel will celebrate the 41st anniversary of its independence.

I am pleased to once again sponsor this legislation, which has been spearheaded each year by the Jewish Community Relations Council of New York City. And I am most pleased at the

outpouring of cosponsorship by our colleagues.

House Joint Resolution 136 requests the president to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States, State and local government agencies, and interested organizations to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs. Mr. Speaker, accordingly, I urge prompt adoption of the pending legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEISS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 25

Whereas May 10, 1989, marks the forty-first anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel;

Whereas the months of April, May, and June contain events of major significance in the Jewish calendar—Passover, the anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, Holocaust Memorial Day, and Jerusalem Day;

Whereas the Congress recognizes that an understanding of the heritage of all American ethnic groups contributes to the unity of our country; and

Whereas intergroup understanding can be further fostered through an appreciation of the culture, history and traditions of the Jewish community and the contributions of Jews to our country and society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of May 7, 1989, through May 14, 1989, is designated as "Jewish Heritage Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States, State and local government agencies, and interested organizations to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, activities and programs.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAW DAY U.S.A.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 52) to express gratitude for law enforcement personnel and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I commend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] for sponsoring this resolution and for his concern that all Americans are reminded of the importance of respect for the law.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is based upon a foundation of law. Our Founding Fathers were wise students of politics and history. They knew that since the beginning of recorded time, society broke down when rule was put into the hands of individuals instead of upon a codified system of laws.

Accordingly, our Republic is one in which the laws themselves are supreme. No elected or appointed public official can ever circumvent or preclude the written law of the land.

On Law Day, we especially honor those brave men and women who, throughout the years, ascertain that our laws are enforced. It is a sad but true fact that many Americans do not truly appreciate the sacrifices made by our law enforcement officials. Do we really appreciate the fact that our law enforcement officials—policemen, policewomen, sheriffs, constables, security guards, and others—place their lives on the line every day, so that we can remain a society of laws?

Do Americans recognize that a law enforcement official is killed in the line of duty somewhere in our Nation on an average of once every 57 hours?

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this staggering statistic is evidence that our society is in a state of war with the criminal elements.

Therefore, it is all the more fitting that we adopt this resolution declaring May 1, 1989, to be "Law Day U.S.A." It is imperative that the American people be reminded that only under a system of law and order can we maintain the level of justice we have enjoyed in the past, and only through such a system can we continue to aspire to the even more perfect society envisioned by our Founding Fathers.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SAWYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I know my distinguished colleague from New York was asking rhetorical questions about the appreciation that the Nation has for the policy and level, the kinds of sacrifice that law enforcement officers all over the United States are called upon to make day in and dry out, whether we ever actually have to have that sacrifice or not.

It is clear, that appreciation is one of the reasons that we as a nation set aside Law Day every year to encourage that kind of support for law enforcement and law observance across the United States. We respect that most special privilege of all that we enjoy as a nation, the rule of law under which we live. No privilege is held more dear. None is more fundamental to all of the rights that we hold as American citizens, and I am pleased to join in these comments today.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 52

Whereas the first day of May of each year has been designated as "Law Day U.S.A." and set aside as a special day to advance equality and justice under law, to encourage citizen support for law enforcement and law observance, and to foster respect for law and an understanding of the essential place of law in the life of every citizen of the United States;

Whereas each day police officers and other law enforcement personnel perform their duties unflinchingly and without hesitation;

Whereas each year tens of thousands of law enforcement personnel are injured or assaulted in the course of duty and many are killed;

Whereas law enforcement personnel are devoted to their jobs, are underpaid for their efforts, and are tireless in their work; and

Whereas law enforcement personnel perform their duties without adequate recognition; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in celebration of "Law Day, U.S.A.", May 1, 1989, the grateful people of this Nation give special emphasis to all law enforcement personnel of the United States, and acknowledge the unflinching and devoted service law enforcement personnel perform as such personnel help preserve domestic tranquillity and guarantee the legal rights of all individuals of this Nation.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DRINKING WATER WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 60) to designate the period commencing on May 1, 1989, and ending on May 7, 1989, as "National Drinking Water Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but would like to inform the House the minority has no objection to the Senate joint resolution before the Members.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Population and its ranking minority member, Mr. RIDGE, also my good friend BILL FORD, who is chairman of the full Post Office and Civil Service Committee. They have been very generous with their assistance in the passage of this legislation, and I appreciate their efforts and support.

As sponsor of House Joint Resolution 134 the House companion legislation, I am here today to support the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 60, which declares the week of May 1 through 7, 1989, as "National Drinking Water Week." Last year with broad bipartisan support, this measure was passed and signed into law by the President and was a tremendous success. This year the measure has already passed the other body and with the dates marking the celebration fast approaching, we have the opportunity today to reaffirm our commitment to the protection of something we have all grown to take for granted, safe, clean water we can drink.

With the extreme drought experienced last summer and the expectation of yet another long dry season, this measure is vitally important to highlight how fragile our water supply is. Drought warnings are already pending in my own State of New Jersey and New York City has just declared a drought emergency. Spring has just begun and already water has become a restricted commodity, and not just in the East, but throughout the West and Midwest. Not only are water supplies threatened by drought, but the contamination which was highlighted when the Superfund legislation was introduced still remains as a serious problem.

Thousands of toxic sites still threaten aquifers and rivers. Pesticides, dioxin, and radon have been found in our ground water and lead has raised concern in several of our cities. We are not merely talking about water to drink. What we are talking about is water that is safe to use. Water that is free of contaminants, free of carcinogens, water which we may drink free of fear. The name of this resolution should actually be "National Safe Drinking Water Week." That is what we are really talking about.

We have made gigantic leaps in building an infrastructure which makes water available virtually anywhere people live or travel to, but maintaining a water supply and the means to transport it is a continual process. Unfortunately it is easy to take water from the tap for granted, but this was not always so, and it is a simple task for an act of nature or man to shock us into the horrible realization that safe drinking water remains so only with wise planning and cautious vigilance.

Several national groups including the American Water Works Association and the National Water Alliance have been very supportive of this legislation and hope to use the event to educate the public in water conservation and to highlight the need to continue efforts begun under the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act. The EPA and OMB are also fully supportive of the legislation and have already drafted language for a Presidential proclamation.

Every year our demand for water increases and the available supply becomes more restricted. Pollution taints much of that supply and in the last several years nature has been increasingly stingy in replenishing our reserves. This week has been set aside for 2 years in the hope of making people more aware and more appreciative of this vital commodity which is essential to life. I want to thank all my colleagues who supported this measure and who realize the significance of our water resources. We must continue to work to ensure their preservation.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 60

Whereas water itself is God-given, and the drinking water that flows dependably through our household taps results from the dedication of men and women who operate the public water systems of collection, storage, treatment, testing, and distribution that insures that drinking water is available, affordable, and of unquestionable quality;

Whereas the advances in health effects research and water analysis and treatment technologies, in conjunction with the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1986 (Public Law 99-339), could create major changes in the production and distribution of drinking water;

Whereas this substance, when the public uses with confidence in so many productive ways, is without doubt the single most important product in the world and a significant issue of the future;

Whereas the public expects high quality drinking water to always be there when needed; and

Whereas the public continues to increase its demand for drinking water of unquestionable quality: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the period commencing on May 1, 1989, is designated as "National Drinking Water Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such period with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs designed to enhance public awareness of drinking water issues and public recognition of the difference that drinking water makes to the health, safety, and quality of the life we enjoy.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION CENTENNIAL DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 84) to designate April 30, 1989, as "National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution Centennial Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs who is the chief sponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 84, designating April 30, 1989, as National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution Centennial Day.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] for allowing this resolution to come to the floor today, and also the ranking member from New York, the ranking member of the full committee.

This resolution before Members today does commemorate the centennial of the Sons of the American Revolution, and I urge all Members to support the legislation.

The Sons of the American Revolution is the counterpart to the Daughters of the American Revolution, probably better known than this organization. But this organization is the largest and one of the oldest societies in America and was organized on April 30, 1889, and incorporated by joint action of the House and the Senate under Public Law 59-214.

The objectives are patriotism, historical and educational, and include activities intended to perpetuate the memories of those who by their service during the American Revolution achieved the independence of this Nation.

Much of that was fought in the Battle of Saratoga in my congressional district, next to the gentleman from New York, and we certainly appreciate the committee allowing this resolution to come to the floor today.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York for bringing this resolution to the floor at this time.

Throughout the Hudson Valley of New York, we have had a great portion of the revolutionary history enacted, and the Sons of the American Revolution have helped to focus attention on that aspect, that important chapter of our history.

They are, indeed, a very patriotic society and has helped to remind our Nation of the ideals that our Founding Fathers had when they first brought about the bringing about of our great democracy, and I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 84

Whereas the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution was established on April 30, 1889;

Whereas through patriotic, historical, and educational activities, the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution perpetuates the memory of the patriots of the American Revolutionary War who achieved the independence of the United States;

Whereas the activities of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution are designed to inspire the descendants of the patriots of the American Revolution and the people of the United States with respect and reverence for the principles of government that were established by the patriots; and

Whereas the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution celebrates its centennial in 1989: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 30, 1989, is designated as "National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution Centennial Day", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on the several joint resolutions just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

COMMUNISM HAS AN EVIL EMPEROR, HE IS NICOLAE CEAUSESCU

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share with you the plight of the people of Romania, where glasnost is not just absent but, in fact, the voices of suffering people are increasingly stifled.

This week's issue of The Economist tells the reason for Romania's present darkness. The headline says, "If communism has an evil emperor, he is Nicolae Ceausescu."

Many people are now aware of the wholesale destruction of villages and systematic human rights violations of the Ceausescu regime. We know that as many as 30,000 Romanians, mostly ethnic Hungarians, have now fled into neighboring Hungary—the first mass exodus from one Communist country to another.

And the Hungarian minority in Romania are not alone in their misery. Thousands of ethnic Romanians have fled into both Hungary and neighboring Yugoslavia.

The United States needs to join its European allies in taking concrete action to protest Romania's continued repression. We should consider further diplomatic actions or further economic sanctions from which the Ceausescu regime is, in fact, not immune. It is clear from recent private United States-Romanian business meetings that Ceausescu seeks renewed favorable trade treatment from the United States.

We must send clear signals to the contrary. The Romanian Government will not receive favorable treatment of any kind as long as Romanian journalists remain locked up and gagged, former high officials of the regime are suppressed, and individual Romanians are threatened and punished for exercising their recognized rights to free expression, freedom of worship, and a right to make fundamental choices about their lives.

ROMANIA'S DARKNESS—IF COMMUNISM HAS AN EVIL EMPEROR, HE IS NICOLAE CEAUSESCU

It has taken the West far too long to recognise that its once-favourite communist leader is Europe's nastiest dictator. Romania's President Nicolae Ceausescu drew western admiration for such mild shows of independence as his defiance of the Soviet boycott of the Los Angeles Olympics. But in the Gorbachev world, whatever Russia-snubbing value Mr. Ceausescu once had is gone, so western leaders now see him for what he is: a mad despot. What can be done about him?

The quarter-century of Ceausescu rule is officially called the "era of light", yet Romania is a land of darkness caused by power cuts and rationing. The economy is in ruins. So is the heart of Bucharest (including about 30 of its old churches), which Mr. Ceausescu has torn down so that he can build a grotesque monument to his own glory. Not content with destroying the capital, Mr. Ceausescu has started to send his bulldozers into the countryside, where the idea of his so-called "systematisation" programme is to flatten half of Romania's villages and move peasants into tower blocks.

For all this—and the empty shops, the petrol rationing, the pollution, the campaign to make women have more children—Romanians are told to thank their "enlightened strategist of happiness". The Ceausescu personality cult extends to his appalling wife, Elena, and to other members of the clan: socialism in one family. The ubiquitous secret police make sure that any sign of protest (a miners' strike in 1977, a riot in Brasov in 1987, a handful of "open letters" from intellectuals this year) is quickly suppressed. The few Romanians who dare curse the big boss out loud accuse him of building Africa-in-Europe. It is an insult to Africa.

It may be too late for the West to force Mr. Ceausescu to change his ways. Economic pressure will not work: he now claims to have paid back all Romania's debts and this week followed the Albanian example of outlawing any foreign borrowing. He may be immune to political pressure too. True, in January Romania signed the human-rights agreement negotiated in Vienna as part of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), but Mr. Ceausescu immediately said he would ignore the bits he didn't like.

At last, a fuss—The best hope is that international criticism will hurt Mr. Ceausescu's immense vanity—or, failing that, so upset influential Romanians who care about their country's prestige that they contemplate deposing him. At last, the condemnation has started. France and West Germany recently recalled their ambassadors for consultation; Britain is speaking up.

The "Information Forum" that opened in London this week as part of the CSCE effort is a chance to do more. Western delegates should point out loudly that, because contacts with foreigners have to be reported to the police, most Romanians are too frightened to talk to the few western journalists allowed into the country. The westerners should also insist that Russians and East Europeans join the criticism. So far only Hungary—worried about the treatment of Hungarian-speakers in Transylvania—is making a fuss. It is time for Mr. Gorbachev to extend *glasnost* to the Romanian tragedy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LELAND). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virgin Islands [Mr. DE LUGO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DE LUGO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE ECONOMIC GROWTH ZONE ACT OF 1989

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYNE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Economic Growth Zone Act of 1989. This legislation is identical to legislation I introduced in the 100th Congress. It would target Federal assistance, in the form of low-interest loans and seed money grants, to locally designated zones of economic distress.

The Economic Growth Zone Act complements the current Enterprise Zone Program that became law as Title VII of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987. It also complements H.R. 6, a valuable extension of the Enterprise Zone Program, that has been introduced by my colleagues, Congressman RANGEL and Congressman GARCIA. All three programs use similar criteria for determining zone eligibility. In each program, the local government must propose to redevelop an area of persistent poverty, unemployment, and economic distress, as defined in section 102 of the Economic Growth Zone Act. The

goals of each program are to create new jobs and revitalize local economies in distressed areas through a public-private partnership.

My legislation proposes using a modest amount of up-front funds to stimulate the creation or expansion of businesses in an area targeted for economic growth. In addition, the bill would modify certain existing Federal programs to meet the special needs of the zones which could total up to 250 over a period of years.

Decades of experience with Federal urban programs have taught us one thing for certain: successful urban development requires a balanced approach. Too heavy a reliance on a single approach, whether it be the bulldozer of urban renewal or the tax haven of enterprise zones, is unwise.

The Economic Growth Zone Act of 1989 was drafted with an eye toward a comprehensive Federal, State, and local government approach to redevelopment of a designated zone. Consultation with a wide variety of labor, business, neighborhood, and government experts helped me to determine exactly what type of assistance is needed to aid very depressed areas.

The seed capital fund for business start-up and expansion is among the most important tools included in the Economic Growth Zone Act. As most small business persons are aware, cash flow is often more of a problem than taxes in the critical early years of a business. This is especially true for those fledgling enterprises now located, or likely to locate, in zones designated for development. My legislation would establish a locally administered fund, a combination of Federal and local dollars, which would provide loans to businesses which seek to locate or expand in a zone. The decisions on where to put the money, would be made at the local level, not in Washington, and would be based in part on the prospect that new jobs will be created for zone residents as a result of the loan. The bill provides seed money to promote the startup and expansion of businesses which locate in the zone. The bill authorizes $70 million for each of fiscal years 1990–1994 to match local government set-asides of CDBG allocations for the purposes of providing loans or loan guarantees for initial or working capital to small businesses for the purchase, rehabilitation or expansion of facilities and equipment, contingent on the firm satisfying certain job hire conditions.

In addition, the legislation provides for broad citizens participation in decisionmaking and includes a protection against the relocation of a facility from one area to another solely to take advantage of the zone benefits.

Loan guarantees to cities would support the repair and development of infrastructure in a zone—a prerequisite, in my mind, to any effort aimed at business retention or attraction. HUD may guarantee an aggregate amount of loans not exceeding 5 percent of the appropriations for the DCBG program for each of the fiscal years 1990 to 1994. According to a survey conducted by the Census Bureau in the late 1970's, the availability of adequate infrastructure was either of critical or significant importance to business engaged in making location decisions. Infrastructure was often cited as a more important factor than the existence of local tax incentives or local industrial revenue bond financing to those surveyed.

Cities which become involved in the economic growth zone effort would be required by the legislation to plan and carry out a comprehensive rehabilitation of public streets, lights, water systems, and other facilities in a designated area. Working in tandem with State agencies, cities would qualify for a long-term, low-interest loan from HUD for the repair of public infrastructure. The repair of public infrastructure, under the Economic Growth Zone Act, is a condition for development, not the spinoff result of development activity.

The Economic Growth Zone Act also builds on existing urban development programs by requiring that preference be given in several HUD programs for projects initiated within a zone. It requires, for example, that 5 percent of urban development action grant funds be earmarked for zone projects.

To increase the involvement of private lenders in zone activities, the legislation authorizes additional funds to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for projects within the designated areas. This federally backed initiative, as I am sure many Members are aware, brings together private lenders, community groups, and local government leaders in cooperative efforts to construct and rehabilitate low-cost housing. This bill authorizes $7 million for each of the fiscal years 1990–94 for these projects.

The Economic Growth Zone Act builds on the old but breaks new grounds as well. Section 307 of the act provides grants to local governments for the development of business incubator facilities within the zone. These facilities enable small, growing businesses to keep costs down by sharing expenses for such things as office space and management services with similar enterprises housed in a shared structure. Innovative businesses are thus allowed to incubate in the critical early years of operation. The bill authorizes $10 million for each of the fiscal years 1990 through 1994 for grants by HUD to local governments and nonprofit organizations for the development of these business-creation facilities.

The revitalization of neighborhood commercial strips is essential for an improved business climate in any distressed area. Recognizing this need, the Economic Growth Zone Act provides for low-interest loans for concentrated physical development, including facade improvement, of commercial strips located within the economic growth zone. This bill authorizes $13 million for each of the fiscal years 1990 through 1994 in addition to the current authorization for the section 312 Rehabilitation Loan Fund, for loans to local governments to rehabilitate commercial strips located within designated zones.

This legislation, a combination of the old and the new, a mix of Washington resources with local initiative, stresses planning, citizen participation, and economic growth as factors which will produce positive economic change.

I would hope that this House will consider this approach to urban development as it reviews tax-based proposals for urban enterprise zones. As one among many tools, tax incentives can contribute to urban development. But to assure success, they should be used in a coordinated effort to improve the physical appearance, and thereby the business environment, of a distressed area. Without such a community-based effort to make a neighborhood vital, a lot of enterprise may yield minimal results.

At this point, I would like to include in the RECORD a section-by-section description of the legislation:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE ECONOMIC GROWTH ZONE ACT OF 1989

TITLE I: DESIGNATION OF ECONOMIC GROWTH ZONES

Section 101: Designation by the Secretary.

Would require the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), within 2 months after the Economic Growth Zone Act of 1989 (EGZA) is enacted, to issue regulations detailing the procedures for State and local government nomination of an area as a Federal Economic Growth Zone (zone). HUD must designate at least 200, but no more than 250, areas as zones. As a prerequisite for designation, a State must pass enabling legislation granting the State and local government the authority to make federally prescribed State and local commitments as required under Section 102 of EGZA. Designation of an area as a zone would be for a period of 5 years. HUD may terminate designation as a result of State or local government noncompliance with Section 102 of EGZA. In such instance, HUD will specify the termination date.

Section 102: Eligibility requirements.

States that HUD may designate an area as a zone only if: (1) the area designated has a population of 4,000, as determined by the most recent available census data; (2) such area is one of pervasive poverty, unemployment and general distress; (3) such area is within a metropolitan city or urban county eligible for Urban Development Action Grants, and (4) such area meets any one of the following criteria: (a) the area has an unemployment rate of not less than 1.5 times the national unemployment rate; or (b) not less than 20 percent of the population of the area have incomes at or below poverty level; or (c) not less than 70 percent of the households in the area have incomes that are at or below the median income of the local jurisdiction; or (d) the population of the area declined by 20 percent or more during the period 1970 to 1980.

To qualify an area for designation as a zone, the State and local governments must agree to follow a specific course of action which would address the infrastructure repair needs of the proposed zone and provide incentives that would create permanent private sector jobs and stimulate economic development. The course of action shall include: (1) a commitment by the State and the local government to conduct a comprehensive review of the infrastructure needs of the proposed zones; (2) a commitment by the local government to finance infrastructure repairs through a guaranteed loan, as provided in Sec. 302; (3) a commitment by the State of such funds as may be necessary to assist in the repair of infrastructure in the area and (4) a commitment by the State to coordinate existing community and economic development plans in the area proposed for designation, and to list components for plans to encourage acquisition by the State from firms located, or which intend to locate, in the proposed zone. The course of action may also include, but is not limited to, an increase in the level of efficiency of such services as crime prevention within the area proposed for designation,

and may involve private entities, such as neighborhood development organizations.

Section 103: Preliminary approval of designation.

Provides that HUD may give preliminary approval for designation of an area as an economic growth zone only if the local government, in cooperation with the State government, and in consultation with area businesses, residents and neighborhood development organizations, prepares an Economic Growth Zone Development Plan. The plan must be consistent with the overall economic development plan of the unit of general local government, and shall include: (1) an assessment of the economic and social conditions of the proposed zone; (2) specific development objectives for the zone; (3) advisory guidelines for making investment and development decisions in the area, and for monitoring the effectiveness of the economic growth zone plan; (4) evaluations of employment opportunities, job skills and training needs of area residents; (5) evaluations of existing jobs training, business development and management assistance resources available to zone residents and businesses including any commitments for training assistance from neighborhood development organizations or educational institutions; (6) an evaluation of energy conservation efforts within the zone; (7) a strategy to incorporate the Job Training and Partnership Act in activities within the zone. Zone approval may be granted by HUD only when the local government, in cooperation with the State, prepares a preliminary plan for infrastructure improvement in the zone.

Section 104: Approval of designation.

In accordance with this section, HUD's approval of zone designation requires that: (1) HUD must have given preliminary approval of the area for zone designation; and (2) the unit of general local government involved must pledge to set aside for two consecutive years 5 per cent of its annual community development block grant allocation, or $1 million, whichever is the less for an Economic Growth Zone Development Fund (fund) as authorized under Section 301 of EGZA. Further, the local government must apply for an infrastructure repair loan guarantee and pledge to use local manpower agencies as the first source in employment for repairs.

This section further states that when a local government designates an area as a proposed zone, that local government shall file an application to HUD which shall include a map of the area and a certification by the local government that public hearings have been held on the proposed designation and that a plan has been developed to minimize displacement of low and moderate income residents of the area. The local government must also assess the infrastructure condition in the area and prepare a preliminary repair and maintenance schedule for such infrastructure, including cost estimates. In addition, the local government must agree to offer various incentives to create permanent private sector jobs and stimulate economic development. Such incentives may include, but are not limited to: (1) an increase in the level of local government services, such as police protection, transportation or road improvement; (2) a business and industrial development program which provides for payment of property liability and property loss insurance premiums, and for payment of payroll taxes, if participating businesses agree (a) to locate or expand in the zone and (b) to allow employees to organize, to form unions and to bargain collectively.

In addition, the local government must agree to commit to nonprofit entities engaged in zone activities economic development and land use planning resources, and to provide temporary space free of charge and telephone and other services at cost.

Business incentives are available only to those businesses certified under Section 301(f).

Section 105: Final approval of designation.

States that when an application is submitted by a State and local government for a zone designation, HUD shall consider the following: 1) the extent of poverty, unemployment and general distress in the proposed zone; 2) the extent of State and local government financial commitment to promote community and economic development within the zone; 3) the extent of resident, business and private organization support for the development of the zone; 4) the need for widespread geographical distribution of zones throughout the nation; and 5) the extent to which State and local government can provide guarantees that commitments made in the economic growth zone development plan can be enforced.

Section 106: Data used.

Specifies that HUD may use data supplied by federal agencies or data supplied by the State and local government, when the Secretary determines such data to be accurate, in determining eligibility of an area for zone designation.

TITLE II: ADVISORY NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCILS

Section 201: Establishment.

Requires the establishment by the State and the unit of general local government of an advisory neighborhood council in the zone within 90 days after zone designation under Title I.

Section 202: Membership.

Provides that members of the council, who shall be representative of business, labor, neighborhood residents and local government, shall be appointed by the chief executive office of the local government in which the zone is located.

Section 203: Duties.

Requires the advisory neighborhood council to act in an advisory capacity to the local government in which the zone is located on economic activities relating to the zone. In addition, the council shall: (1) prepare analyses of economic changes taking place within the zone; (2) act as an advocate for the promotion and development of businesses in the zone; (3) consult with the local government and appropriate departments of the State involved on the incentives offered for business development in the zone. The council shall coordinate the local needs of employers and assist, on the request of an employer, in the recruitment of employees for existing or future jobs.

Section 204: Meetings and records.

Provides for procedures for meetings of the council and sets a policy for public access to records of the decisionmaking of the council.

Section 205: General provisions.

Requires that the local government shall provide the council with such offices and staff as shall be necessary. The council is required to make a detailed report of its activities to the state and local government each year, with such report being forwarded to the Secretary, together with additional comments by the units of government involved.

TITLE III: ASSISTANCE FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH ZONES

Section 301: Economic Growth Zone development funds.

Requires each unit of general local government in which there is a designated zone to establish an economic growth zone development fund. The fund shall provide loans and loan guarantees to small business for working capital or equipment and facilities expansion.

Loans may be used to fund business and industrial development programs if the participating businesses agree in writing to: (1) locate or expand operations in the zone and (2) allow employees to organize, to form trade unions and to bargain collectively.

The local government would set aside for each of not less than 2 consecutive years 5 percent of each annual Community Development Block Grant allocation, or $1 million each year, whichever is the lesser amount, to the Economic Growth Zone Development Fund. There is authorized to be appropriated $70 million each year, FY 1990-1994, to match the set-asides. At least one Federal dollar for every community development block grant dollar, and not more than three dollars, shall be matched by HUD. A fund may also include amounts from any other source, including grants, gifts and loans.

The fund shall make or guarantee loans for initial or working capital to small businesses for the purchase, rehabilitation or expansion of facilities and equipment and shall make grants to neighborhood development organizations within the zone for activities designed to promote job creation and economic development.

An existing business located in the zone may qualify for assistance under this section if 50 percent of its present workforce are residents of the local jurisdiction, and if the business pledges that 75 percent of its new hires will be residents of the local jurisdiction, with special preference given to hiring residents of the zone.

A business seeking to locate in the zone would qualify for assistance under this section if the business pledges that 75 percent of its new hires will be residents of the local jurisdiction, with special preference given to hiring residents of the zone.

In addition, both classes of business must be willing to set aside 25 percent of the new jobs for one or more of the following: (1) persons unemployed 6 months or longer; (2) recipients of general assistance or aid to families with dependent children; (3) heads of households with family incomes at or below the statewide poverty level; or (4) residents of the zone.

Furthermore, in order to receive assistance, a business cannot be found by the local government to have been assessed civil penalties for, or convicted of, substantial violations of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.

The local government, with approval from HUD, may waive one or more of the business qualification requirements if it determines that, despite a good faith effort, a business is unable to hire employees who meet conditions described in EGZA.

The local government shall enter into a written agreement with the business receiving assistance which shall explain how the business will meet the conditions for certification described in this section.

In administering the Economic Growth Zone Development Fund, the local government shall review periodically employer records to ensure that a business continues to qualify for assistance.

Section 302: Economic growth zone infrastructure loan guarantees.

Under this provision, notes and other public obligations issued by the local government and guaranteed by HUD would be used to finance public works and site improvement in the zone. The aggregate amount of loans guaranteed by HUD may not exceed 5 percent of the amount appropriated by the Community Development Block Grant program for each of the fiscal years 1990 through 1994. Loan terms shall be for not less than 20 years, and not more than 40 years, and may not exceed 3 times the local government's CDBG allocation for one year. The local government shall pledge to repay the note with increments of local tax receipts generated by the activities under EGZA, or from the local government's CDBG allocation or by proceeds from the sale of real property. The rate and maturity of notes shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Section 303: Economic growth zone urban development action grants.

Provides that HUD set aside 5 percent of the amount appropriated for Urban Development Action Grants for allocation to zone areas in each of the fiscal years 1990 through 1994. Applications for grants shall compete only with applications involving other zone projects. The leveraging ratio may be as low as 2 private dollars for every UDAG dollar.

Section 304: Preference in Department of Housing and Urban Development programs.

Directs HUD to give preferential treatment to projects in designated zones for other HUD programs, including Section 312 Rehabilitation Loans, Section 810 Urban Homesteading, Section 202 Handicapped and Elderly Housing and the Solar Energy and Energy Conservation Bank.

Section 305: Rehabilitation and neighborhood conservation housing insurance in economic growth zones.

Directs HUD to make available Section 220 mortgage insurance in designated zones.

Section 306: Use of Department of Housing and Urban Development property in economic growth zones.

Under this provision, HUD is directed to offer for sale to the local government such vacant and underdeveloped property within the zone owned by HUD, if the local government has a detailed plan for use of the property. Such land or property shall be sold for nominal consideration.

Section 307: Development of facilities for new businesses.

Provides $10 million for each of the fiscal years 1990 through 1994 for grants by HUD to local governments and nonprofit organizations for the development of facilities within the zone designed to promote the creation of new businesses. The grants may be used to acquire, rehabilitate or pay for certain expenses of structures located within the zone which are designed to lower costs for startup businesses through sharing several fixed and management expenses, and which promote access by the new businesses to local educational resources.

Section 308: Neighborhood reinvestment.

Authorizes $7 million for each of the fiscal years 1990 through 1994, in addition to the current authorization for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, to attempt where feasible, to replicate successful Corporation projects in designated zones. To the extent practicable, the Corporation shall attempt to establish Neighborhood Housing Services in the zones, drawing together local residents, businesses, and lenders to increase the number of housing-related loans made in the zone. In addition, the Corporation shall develop such programs for the zones which emphasize the improvement of low and moderate income housing, promote homeownership by persons of low and moderate income, and generally improve the climate for private lending within the zone.

Section 309: Neighborhood commercial revitalization.

Provides $13 million for each of the fiscal years 1990 through 1994 in addition to the current authorization for the Section 312 Rehabilitation Loan Fund, for loans to local governments to rehabilitate commercial strips located within designated zones. Such activities, as part of an effort to upgrade the commercial areas of a zone, would be eligible for the low interest loans.

Section 310: Prohibition of assistance for facility relocation.

This section would forbid any activity under EGZA which would promote the relocation of any industrial or commercial plant or facility from one location to the other, unless it is determined by HUD that such relocation will not be harmful to the employment or economic base of the location from which the plant or facility is to be relocated.

TITLE IV: GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 401: Coordination with other Federal programs.

Directs HUD to promote the coordination of existing federal housing, community and economic development, small business, banking, financial assistance and employment training programs carried out within the zone, and to expedite application for programs through the consolidation of forms and periodic reports.

Section 402: Regulations.

Requires HUD, within 120 days of passage of EGZA, to issue program regulations which include application deadlines and which prescribe the form and manner in which applications are to be submitted.

Section 403: Annual Report of the Secretary.

Requires HUD to submit to Congress an annual report detailing the impact of zone designation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PASHAYAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, during the month of April, Armenians all over the world observed the 73d anniversary of the Armenian genocide. It is my privilege once again to sponsor a special order so that Members of this body can join in this commemoration.

In the latter half of the 19th century the Ottoman Turkish government began a policy of persecution against its Armenian population. The persecution was brutal and ferocious. It resulted in the deaths of many Armenians in 1894 and 1895, and in 1909. The pattern of persecution and destruction culminated in the great massacre of 1915 through 1923. At least 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children perished. Those who survived became homeless refugees, whose descendants, with their painful memories, can be found in many countries all over the world today.

This terrible fact of history has been documented by eyewitnesses and media accounts, including those of the United States Ambassador to the Ottoman Turkish Empire, Henry A. Morgenthau. The 45th and 66th Congresses adopted resolutions deploring the massacres. President Reagan and seven Presidents before him have spoken out against the treatment of the Armenians. In spite of the overwhelming evidence and recognition, the debate still rages over whether or not these events of history should be remembered.

The debate appears most pronounced in this body and during this Congress, where on August 7, 1987, we considered and rejected a procedural motion to vote on House Joint Resolution 132, a measure to commemorate the Armenian genocide. We therefore failed to take action to remember the first genocide of the 20th century. We submitted to the threats of our valued NATO ally, Turkey, and to the appeals of our State Department. We emboldened those who refuse to face history to press even more diligently against all levels of government and all institutions who would commemorate or otherwise remember the treatment of the Armenians. The Turkish Government has even gone so far as to advise this body that it shall not tolerate the introduction of any resolution on the Armenian genocide in the future. Our Government has been advised that the President of the Republic of Turkey will cancel his visit to the United States scheduled for this summer if a resolution on this question is presented to this body for consideration. We now have a foreign government telling what we can discuss. This should be intolerable.

Mr. Speaker, our failure to act and resolve this so-called controversy was not, to my great satisfaction, repeated elsewhere in our Nation. Within the past year and despite an intense campaign of denial orchestrated by the Republic of Turkey, the United States Holocaust Memorial Council affirmed the inclusion of the Armenian genocide in its museum and educational programs. The States of California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and New York remembered April 24, 1988, Armenian Martyr's Day, with commemorative events as well as resolutions passed by their legislative bodies. Similar successes can be reported on the growing movement to provide holocaust, genocide, and human-rights curricula in our Nation's secondary schools. In my State of California, the State legislature adopted a model curriculum on these topics for public schools, which included the Armenian experience. This took place over the strenuous objection of Tur-

key's friends, who once again attempted to deny that the genocide even took place. I am also pleased to report that an exemplary educational curriculum entitled "Facing History and Ourselves" expanded its Armenian genocide component. The Massachusetts-based "Facing Histories" case study approach to the Holocaust and the Armenian genocide, underscores the crucial importance of remembering and facing history. I am proud of the efforts in California, Massachusetts, and other States where educators who are committed to genocide prevention and human rights are providing an opportunity for our students to learn from the past—an opportunity that our misguided ally Turkey would like very much to deny.

Mr. Speaker, while millions of our citizens were called upon by their State governments to reflect upon the Armenian tragedy, and while tens of thousands of students were presented with the Armenian genocide as a case study, we in the Congress failed to participate. The Republic of Turkey was able to accomplish with us what they failed to accomplish anywhere else in this great nation. This body must address the growing gap between the trend in our society to remember all instances of genocide in this century and our indecisiveness. The time is overdue for this body to do what is right and pass a resolution on the Armenian genocide.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the recently approved legislation on the Genocide Convention. On April 25, this body passed such a measure. In testimony submitted to the Judiciary Committee, the examples of genocide in this century were frequently invoked, including of course the genocide of the Armenians. I am delighted that this body approved this legislation making genocide a crime under U.S. law. I should also like to share the relevance of the Armenian experience to the convention. Raphael Lemkin, the man who coined the word "genocide," and began the movement to make genocide a crime under international law, coined the word to apply to the Armenians.

From Raphael Lemkin's papers, now housed in the New York Public Library, we learned that:

> A bold plan was formulated in my mind. This consisted of obtaining the ratification by Turkey among the first 20 founding nations. This would be an atonement for the genocide of the Armenians. But how could this be achieved? The Turks are proud of their republican form of government and of progressive concepts, which helped them in replacing the rule of the Ottoman Empire. The Genocide Convention must be put within the framework of social and international progress. I knew however that in this conversation both sides will have to avoid speaking about one thing, although it would be constantly in their minds.

Mr. Speaker, placed within context, how can this body on one hand support the Genocide Convention and on the other refuse to commemorate the Armenian genocide?

Mr. Speaker, I urge this body on the next possible opportunity to affirm this fact of history once and for all.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASHAYAN. I am delighted to yield to my friend and colleague the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate and thank the gentleman from California [Mr. PASHAYAN] for taking this special order honoring the Armenian martyrs, who became the victims of one of the worst genocides of this century. During the month of April, Armenians all over the world will be observing the 74th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Armenia became the first nation to accept Christianity as a state religion. It has been invaded and conquered many times during the course of its long history. Its people have defended their religion and have been persecuted, massacred, and driven from their land. In the latter half of the 19th century, the Ottoman Turkish government began a policy of persecution against its Armenian population. This persecution was brutal and ferocious. It resulted in many deaths of Armenians in 1894 through 1896, and in 1909. The pattern of persecution and destruction culminated in the great messacre of 1915 through 1923. At least 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children perished in this holocaust. Those who survived became homeless refugees, whose descendants, with their painful memories, can be found in many countries today.

There is still considerable debate over whether or not these events of history should be remembered. As a free and democratic nation, I believe we must continue to acknowledge and deplore the events surrounding the Armenian genocide as vigorously as we deplored modern acts of terrorism.

Today, Armenians flourish and are prominent and successful citizens of our Nation. Many of my Armenian friends have related horrible stories of how the genocide affected their families and loved ones. I know how important this tribute is to them and to the memories of those who lost their lives in the slaughter.

Cruelty, murder, and genocide are terrible, terrible examples of man's inhumanity to man. We commemorate Armenian Martyrs' Day to remember this and to recognize the suffering and pain that the Armenian world community has endured. To diminish in any way the events of 1915 and succeedings years to not only a great injustice in itself, but a great disservice to the memories of those who were killed and to their survivors and descendants.

We recognize April 24 as the day of man's inhumanity to man because we must remember that in modern times, acts or barbarism have continued unchecked. It is indeed a tragedy that many such acts have taken place. However, we must never become cynical or lose hope. We must never again permit such atrocities. As we join with Armenians all over the world in remembering Martyrs' Day, we will give encouragement to Armenians everwhere to continue their struggle for recognition and justice. The maryrdom of their people must never be forgotten and should serve as a warning signal that our nation will not tolerate similar atrocities against another people.

Let us commit ourselves today to a course in the future that prevents us from ever permitting such a honorable occurrence again anywhere in the world. Again, I thank the gentleman from California and commend him for his continuous efforts to commemorate this historic and tragic event.

□ 1340

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] for all his years of laboring in the vineyards on this issue. It is much appreciated by everybody.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN], my friend and colleague from the district next to mine.

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and support Armenian Martyr's Day. This day is to commemorate the period from 1915 to 1923 during which history records the tragic loss of two of every three Armenians then living in their homeland.

I believe that it is very important that we recognize one of the most horrendous and despicable displays of violence in the 20th century, because it is tantamount to disavowing the values and ideals that this great country has always held so dear. While this is an issue of great importance to the Armenian people it should also be an issue of great importance to all Americans. The American people have always been known throughout the world as a leading moral force. Not to officially recognize one of the most atrocious crimes against mankind runs counter to this very tradition.

Under a United Nations Treaty adopted in 1950, genocide is a crime under international law whether committed in time of peace or time of war. History has a way of repeating itself and unless we acknowledge past mistakes, we have not provided the precedent to avert tragedies for others in future generations. As Walter Karabian said in a 1982 address to the World Affairs Council, quote:

To allow genocidal actions to go unrecognized or unpunished flaunts the most basic principles of civilized countries and encourages those who could perpetrate future cultural or religious massacres.

There is no statute of limitations on genocide. As long as we gather together and remember, the past will not go away. The martyrs of Armenia will live as proof to all the world that the spirit of a Christian people could not be stilled and that those who perpetrate genocide will always receive their just due in the pages in history.

To not recognize the Armenian genocide is to ignore history. The historical record of the Armenian genocide is clear and irrefutable. It is our moral responsibility to acknowledge it. So as we commemorate Armenian Martyr's Day and remember the 1½ million Armenians that were brutally murdered, let us keep alive the memory of those who were killed and try to gain insights and learn lessons from this experience so that a similar episode may never be repeated again.

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN] for his very appropriate remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. COELHO], my friend and colleague also from the neighboring district.

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, on April 24 of each year, the Armenian community around the world pauses on Martyrs' Day in remembrance of the 1½ million Armenians who were systematically killed during the tragic genocide carried out against them by the Ottoman Turks from 1915 to 1923.

The anniversary of this atrocity is particularly poignant this year, as the Armenian people were dealt its second crushing blow of the century. An earthquake last December nearly destroyed their country and devastated their economy. As the leader of a congressional delegation that journeyed to Soviet Armenia following the quake, we pledged our assistance to the Armenian people—be it public or private—to help rebuild their country and rescue a generation of injured and orphaned children. We have another opportunity to revive the Armenian spirit in the form of the passage of Armenian Genocide Resolution During the 101st Congress.

For several years, my colleagues and I have been trying to win congressional approval and administration support for legislation commemorating the Armenian genocide. When I first introduced this legislation, I was sure that an administration which so often raised its voice against the human rights violations of the present, would join us in remembering a tragedy of epic size from the past. I was naive. The Reagan administration had made a sordid pact to look at history with its eyes clamped firmly shut. And, in doing so, we cheapened our diplomacy and undermined America's moral leadership by refusing to acknowledge that something evil happened. Silence ill-befits a nation like America.

One and half million Armenians perished from the persecution and massacre by the Ottoman Government. More than 500,000 Armenians were exiled from their homeland which their ancestors had occupied for over 3,000 years. As a result of the killings and deportations, the Armenian population in the Ottoman Empire was reduced from 2½ million to fewer than 100,000. House Joint Resolution 36 does not attempt to hold today's Turkish Republic responsible for the atrocities committed by the Ottoman Empire over 70 years ago. It does reaffirm our indignation at the genocide of this century, and implore us to remember and acknowledge the mistakes of the past, so as to not repeat them or ignore them in the future.

I am hopeful that the current administration is more cognizant of the past and more sensitive to the surviving Armenians and their families who are pained at every defeated attempt to achieve the recognition they deserve. Last year the House and Senate passed and President Reagan signed S. 1851, a bill to implement the International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. This bill allows our Nation to join with all the other civilized countries who have previously ratified the convention in formally denouncing this heinous crime and pledging to cooperate against future perpetrators of genocide. Surely the first step toward achieving these important and long-overdue goals, is the recognition of events of the past. The enduring tragedy of this particular instance of genocide is that to this day the government of the modern Turkish State and our own Government refuse to acknowledge that this crime ever took place. The historical evidence surrounding this instance of genocide, however, is as clear and compelling as the evidence surrounding the Jewish Holocaust.

Soon after the earthquake in Soviet Armenia, President-elect George Bush asked his son Jeb and his grandson George to visit the victims of the tragedy and to offer their support. The younger George Bush captured the hearts of the Soviet people. His grandfather and this Congress have the opportunity to show further support to the Armenian people this year by reversing the Reagan administration's nonrecognition of the Armenian genocide and by passing this resolution during this session.

Only through these actions will the United States be able to reclaim its rightful place at the forefront of the international community as the defender of justice and human rights for all people throughout the world. If we are vigilant, if we give substance to our commitment to justice through deeds as well as words, we can truly end this century, and this era of suffering, with dignity and with some sense of confidence in the future, not just for the Armenian people, but for all of us.

□ 1350

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. COELHO] for his remarks, and take it that they were given in a spirit of nonpartisanship, and that whatever observations he made on various administrations were done in that spirit.

I might also add that in the same spirit the gentleman, I know is aware that one of the reasons his bill which was so aptly introduced in the last Congress failed was because there were delays in bringing it to the floor, and I make that observation in the same nonpartisan spirit that I know my colleague made on his observations on the administration.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the following is a speech I delivered at Boston's City Hall Plaza yesterday before a rally commemorating the 74th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide:

It is a great honor to be here with you today. Since I returned from Soviet Armenia earlier this year, I have spoken with a great many groups throughout the Nation. But, I have never spoken to a group with more enthusiasm. And, I have never spoken on an occasion as significant as this.

Your gathering here, in such large numbers, with such a profound rallying cry, bears witness to the proud heritage of the Armenian people, and to your noble efforts to heal the wounds of Armenia's suffering—past and present.

Today, we commemorate the 74th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide—a horror that took the lives of 1½ million people.

For too long, the world has closed its eyes and tried to pretend it never happened.

But, you have not let the world forget. Generation after generation, you have struggled to keep the memory alive. You have held high the cause of the Armenian people. And you have reminded people in every land of the history of man's inhumanity to man.

In gathering here today and in the countless similar rallies around the globe, we acknowledge the genocide, we mourn the victims, and we renew our cry—never again!

In 1987, we in Congress tried unsuccessfully against a massive lobbying effort to bring a genocide resolution to the floor for a vote. This resolution is still needed. We must never stop this effort as long as there are those who try to deny the genocide or as long as there are those who would fight it under the guise of political expediency.

As long as thousands of people gather in rallies such as this one, we will not forget! Those who would like to cover up the Armenian Genocide have not succeeded, and they never will!

My first involvement in issues of Armenian culture came with the genocide resolution. And since that time I have deepened my knowledge and respect for the Armenian people. The earthquake has been a turning point for us all.

It was 11:41 a.m. on December 7. Children were in school, adults were at work, and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev was in New York City when the ground began to move. First one shock, then another, and when the Earth stopped trembling, much of Soviet Armenia was in ruins.

More than 25,000 people were killed; 130,000 were injured; 500,000 were left homeless. In Armenia's second largest city, Leninakan, two-thirds of the structures collapsed. Towns near the epicenter were even harder hit. That afternoon, one Soviet news commentator announced, "The population of Spitak is gone."

In January of this year I went to Armenia as a member of the first congressional delegation to visit that devastated region. Four Members of Congress from both parties were asked to travel to the earthquake region as a gesture of support and to determine how the United States could best continue to help the victims.

We were encouraged to make the trip by the State Department, and we received extensive briefings on the damage before we left. Yet, there was no way to prepare oneself for the shock of witnessing such devastation.

The survivors spoke of their terror and grief. We visited a children's hospital in Yerevan, where the young victims could no longer smile. We met with a government official from Spitak who had lost his wife and 10 children.

The mayor of Leninakan, while briefing us on the damage to his city, broke down in tears and could not finish. He had lost his mother, his wife, and a son.

The psychological scars will be slow to heal. We heard the story of one child who was told to leave class for misbehaving. While he was out, the earthquake struck and the school crumbled, crushing his classmates. We asked ourselves, How does a child learn to look forward again with such a memory?

The one bright spot on the Armenian landscape has been the tremendous outpouring of international concern and support for the earthquake victims.

Over 50 countries and countless international organizations sent help. The U.S. Government sent rescue teams and relief flights. Private groups in this country have sent millions of dollars in aid as well as dozens of relief flights.

Armenians in the United States contributed over $20 million. But, of all the groups in this country, you, the Armenian community in Boston, were the most generous. You raised the most money in the United States for relief efforts. And aid continues to come in many forms.

Americans all over the country have opened their homes and hearts to victims of the earthquake in need of care not available in the Soviet Union. I was moved by the story of 37 Armenian children who have been brought to the United States by Project Hope so they could receive medical treatment in hospitals here.

Just last week, NASA set up what is called a "spacebridge" that will allow United States medical personnel to consult directly with their counterparts in Armenia to aid victims of the earthquake.

The Christmas visit of President-elect Bush's son and grandson profoundly touched the people of Armenia. Everywhere we went, people told us how deeply they appreciated the new President sending his family to be with them in their time of suffering.

But, despite the spirit of openness and glasnost that characterized our visit and the relief efforts, signs of tension remained. Soviet soldiers were posted on street corners. Tanks were stationed throughout the capital. The officials who accompanied us on our tour of the quake area often felt the ire of the local population.

There is a strong residue of distrust of the Soviets and of Mikhail Gorbachev as a result of the history of conflict in the region. Indeed, it seemed to us to be a tragic symbol of Soviet rule in Armenia that the Soviet-built structures collapsed in the earthquake while the older buildings withstood the tremors.

It was if the years of mismanagement and neglect were taking their bitter toll, while the ending of Armenian culture prevailed.

The rebuilding offers new challenges and opportunities for Gorbachev. The fact that, for the first time since World War II, the Soviet Union accepted disaster relief from the United States is in itself important. The Soviets expressed deep gratitude for American help, and the Prime Minister of Soviet Armenia told us that he hoped the visit of our delegation would be part of a broader normalizing of relations between our countries.

But, as we all painfully know, political problems and the scourge of injustice are still very much existent in Armenia. We can point out to the imprisonment of the Karabagh Committee by Soviet authorities as a glaring example.

Members of that committee have worked peacefully, and within their civil rights, to reunify the Nagorno-Karabagh region with Armenia. Under Azerbaijani control, the Armenian minority in the Karabagh has suffered ethnic discrimination, economic oppression and political repression at the hands of Azerbaijani officials.

The Karabagh Committee is in a Moscow prison awaiting trial on trumped-up charges. No evidence has been produced by anyone to show that members of this group are guilty of the charges leveled against them.

I have joined other Members of Congress in demanding that Gorbachev release the Karabagh Committee. There is no need for a trial. The Karabagh Committee must be set free.

I have contacted international human rights organizations to ask that this important matter be monitored, and I will continue to work to bring the glare of international attention on the plight of these brave activists. It is their courage that has in effect put the Soviet Government's policy of glasnost on trial.

As we continue our fight for justice in Soviet Armenia, as we work to rebuild the devastation wrought by nature, it is all the more important that we pause together at this time and in this place and remember.

I hope and believe the most recent tragedy for the Armenian people will be a new beginning. Already the world has opened its heart as never before.

This time, once the headlines have faded, and the rebuilding has progressed, we must continue to stand firm. And we must not forget the people whose grief we have shared, whose tragedy has brought the world so much closer together.

It is my great honor to stand with you today. To share your triumphs and your struggles for a better tomorrow. Thank you.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in remembering the hundreds of thousands of Armenians who died at the hands of the Ottoman Empire in Turkey during the early part of this century.

The start of the persecution of the Armenians in eastern Turkey began in 1915 and continued for several years. The Armenian Christian people vanished from their traditional homeland in Turkey's eastern province of Anatolia through forced deportation. This deportation was carried out through death marches conducted in the ghastly conditions of plague, starvation, and sheer exhaustion. The men were often taken away to be killed immediately while the women and children suffered for months before death finally freed them. Some Armenians survived this period of persecution and they settled in Soviet Armenia in the Caucasus or relocated throughout Europe, the Middle East, and the United States. It has been estimated that anywhere from 700,000 to 1.5 million Armenians died during this tragic period of history.

There can be no doubt that the events that occurred from 1915 through 1923 constitute a tragedy of historic proportions. Today, we remember the suffering of the Armenian people at the hands of the Ottoman Empire of Turkey. The Armenians are a strong group of people who have endured many years without a homeland of their own.

American Armenians have greatly contributed to the culture of the United States and serve as active citizens in our political system. I encourage all my colleagues to join me today in remembering the suffering this group has endured and acknowledging the strong contribution that Armenians make to our Nation today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the 74th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide which took place on April 24, 1915 when more than 1 million Armenians lost their lives at the hands of the Ottoman Empire.

It is more important now, than ever before, that we continue to focus attention on this sad anniversary, because as the years pass, so, too, are more and more survivors of the Armenian Genocide passing away. This means that there are fewer and fewer Armenians alive who actually suffered through those terrible times and can relate to succeeding generations the events of the genocide which took place. Only by continuing to remember the disastrous events of 1915 can we hope to prevent a tragedy of this magnitude occurring again.

I was pleased to learn from an article which appeared in the Washington Post today that at long last and for the first time the Soviet

Government is permitting an official commemoration of the Armenian Genocide in Soviet Armenia. An article about that commemoration which appeared in the April 25 Washington Post and the text of that article follows:

[By the Washington Post, Apr. 25, 1989]

ARMENIANS COMMEMORATE AND PROTEST—MARCHERS DENOUNCE EVENTS OF 1915, 1988

(Reuter)

Moscow, April 24.—Hundreds of thousands of Armenians today combined the commemoration of a 1915 massacre in Turkey with protests against the arrest last December of leaders of a national movement in the Soviet Republic of Armenia.

Local journalists said vast throngs from all over Armenia filed through the streets of the capital, Yerevan, in the first officially approved commemoration of what Armenians describe as "the victims of the genocide."

Journalists at the scene said many also carried portraits of jailed leaders of an unofficial mass movement seeking broader rights for their republic.

Thousands gathered outside the headquarters of the Armenian Communist Party chanting "Liberation" as they watched 14 people wearing symbolic prison clothes parade around it and government buildings nearby to protest the arrest of the 14 leaders, who are awaiting trial in a Moscow jail.

The Armenian journalists said huge crowds carrying wreaths walked to a monument to those who died in 1915, when many historians say up to 2 million people were killed.

Successive Turkish governments have denied there was any massacre of civilians, saying troops only took action against Armenians living in Turkey involved in an insurrection.

Although there have been unofficial ceremonies in Yerevan marking the anniversary in the past, an official holiday was declared this year in a decision many Armenians believe was linked to mass protests in the republic throughout last year.

The protests, halted by the imposition of a military-supervised curfew and a devastating earthquake last December—which killed about 25,000 people—were part of an upsurge of national feeling throughout the Soviet Union's 15 republics.

Mr. Speaker, as we recall and mourn the loss of the Armenian martyrs earlier in this century, so, too, should we now pledge ourselves to continue to remember those innocent martyrs and to continue to fight against violence and destruction so that humanity may survive in a world where genocide can never recur.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, this past winter the world looked on with horror as film footage documented the tragedy suffered by the Armenians due to the earthquake in Soviet Armenia. Cities were razed, entire communities were destroyed, tens of thousands of Armenians were killed. Observers found it hard to fathom that one people could absorb such death and destruction. Yet the Armenians in their long history have suffered worse, much worse.

In the shadow of World War I, the Ottoman Turk Government embarked on a plan to systematically eliminate the Armenian people from their ancestral homeland.

The Armenian men who had answered the call to join their country's armed forces were isolated and shot. On orders from the central government, Turkish soldiers rampaged from town to town, brutalizing and butchering the remaining Armenian population. Women and children were then forced on a death-march into the Syrian Desert. By the end of the war, the Ottoman Turks had been successful in exterminating two out of every three Armenians. A million and a half Armenians had perished at the hands of the Ottoman Turks.

Henry Morgenthau, Sr., then U.S. Ambassador to Turkey, wrote:

I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915.

Only 20 years later, Adolph Hitler asked rhetorically, "Who remembers the Armenians?" as he began his master plan to annihilate the Jews. Those who fail to remember history are condemned to repeat it.

The years cannot mute the voice of those Armenian survivors whose individual accounts of savagery combine to form a bedrock of irrefutable evidence. Despite the attempts to hide the records and to distort the facts; despite the world's preoccupation with politics and strategy, the truth of the Armenian Genocide remains.

We commemorate April 24 as the National Day of Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide of 1915–23, and pledge that their deaths were not in vain, that their suffering will not be forgotten. We must use the truth of the Armenian Genocide to help prevent such a tragic event from ever occurring again.

But we also use this day to rejoice in the continued survival of the Armenian people, for while the Turks crushed the fruit, the seed remained. I am reminded of a passage that William Saroyan wrote:

I should like to see any power in this world destroy this race, this small tribe of unimportant people whose history has ended, whose wars have been fought and lost, whose structures have crumbled, whose literature is unread, and whose prayers are no more answered. Go ahead, destroy this race! Destroy Armenia! See if you can do it. Send them from their homes into the desert. Let them have neither bread nor water. Burn their home and churches. Then, see if they will not laugh again, see if they will not sing and pray again. For, when two of them meet anywhere in the world, see if they will not create a new Armenia.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to honor both the victims and the survivors of the Armenian Genocide.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, today, here in the galleries of this great Chamber, in the Halls of Congress, and on the steps and grounds of the Capitol, there are joined with us the spirits of 1½ million Armenians massacred during the Genocide of 1915. One and a half million souls stand witness today to our every word and our every action, and they ask of us one thing—to remember them. Simply remember them.

Remember, only for a moment, that 74 years ago over 1 million mothers, fathers, children, and grandparents were slaughtered because they were Christians in a Moslem country and Armenians in an Ottoman Turkish nation. Only for one moment today remember these fellow human beings so their spirits may rest a little more at peace in their unmarked and forgotten graves.

Eyewitness accounts of these atrocities are preserved among other places in the records of the American State Department and in the memoirs of the United States Ambassador to Turkey, from 1913 to 1916, Henry Morgenthau. All the accounts from all the sources come together to form one tragic horrific scene. The young Armenian men who had been drafted into the Turkish Army had fought valiantly on Turkey's behalf. But in 1915, these men were disarmed and put to work as laborers and pack animals so they would starve to death or be shot outright. In April 1915, Armenian clergymen and village leaders were systematically rounded up and shot. These groups are considered to be fortunate because a much worse fate awaited the women, children, and elderly.

Under the pretext of deportation, they were marched into the desert. Rapes, mutilations, beatings, starvation, slavery, and drownings are only some of the things of which eyewitnesses speak. When bored, the Turkish gendarmes would slash stomachs of pregnant mothers to stab the unborn children or behead someone so they would have a ball to play with and kick around. Ambassador Morgenthau writes:

I have by no means told the most terrible details, for a complete narration of the sadistic orgies of which these Armenian men and women were the victims can never be printed in an American publication. Whatever crimes the most perverted instincts of the human mind can devise, and whatever refinement of persecution and injustice the most debased imagination can conceive, became the daily misfortunes of this devoted people.

American, Canadian, and German missionaries along with American consuls appealed to the United States Embassy that the moral power of the United States was the only hope of saving nearly 2 million people from massacre, starvation, and worse. But when Ambassador Morgenthau protested the atrocities, Talaat Pasha, ex-Grand Vizer and Turkish Minister of the Interior in 1915, responded:

It is no use for you to argue, we have already disposed of three quarters of the Armenians; there are none at all left in Bitlis, Van, and Erzeroum—we have got to finish them. We will not have the Armenians anywhere in Anatolia. They can live in the desert but nowhere else.

Today, we appropriate foreign aid for Turkey and they, in turn, hire high-powered lobbying firms to, among other things, convince us not to commemorate the deaths of these brave souls and to enlist our support for their entry into the European community. At the same time that Turkey is wining and dining United States congressional delegations in Istanbul, Amnesty International is collecting long lists of gross human rights violations in modern day Turkey. My colleagues, I warn you not to capitulate and fall prey to well-financed self-interest lobbies. If we are to truly uphold the U.S. national interest, we would stand up for human rights wherever it may be threatened.

It is only befitting the moral power and decency of the United States to commemorate "man's inhumanity to man."

To quibble over numbers and grasp for excuses not to support a genocide commemorative resolution lessens the value placed on life. Once opened, revisionist history is a Pandora's box which may present surprising results. If after 74 years, we place less importance on the remembrance of the Armenian genocide, then in a few short years from now some scholars may suggest revising the facts of the Jewish Holocaust. Moving down such a dangerous road someone may offer justifications for the Khmer Rouge massacres. Still further someone may wish to retract America's statements on Japanese internments or renege on hard-fought civil rights victories. Only by remembering can we attempt to learn from history.

In his memoirs, Ambassador Henry Morgenthau quotes an Armenian woman before she was deported: "Pray for us. We shall not see you in this world again, but sometime we shall meet. Pray for us!"

My colleagues, let us pray for that one lone martyred Armenian. Let us remember her so that her death and ours will not be an end.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this special order to commemorate Armenian Martyr's Day in memory of the senseless murder of almost 1.5 million Armenians by the Ottoman Empire and its successors in the years during and after the First World War. I wish to thank my colleagues, Representatives COELHO and PASHAYAN, for allowing me the opportunity to pay tribute to the sacrifices borne by the Armenian people in these years of struggle to preserve their race and culture from extinction.

Armenian Americans traditionally observe the genocide committed against their ancestors on April 24. It is a time to remember and acknowledge the crimes perpetrated against their people, and a time for all Americans to recall the various instances in which genocide has blackened the record of human achievement in the 20th century. If we are to have any hope of preventing future incidents of genocide, it is vital that we remember the victims of the past. House Joint Resolution 36, a bill to designate April 24, 1989, as National Day of Rememberance of the Armenian Genocide of 1915-23, is one method for maintaining the memories and lessons of the Armenian massacres in the present day. I am proud to support House Joint Resolution 36.

This bill is not intended to offend the present Government of Turkey, which is a valued ally of the United States. Turkey's contribution to the Western alliance, however, does not justify a rewriting of the facts. The circumstances surrounding the Armenian massacres are clear. One and a half million Armenians were killed through a systematic program of persecution and genocide by the Ottoman government.

Today is an important day of rememberance for people of Armenian descent. I join them in recalling the pain and suffering experienced by their ancestors more than 60 years ago in the hope that such tragedies will not again be repeated.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker I raise my voice today to commemorate the 74th anniversary of the Armenian genocide by the Ottoman empire. Seventy-four years ago the first genocide of the 20th century began. It nearly extinguished the Armenian population that had lived in its ancestral homeland for over 3,000 years of recorded history. Two-thirds of a nation of people perished by the sword, induced hunger and disease during the period of 1915 to 1923 as a result of the deportation of the Armenian population into the deserts of Syria.

We know that the world kept silent during this mass murder. The world kept silent even though at least 1½ million people were killed. Their only crime was that they practiced the wrong religion and that they were a minority.

Since then, millions of other people have died in genocides in many different countries. Armenia set an example that many other reckless and immoral governments followed. And the example of Armenia also showed how easily nations may get away with genocide and mass murder. The perpetrators faced no judicial inquiry; no ministers resigned in disgrace.

But Armenia did not only set a negative example. We must learn from this experience by taking to heart the past mistakes of mankind. This is why our remembrance is so important and this is why the world must acknowledge what has happened in Armenia. Only by this knowledge of the past we can prepare for the future, a better future for ourselves and our children.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Congressman COELHO and Congressman PASHAYAN for reserving this special order to commemorate the tragic events that took place in the Ottoman empire from 1915-23. I am honored to join my colleagues today to remember and honor the 1½ million victims of the Armenian genocide and their survivors.

Mr. Speaker, as we mark Armenian Martyr's Day, we must acknowledge there are people who would deny the genocide ever occurred. We know they are wrong. We cannot allow time to obscure or fade the truth in the genocide. We must remember the painful facts in detail in keeping the truth alive. We must remember that in 1915 the Armenian members of the Ottoman Turkish Army were segregated, disarmed and either forced to work themselves to death, or massacred. We must remember the villages whose entire populations were murdered. We must remember the Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders who were systematically killed. And finally we must remember the mass deportations and deaths of thousands of Armenians.

The past year has been a difficult one for Armenians and their friends everywhere. Early last year, many Soviet Armenians engaged in nationalist protests were killed or wounded when Soviet forces violently tried to stop the demonstrations. Unfortunately, an even greater challenge lay ahead for the Armenian people. The devastating earthquake which shook Armenia on December 7, 1988, and claimed nearly 25,000 lives was perhaps the greatest natural disaster to strike mankind in this century. My prayers are with the families of the Armenians whose lives were lost in the earthquake as they struggle to overcome this tragedy.

Although the trials ot the Armenian people have been great, their spirit has not been broken. Yesterday, in Soviet Armenia, hundreds of thousands of Armenians gathered in the capital city of Yerevan to commemorate the genocide. This year was the first year Armenians were legally allowed to do so.

Mr. Speaker, on this solemn occasion, Americans pause to remember a terrible chapter in this history of mankind. Today, Armenian-Americans will remember their brothers, sisters, parents and friends who perished more than 70 years ago. These survivors and their families have helped to build the United States into a strong, prosperous, and free Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the events of the Armenian genocide must never be repeated. I personally pledge to continue my efforts to ensure the world never forgets the horrible truth of the Armenian genocide, so that such a tragedy never happens again.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, April 24 marked the 74th anniversary of the genocide of the 1.5 million Armenians in the Ottoman Empire. We continue to remember and we will never forget the atrocities committed against the people of Armenia.

On April 24, hundreds of thousands of Armenians marched in Yerevan to commemorate those who are were systematically killed during and after the First World War. Unfortunately, the marchers were not only mourning and commemorating Armenians killed decades ago. In the last 2 years, both man and nature have combined to take a particularly horrifying toll of the Armenian nation. It is estimated that 25,000 people lost their lives as a result of the earthquake last December, a tragedy that resounded around the world. The hearts of Americans and people everywhere went out to the victims and the survivors, and shared their pain and loss.

Natural disasters, however, are not in our ability to control. In the case of Armenia, the destruction caused by the earthquake was exacerbated and compounded by the loss of life brought about by people. We all know that for over a year, Armenians have been campaigning for the incorporation of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, 75 percent of whose inhabitants are Armenians, from the neighboring republic of Azerbaidjan to Armenia. According to official Soviet statistics, the antagonism between Armenians and Azerbaidjanis over this issue has cost over 90 lives, almost all of them Armenians. The name of Sumgait, where at least scores of Armenians were massacred, will always live in our memory as a symbol of the horrors to which the combination of nationalism and violence can lead.

In 1989, the Soviet authorities in Moscow decided to put Nagorno-Karabakh under Moscow's special control, rather than leave it under Azerbaidjani rule or give it to Armenia. Tensions have cooled somewhat as a result, but the issue remains a sore point. Without a calm, nonviolent approach, this—and other—nationality problems cannot be successfully addressed in the U.S.S.R.

It is all the more worrisome, therefore, that the members of the Karabakh Committee, a nonviolent group composed of intellectuals

and artists whose primary goal is the peaceful incorporation of Nagorno-Karabakh into Armenia, were arrested in December and January. They have since been moved to Moscow, where they are being held in detention in KGB prisons. They are not allowed to see lawyers or their relatives and the Soviet authorities have released almost no information about their fate and prospects.

Mr. Speaker, as cochairman for the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I can assure you that the Commission is carefully following the situation of the Karabakh Committee and in Armenia generally. Along with the Department of State, we are making use of new mechanisms and opportunities afforded by the Vienna concluding document to make known our concerns to the Soviet authorities.

It has been a difficult and trying year for the Armenian nation. As we commemorate the deaths of those killed in 1915, we hope that wisdom and kindness will prevent any recurrence of man-made disasters.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LELAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. FEIGHAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mrs. BYRON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

EXPRESSING SOLIDARITY WITH THE SUFFERING PEOPLE OF LEBANON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for bringing this special order to the floor at this time. I think this issue is especially critical, and I am pleased to support the gentleman's effort.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the special order on Lebanon requested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] and the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

During the last several weeks, more than 20,000 shells and rockets have fallen on residential areas in Lebanon. Vital sources of food, water, and electricity have been destroyed. The senseless destruction of this nation brings feelings of remorse to those of us who respect and admire the many contributions of Lebanese-Americans to our own society.

Lebanon has played a critical role in the geopolitical stability of the Middle East. The reinstitution of democratic government and the removal of all foreign military and paramilitary forces are essential to the preservation of Lebanon's territorial integrity and sovereignty.

Mr. Speaker, the failure of the Presidential elections of September 1988 in Lebanon has deepened the divisions within Lebanese society. It is essential that the international community calls to all parties to end the strife between Moslems and Christians and respond to the international call for a cease-fire. The process of internal reconciliation must begin.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to be a participant with our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] in this special order, but in his absence at the moment, I have taken this time hoping that others who have expressed some interest in joining in the special order would also participate or at least extend their remarks during the course of this special order.

We are here to express our solidarity with the suffering people of Lebanon. They are victims of a savage and seemingly unending war that recently flared up in unprecedented violence.

For over 30 years I have gotten to know the Lebanese-Americans of my community in the 18th Congressional District of Illinois. I have benefited from their counsel. Our district has benefited from their commitment to family values and hard work.

For many years, one of my chief legislative aides was Tom McMurray, of Lebanese ancestry. Today, my chief aide in our Peoria office Ray LaHood, the mayor of Peoria Jim Maloof, and our sheriff, George Shadid, are all three of Lebanese ancestry.

So my interest in the fate of Lebanon and its people is more than merely academic or pro forma. I have known these people for many years, and I want to do all that I can to help their relatives in Lebanon. One way is by bringing their plight to the attention of the world.

Lebanon has become a symbol of the madness of our times, of ruthless invasion and foreign occupation, and the savage brutality with which strong nations badger weaker nations.

But the geopolitical realities are not as important as the individual human tragedies.

By now the statistics are known—well over 300 dead, and over 20,000 shells fired within the last week or so; innocent victims have been killed in a barrage that resulted in the destruction of homes and the loss of electricity and of water for thousands of men, women, and children.

At the heart of this tragedy is the hope of the people of Lebanon for territorial integrity, freedom, independence, peace and justice—exactly what we take so for granted in the United States.

Only a relatively few years ago, Lebanon was an example of peace and prosperity in the Middle East. But in recent years it has become a killing ground.

Last week, the newspaper of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Peoria, The Catholic Post, carried the following headline on its front page: "War Threatens Survival of Lebanese Maronites."

The story went on to say:

> The artillery duel that has battered the Lebanese capital of Beirut for more than a month is seen by many Maronite Catholics as a final assault on the last bastion of Christianity in the Middle East.

That same newspaper carried another front-page story on the effect of this violence on residents of the 18th Congressional District. The story stated:

> The fighting in war-torn Lebanon deeply affects the hundreds of people of Lebanese descent who live in the Peoria area, and U.S. leaders need to intervene, according to Father Faouzi Elia of Peoria.
>
> Father Elia, pastor of St. Sharbel Maronite Rite Catholic Church, with a congregation of 450 families, spoke to the Catholic Post this week about the plight of his parishioners, almost all of whom have relatives in Lebanon.
>
> Father Elia himself has 50 family members still living in Lebanon, and recently his cousin was killed in the fighting.

I happen to know Father Elia very well. Last week he visited my office to express his sorrow and his desire to have our Government help in some way.

I have written a letter to Secretary of State Jim Baker expressing my concern. I have spoken to President Bush's Chief of Staff, John Sununu, himself of Lebanese ancestry, and to the President himself about this tragedy. I know they all share our concern.

One week ago, while the shelling was going on in all its fury, the White House issued a statement which said, in part:

> President Bush is deeply concerned about the growing violence in Lebanon and the escalating suffering of the Lebanese people. The President calls for all internal parties and Syria to cease shelling and to step back from confrontation. The President strongly supports efforts currently underway, such as the one by the Arab league to bring about a cease-fire and an end to the violence.

That is a good start. But we need to keep on directing the attention of the world to Lebanon. Last week there was a demonstration of several thousand people in Washington from around the country to demonstrate. As is their given right to do. Unfortunately it was on page 20, a small two-column story about that demonstration, as distinguished, of course, from some much larger having taken place in recent weeks. But grateful we are the Washington Post in its lead editorial had the editorial "Under Syrian Guns." Maybe a little attention that we may be able to draw again to the plight of the Lebanese might be helpful.

We in America know all too well what the violence in Lebanon means. We lost 265 American servicemen in Lebanon, 241 of them in the terrorist attack on the Marine barracks. We have nine American hostages even now being held in that country.

I am fully aware of the bitter memory of the loss of our servicemen and of our hostages. So I want to make clear that I am not calling for any kind of American military intervention. I am calling for recognition of the ongoing tragedy and for the attention of the world toward that tragedy.

The difficulty in a situation like this one is that the United States has very little leverage over the Syrians. The very nature of the internecine warfare makes diplomacy very difficult. Even the best intentions of those who want to help can't be put into practice easily or quickly.

I believe, however, that our country can be doing more in acting as a source of humanitarian aid and in trying to stop the violence. At the very least we should be launching a diplomatic offensive against the violence calling upon all the nations of the region and the world to do all they can to help Lebanon.

One of the best known maxims is that the squeaky wheel gets the grease. And it is true. People and nations who shout the most, complain the most and bring their needs to the attention of others with persistence and anger, get attention, and they get real action.

The Lebanese people have never been like that. They are self-reliant, hard-working people. They are not the proverbial squeaky wheels who get a large share of the benefits. They have been content, when other nations leave them alone to simply lead their own lives. The various religious and ethnic differences in that country have never made things easy for the Lebanese people. But until recently, there was at least the knowledge that if they could get the peace among themselves they would make their own destiny.

But now, when their very existence as a nation is being threatened by violence, their virtue of not asking for help has become detrimental to their future. They do need our help, and quite frankly, they are not used to being dependent upon the kindness of strangers.

They have suffered too long. Their suffering cries out to us in eloquent and undeniable urgency.

So today, in the special order, we speak for those who cannot speak for themselves, certainly in this forum. We speak to the President, to use all available diplomatic and humanitarian means to help them. We speak to the American media to report the facts of this recent devastation.

□ 1400

As a matter of fact, I think I recall one of the news anchormen last week in reporting on some of the goings on there made the point that it was such a war zone that there was a difficulty in actually dispatching the kinds of on-the-scene reporters that we would normally expect to have covering such an incident. And we speak to the American people to help them be aware of what is taking place in Lebanon.

Mr. Speaker, Lebanon is dying before our eyes. We have to do what we can to save its people from a fate they do not deserve—a fate no one deserves.

Mr. Speaker, I add for the RECORD editorial comments and stories on the situation in Lebanon.

The articles referred to follow:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 1989]

UNDER SYRIAN GUNS

In a convulsion like the one Lebanon is experiencing now, it becomes not merely helpful but urgent to distinguish between two orders of problem. One is political root causes. These, in Lebanon, have long resisted treatment. That is not a reason to ignore them, but it is a reason not to let a search for political solutions get in the way of treating the other problem in Lebanon, which is people dying. That is what must be addressed in Lebanon right now.

The Syrians have had a complex role in Lebanon, but their current role is easy to comprehend. To assert their authority against a political challenge launched by Gen. Michel Aoun, the Christian president, they are conducting massive bombardments of civilian areas in Beirut. The death toll is into the hundreds. By the standard Syria applies when a political challenge comes within its own closed society from some of its own people, this may not be much, but by any ordinary standard it is criminal and it must stop.

How? No conceivable political change can come fast enough to save the lives of a Beirut populace living under Syrian guns. Possibly Damascus can be given pause, however, if enough people outside Lebanon pay attention to what is going on. Syria's President Assad has shown he has no scruples about taking civilian life, but he has also shown a certain shrewd appreciation of the political costs. It is at least a fair bet that as the international spotlight comes to shine on Lebanon, fewer Lebanese are going to die. This is essentially the theory behind the initiative the French launched to get other nations involved in the Lebanon crisis. It was a ringing of diplomatic bells to attract attention. To an extent, it worked.

It is painful to report that the U.S. government has failed to get the full message. The Bush administration has reacted to French and other appeals to get involved by making a plaintive public recital of its inability to bring influence to bear in Damascus. Perhaps American officials are thinking—and they are right to—that Washington is not going to send back the Marines. But why make such a big display of American detachment and incapacity? That translates into an assurance to Syria that it won't have to pay much of a price for its barbarity. Why mumble? Why not keep trying to embarrass Syria into lowering its guns? The French sent a hospital ship, which took aboard both Moslem and Christian victims of Syrian fire. Could not the United States summon up the diplomatic wit to make a similar gesture? It could save lives.

LEBANESE WAR PROTESTED AT RALLY HERE

(By Karlyn Barker and David Ottaway)

A delegation of Lebanese leaders met with President Bush yesterday and more than 4,000 Lebanese and Lebanese Americans held a peaceful protest in Lafayette Park in hopes of getting the United States to intervene with Syria to stop its bombing of Beirut and withdraw troops from Lebanon.

The Lebanese delegation, led by Lebanese Ambassador Abdullah Bouhabib and the Maronite archbishop in the United States, Francis Zayek, met with Bush for a half hour and received assurances of his personal interest in helping to bring about an end to the current crisis, according to Lebanese sources.

The president said he will wait for the results of an Arab League peace mission before making any decisions.

Bouhabib said later that Bush showed "a lot of understanding on Lebanon and a willingness to help."

In Lafayette Park, demonstrators carried red and white flags, chanted "Syria Out of Lebanon" and talked about the danger to relatives and friends because of the shelling there. Before the rally, more than 700 protesters marched through the downtown area and gathered outside The Washington Post, denouncing Syria and urging greater media coverage of the situation in Lebanon. U.S. Park Police estimated the crowd in Lafayette Park at more than 4,000.

Robert Y. Farah, executive director of the Lebanese Information and Research Center, representing the Lebanese resistance, said the protest was organized by a variety of Lebanese American groups.

"The intent was to make the public aware of the plight of Lebanon—to get across through the media and to the administration that the American Lebanese from Maine to California are really angry about the intensity of the shelling * * * and the slow action of the U.S. administration."

Farah, who also participated in the meeting with Bush, said the president expressed concern about the shelling of Lebanon and "the suffering of the Lebanese."

A senior administration official reported that the State Department is now "actively exploring" possible actions the United States might take if the president decides to increase U.S. involvement in a search for a solution to the crisis.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], our Republican leader, for his fine statements about the importance of the Lebanese people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my support to House Resolution 128, expressing this House's concern over the recent events in Lebanon.

While the plight of two whales trapped in Arctic waters attracted international concern, the fate of the Lebanese people is going unnoticed and unmourned.

After all, there has been so much killing in Lebanon in recent years that these recent atrocities are nothing new. They are not news.

Many of us in Congress are deeply concerned about events in Lebanon, and we want an end to the suffering of the Lebanese people.

It would help if Syria would stop its murderous shelling of Lebanese civilians, and to end its occupation of Lebanese territory.

Also if other paramilitary groups in Lebanon would disband, and to recognize the authority of the central government.

The United States has repeatedly expressed its support for a strong central government in Lebanon, and a withdrawal of all foreign forces from that country. It is time for us to take concrete steps to implement this policy.

We should give our full support to international efforts to end this crisis, to effect a cease-fire.

We ought to encourage the Lebanese to come together to fulfill the constitutional mandate to elect a new President in Lebanon.

Our Nation has historic ties with the people of Lebanon. Many Lebanese have emigrated to this country, bringing their talents and skills to make this a stronger nation. The United States ought to stand by Lebanon in this hour of crisis.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 128.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I strongly commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] for his fine statement on this very important issue.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan and know that in his committee deliberations with his colleagues he will do everything he possibly can to keep the fires lit so that we might be continually kept up to date on this tragedy, and hopefully to be able to be of some help and assistance to these poor Lebanese people who are weathering so much.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time and control thereof to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] with whom I originally thought we would be sharing this special order. Now that he is available on the floor, I am happy to yield the time to him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank very much the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the minority leader, for joining us in this special order this afternoon, but particularly to thank him for his extraordinary leadership on this issue. He has been a real friend of Lebanese Americans, and he has certainly been a leader in this institution and in the country in helping to fashion the appropriate American foreign policy in that region. His participation this afternoon in this special order helps to focus the American debate on sharpening that foreign policy to ensure that we can do all that we possibly can in these critical days that lie ahead for that important and beleaguered country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], who has been of enormous assistance in preparing for this special order as well as having joined in a resolution that has been introduced just this week in the Congress calling for very specific action to be taken in order to provide assistance to the Lebanese people.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding and would like to commend him for his initiative as well as that of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the minority leader, as well as my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], for raising the issue of Lebanon again before the American people.

The problem we have with focusing on Lebanon today is quite frankly the fatigue that we suffer as a people and that the world communities suffer because of the everlasting spectacle of Lebanon's agony, an agony which has gone on unchecked for 15 years. We are seeing slowly but surely the devastation, the uprooting, the brutal partitioning, of that beautiful country.

I want to commend my colleagues, as I stated, for bringing this again to the attention of the American people, the international community and the community of nations.

Recently President Bush spoke of his concern for the incredible suffering endured by the Lebanese people, and he vowed that he would try to make a difference. That is important, and, Mr. President, I commend you for that. But more importantly, I urge you to carry out that commitment that you made recently to a group of distinguished Lebanese Americans.

We can make a difference. We can make a difference by raising our voices. And by taking bold initiatives.

The Syrian question is a serious one. We can deal with Syria in one of two ways. We can ignore Syria, but that is not the way to deal with the problem, because Assad is committed, he is strong, and he plays the Lebanese card very skillfully. We have to deal with Syria seriously in this situation, and we have failed to do that. We have to raise our voice in one of two ways. We have to at least try to engage Syria in a discussion of what is happening in Lebanon or, on the other hand, take a more firm stand against Syria. But we cannot ignore Syria.

So, Mr. Speaker, the pain has gone on too long. For 15 years we have seen literally the destruction of a country and the suffering of tens of thousands of innocent people, of indivudals who have undergone the most brutal suffering and inhumanity that one can imagine. It is time for the international community to come together, as has been suggested in the resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], and others which I have cosponsored. It is time for the Arab League, the United Nations, Perez de Cuellar, and other world leaders including President Bush to get intimately involved in trying to do something to move this issue forward on the international agenda.

We must help bring about an immediate ceasefire among the parties. It is time to demand the removal of all foreign military forces and the dismantling of all paramilitary forces in Lebanon.

We, as responsible legislators, can make a difference. The majority leader in the Senate, Senator MITCHEL, has taken a positive, a forceful and an important lead. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], has taken an important lead. The Democratic leadership on our side of the aisle is deeply concerned about this issue.

We have, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of thousands of Lebanese Americans in this country who remember with deep foundness their time spent and the time of their relatives spent in their homeland. It seems to me incumbent upon us as leaders of a peaceful, free world that we show leadership in this terrible, terrible situation that has befallen the people of Lebanon.

□ 1410

So again let me just conclude by commending my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], for taking this special order and asking those in my party to raise their voices and be heard, because we can if we want to, and if we are willing to work in a serious way, stop this insane bom-

bardment and killing and maiming and homelessness that has befallen the Lebanese people.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL], who feels, I am sure, as a Lebanese-American, a special grief watching events unfold in Lebanon and has expressed to all of us in this Chamber a special sense of urgency about the fashioning of American foreign policy to assist the Lebanese people in their struggle to maintain their independence and their national integrity.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, my colleague from Ohio, and thank him and our minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] for taking this special order today to bring to the attention of our colleagues in Congress the special situation in Lebanon.

Mr. Speaker, I have been on the floor for this entire special order and I want particularly to commend the minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] for his very powerful statement this afternoon. I shall not repeat those statistics. We have seen them on the national news and in the print media day after day for the last several weeks.

The Lebanese have been through this carnage, have been through this killing for 15 years now.

As my colleague from Michigan so well put it, there have been changing coalitions within the country of Lebanon; there are Moslems fighting Moslems, Christians fighting Christians, Moslems fighting Christians, and various militia of all natures who have formed in that country over 15 years and have fought each other often in changing circumstances and changing roles.

It has been said that there are more sides to the fighting in Lebanon than there are sides to a Rubic cube. That describes the situation very accurately.

It is a complex situation in the country of Lebanon. Outside forces, outside powers all have their game to play and they use the small country of Lebanon as its playing field.

Lebanon, only about 120 miles north to south, 35 miles from the Mediterranean Sea to the border of Syria, has found itself to be the playing field for various super powers, for various forces from around the Middle East to play their games for selfish purposes on the soil of Lebanon.

There has been in recent weeks an escalation in the fighting. As the minority leader so well put it, the Lebanese are a strong people, they are a caring people. They have a determination to rebuild and have rebuilt on a number of occasions over the last 15 years. But the recent fighting is indeed perhaps the worst in these 15 years. Some 80 percent of the population for the first time is being knocked out of water, power, electricity. There are Christians, there are Moslems, all manner of people who are fleeing the country of Lebanon trying to reach other countries.

Indeed I have spent numerous amounts of time on the phone in the past couple of weeks with our consul in Cyprus trying to help Lebanese reach the United States so that they can spend time with their loved ones here since they are unable to continue living in the home of their birth, Lebanon.

Last Friday here in our Nation's Capital there was an outpouring of some 4,000 Lebanese, Americans of Lebanese descent, who demonstrated peacefully in LaFayette Park in order to bring to the attention of President Bush and this country the plight of the Lebanese today.

The President, much to his credit, met with the leadership of this group, the American Task Force for Lebanon, in the Oval Office with Chief of Staff John Sununu on last Friday.

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of being on the podium at the St. Jude's Children's Research Hospital dinner that honored Chief of Staff John Sununu last March 18 at which time President Bush made an unscheduled appearance and talked about the situation in Lebanon and how he wanted to make a difference.

I certainly commend President Bush for his interest and for his concern about the people of Lebanon.

Secretary of State Baker, with whom our colleague MARY ROSE OAKAR and I have written in the past week, has expressed his desire to work with the Arab League to seek a solution of the Lebanese situation. That is commendable, the interest expressed by the Secretary is commendable. But it is going to take a little more than just pinning our hopes on the Arab League for resolution of this conflict.

There are those who say the Syrians were invited into Lebanon and that they are not wanted today. Those people will put the sole blame on Syria. That cannot be a solution to the problem. The Syrians were invited into Lebanon in 1975 by the Arab League, not the Lebanese Government. They did play a role at that time in fighting side by side with the Christian forces in an effort to quell the Palestinian PLO birth that was beginning at that time within the country of Lebanon.

Rolls have changed, as I mentioned earlier. Today the Syrians find as their main allies in the country of Lebanon, Moslems to whom they lend support, and find as their ally in the fightings that are taking place.

Syria has legitimate gripes in the Middle East, Mr. Speaker. They feel frozen out of every peace proposal that comes down the pike. They have lost what they feel are their legitimate lands in the Golan Heights. Yet they see no involvement of their country in peace process after peace process.

They feel they were invited into Lebanon as peacekeepers and now they are being painted as the bad boy on the block.

Suffice to say, Mr. Speaker, there is enough blame to pass around to all sides in the fighting in Lebanon. There is no one faction, no one group that can claim that they are innocent in this 15-year struggle of the Lebanese people.

All outside forces must leave the country of Lebanon. I refer specifically to Israeli troops in the southern part of Lebanon, who must leave that country as much as any Syrian troops in the northern part or the southern part of that country.

All Iranian forces and Iranian power that goes into that country must be frozen out of the country of Lebanon.

The Iraqis, the Libyans, we could go on and on and list the various countries that are fighting in Lebanon for their own selfish reasons. Suffice to say that all foreign forces must leave the country of Lebanon.

Will there then be peace? That is a difficult question to answer. The Lebanese must have a reconciliation among themselves. They are now in a constitutional crisis having not selected a President succeeding the former President Amin Gemayel. There must be reform within the power process in that country if there is to be true peace in Lebanon.

There must also, Mr. Speaker, very importantly and linked to the peace in Lebanon, be a resolution of the overall Israeli-Arab conflict. That means that the Palestinians must have a homeland. That means that the Palestinians must have a place to which they can go and raise their flag and to call their home, instead of using the country of Lebanon as a place of refuge, instead of building a state within the state of Lebanon as the PLO has been guilty of doing in the past, thus wreaking further havoc on that country.

So there are a number of complex issues, Mr. Speaker.

In conclusion, I do want to say that our Secretary of State is aware of these problems. His efforts in the overall solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict, while some would say are too slow, I think are proceeding at the proper pace and should be allowed to stay on track. I salute him for that.

There is an opportunity that exists today in that overall resolution that perhaps has not existed before and we must not let that opportunity go by. At the same time we must not allow that conflict to divert our attentions any longer from the problem of the

Lebanese people, a people that love Western democracy, a people that love Americans, a people that are not terrorists, a people that are no more responsible for the holding of our hostages than any Member of this body in the Congress of the United States. The Lebanese are not of that nature. They are not responsible for our hostage taking. They are not responsible in general for the overall image that the American people perhaps have of the country of Lebanon.

□ 1420

Indeed, it is the outside forces that have brought about that perception and brought about the problem within that country. So I say that it is time that all outside forces leave the country of Lebanon, that Lebanon's territorial sovereignty be recognized, and their internationally recognized borders be recognized, and that the Lebanese have a reconciliation among themselves as to their problems and as to a peace in that country and the Middle East.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear colleague from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] for taking this special order and for yielding the time to me. He has been gracious in yielding this afternoon.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the participation this afternoon and the comments of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL], who obviously, as could be seen from his presentation, follows these issues very closely over a period of many years.

Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of Lebanon continues. On the eve of the 14th anniversary of the outbreak of civil strife, more than 150,000 people have died. Since March 8, the heaviest bombardments in 4 years have killed more than 300 people and wounded more than 1,000 persons in the beleaguered city of Beirut. Equally devastating are the numbers of men, women, and children suffering physical and mental breakdowns from the protracted, indiscriminate terror that surrounds this city of 1.2 million people.

The Syrian shelling of Beirut came in response to the Lebanese Government's attempt to close and secure illegally operating ports under Syrian control. According to the Lebanese Government, these ports allow safe harbor for terrorist and drug smuggling activities and to import arms as well.

Three million Lebanese are embroiled in a struggle to exercise control over their own destinies. They hope for nothing more than to be left alone by their neighbors and outside forces. Syria—Lebanon's neighbor to the east—occupies 70 percent of Lebanese soil with 40,000 troops and Syria is now determined to extend its hegemony over Lebanon's capital city—a city that once prided itself as being the "Paris of the Middle East."

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow Syria and its surrogates to continue the carnage and destruction of Beirut. The Syrians are continuing the shelling and have hurled hundreds of thousands of Soviet produced 240 millimeter mortars and rockets against Beirut. More men, women and children have been killed and hospitals, schools, and homes are still being destroyed. The carnage continues.

Mr. Speaker, the Lebanese Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Abdallah Bouhabib, in a letter to President Bush made an urgent appeal for help and asked the President to act and to reaffirm his commitment to make a difference in Lebanon. In recent days numerous articles have appeared in the New York Times, the Washington Post, and respected periodicals concerning the tragedy of Lebanon. In all of these articles there is universal condemnation of Syria, its allies in Lebanon, and the bloodshed and devastation against that troubled country. The French are trying to help the Lebanese but there is only so much that one country can do by itself.

The United States has a responsible role to play in Lebanon. I have introduced a resolution calling for the President to push for an immediate cease-fire among the parties in Lebanon, urge the removal of all foreign military and paramilitary forces, and calling upon the Lebanese people to begin a process of internal reconciliation. The resolution recognizes the efforts of the League of Arab States and calls for the United States to support this and other international efforts. Finally, it urges the Government of Lebanon to fulfill the constitutional mandate to elect a new President. At this point I would like to include this material as part of the RECORD:

EMBASSY OF LEBANON,
Washington, March 30, 1989.

Hon. GEORGE BUSH,
President of the United States of America, the White House, Washington, DC.

MR. PRESIDENT: Less than two weeks ago you declared to the world that the Lebanese have suffered for too long and that you wanted them "to know that this President is going to find a way" to make a difference in Lebanon.

Since then, over one hundred Lebanese have been killed, and three hundred have been wounded. Scores of buildings, cars, and vital sources of civilian food, water, fuel, and electricity are being destroyed with the most sophisticated weaponry. Over the last four days some 20,000 shells and rockets have fallen in residential areas.

Two days ago, an Arab League Committee on Lebanon meeting in Tunis appealed for a halt to the fighting in Lebanon. While the Government of Lebanon immediately agreed, Syrian aggression, in its worst form of mass-destruction, continued. Taking advantage of the unilaterally declared cease-fire, the Syrian Army targeted and destroyed a power plant and two large fuel tanks causing blackouts and massive conflagrations forcing thousands of civilians to evacuate. Critical supplies of grains and fuel for bakeries and hospitals have been destroyed, gravely effecting all Lebanon.

Mr. President, we are concerned that although the U.S. Embassy in Lebanon stated that the residence of the U.S. Ambassador in Beirut "was struck by a Syrian shell", Administration officials continue to ignore Syria's destructive role in Lebanon, and thus unintentionally but implicitly and indirectly encourage the Syrians to continue their strangulation of Lebanon.

Mr. President, like the Nicaraguans, Angolans, Afghans, and all beleaguered and suffering peoples around the globe, the Lebanese have the inalienable right to live in peace with self-determination.

Mr. President, in the name of these cherished American values which you have so eloquently brought to your Administration, I appeal to you, not for military or financial assistance, but rather for peace—by calling for an immediate halt to the fighting in Lebanon. I urge you to take measures to help bring about the withdrawal of all non-Lebanese military forces in Lebanon. The free world, and the Lebanese in particular, hold you in highest esteem as a champion of human rights and dignity. We plead with you to act now to make a difference.

With my fullest appreciation of your support.

Sincerely,

ABDALLAH BOUHABIB.

H. RES. 128

Whereas the recent artillery exchanges between Syrian and Lebanese forces and militias have resulted in the death or injury of hundreds of Lebanese civilians;

Whereas such exchanges have destroyed vital sources of civilian food, water, and electricity;

Whereas in the last several weeks, more than 20,000 shells and rockets have fallen in residential areas in Lebanon;

Whereas the deterioraton of conditions in Lebanon threatens its territorial integrity and sovereignty;

Whereas the presence of foreign military and paramilitary forces undermines efforts to establish the authority of a central government in Lebanon;

Whereas the League of Arab States has been asked to mediate the dispute and has called for a cease-fire by the forces fighting in Lebanon;

Whereas the process of reconciliation among the Lebanese is increasingly difficult in the absence of a cease-fire;

Whereas the failure of the presidential elections of September 1988 in Lebanon has deepened the division within Lebanese society;

Whereas the United States supports the restoration of the unity, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Lebanon, the restoration of a central government in Lebanon, and the removal of all foreign forces from and the disbandment of militias in Lebanon;

Whereas the United Nations has demonstrated a historic commitment to working for peace in Lebanon through the presence of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon;

Whereas Article 34 of the United Nations Charter empowers the United Nations Council to investigate any situation which might lead to international friction to determine whether the situation is likely to en-

danger the maintenance of international peace and security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House that the President should—

(1) call for an immediate cease-fire among the parties in Lebanon and the removal of all foreign military forces and disbandment of all paramilitary forces in Lebanon,

(2) urge all parties in Lebanon to respond to the international call for an immediate cease-fire and to undertake immediate discussions regarding internal reconciliation,

(3) support international efforts, including appointment of special emissaries by the United Nations Secretary General and the League of Arab States, to work with the parties in Lebanon to implement a cease-fire and start a process of internal reconciliation in Lebanon, and

(4) support actions to encourage the fulfillment of the constitutional mandate to elect a new president in Lebanon.

Mr. Speaker, the Lebanese are strong, enterprising, and resilient people who are committed to a united, sovereign, and independent Lebanon with a central government capable of governing. Recently, President Bush declared that he was going to find a way to make a difference in Lebanon. This resolution demonstrates our intent to strongly support that commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful, particularly to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], and the other Members of the House who have joined in this special order this afternoon. I hope that from this special order goes a very direct, very compelling message. We believe that there is a responsible and important role in American foreign policy to help end the bloodshed in Lebanon in the short term, and in the long term to help restore the integrity of the international boundaries of this very important nation. The people of Lebanon, as allies of this country, deserve that help. They deserve that assistance, and we have the power and the obligation to provide it.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] and the gentleman from Illinois for sponsoring this special order on Lebanon. I have also been deeply troubled by the tragic situation there.

Until 1975, Lebanon was renowned throughout the world for its role as the financial and trade center of the Middle East. Lebanon's unique economic and social structure made it a model of coexistence in a troubled region of the world. Our country has played an important leadership role there through our efforts to support democracy in Lebanon and to preserve her unity, freedom, sovereignty, and independence. Despite these and many other efforts for reconciliation, the situation has steadily grown worse, and last September the delay in elections brought the country to the brink of a constitutional crisis.

Since the hostilities escalated last month, almost 300 people have been killed and nearly 1,000 have been wounded. Indiscriminate heavy shelling has cost the lives of many innocent civilians, including the dean of the European delegation, the Spanish Ambassador Pedro Manuel de Aristegui.

America must not turn away from the tremendous suffering of the people there.

President Bush has expressed his concern for the people of Lebanon and his desire for an end to their suffering. I urge the President to use all due influence on all parties involved to lay down their arms and return to the table. Only then will the Lebanese people be able to start down the path toward reconciliation.

President Bush should actively work with the Arab League, France, the United Nations and other parties to mediate this tragic crisis, and U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Thomas Pickering should speak against the hostilities that are destroying more lives each day. Without these efforts, the sovereignty and unity of our ally Lebanon are gravely threatened.

America must remain committed to Lebanon's survival as a democratic nation at this critical hour. Only by preserving democracy can Lebanon hope to return to her former prosperity.

I have attached the letter which Congressman RAHALL and I sent to Secretary of State Baker:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 20, 1989.

Hon. James A. Baker III,
Secretary of State,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY BAKER: Until 1975, Lebanon was renowned througout the world for its role as the financial and trade center of the Middle East. Lebanon's unique economic and social structure made it a model of coexistence in a troubled region of the world. Our country has played an important leadership role there through our efforts to support democracy in Lebanon and to preserve her unity, freedom, sovereignty and independence. Despite these and many other efforts for reconciliation, the situation has steadily grown worse, and last September the delay in elections brought the country to the brink of a constitutional crisis.

Since the hostilities escalated last month, almost three hundred people have been killed and hundreds more have been wounded. Indiscriminate heavy shelling has cost the lives of many innocent civilians, including the dean of the European delegation, the Spanish Ambassador Pedro Manuel de Aristegui. The United States must play a stronger role to bring an end to the tremendous bloodshed there.

President Bush has expressed his concern for the people of Lebanon and his desire for an end to their suffering. We urge the President to use all due influence on all parties involved to lay down their arms and return to the table to undertake immediate discussions toward reconciliation. We call upon United States Ambassador to the United Nations Thomas R. Pickering to actively speak against the hostilities that are destroying more lives each day. We also urge the President to actively work with the Arab League, France, the United Nations and other parties to mediate this tragic crisis. Without these efforts, the sovereignty and unity of our ally Lebanon are gravely threatened.

America must remain committed to Lebanon's survival as a democratic nation at this crtical hour. Only by preserving democracy can Lebanon hope to return to her former prosperity.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

MARY ROSE OAKAR,
NICK JOE RAHALL II,
Members of Congress.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the last 14 years in Lebanon have been ones of intermittent storm and calm. Again, we have hit upon storm.

The optimism of the 1976 cease-fire between domestic political groups is now long faded, and the rising death toll—reaching over 300 in just the last few weeks, is a sharp reminder of the devastation and sorrow which are the immediate byproducts of this continued fighting.

Most unsetting is the indiscriminacy of the attacks. Shell-shocked residential areas, bombed-out homes and stores, a lack of electricity and water in many areas, the tragic death of the Spanish Ambassador to Lebanon in his home—these are the images which the Lebanese children carry with them every day.

Over 40,000 Syrian troops continue to occupy Lebanon, as well as surrogates of Iraq, Iran, and the PLO. The outside involvement complicates and adds further tension to the internal situation.

Today, we stand on the floor of the House of Representatives to make a humanitarian plea for the people of Lebanon—to call for an end of the violence and the achievement of national reconciliation.

The Lebanese people deserve justice and peace. As Americans, we must support efforts which advance a cease-fire, which disengage foreign troops, and which broaden peace by encouraging multilateral discussions among the involved factions.

A combination of internal conflict and external assaults have debilitated one of the most productive nations in the Middle East. Today, we call for a healing of these wounds, and we offer our U.S. support for the full recuperation of this war-torn land.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank my good friend and colleague, BOB MICHEL, for taking this special order calling attention to the brutal and savage agony of warfare that is occurring in the country of Lebanon. This small country wedged between Syria and Israel is undergoing one of the most ferocious bombardments since World War II.

I still remember a time not so long ago, when BOB and I visited the beautiful city of Beirut. Back in the early sixties, Beirut was known throughout the world as the Jewel of the Mediterranean. BOB with his wonderful voice would serenade the Lebanese. In those days we could safely traverse the countryside visiting with the friends and relatives of our constituents.

I have many friends and constituents in western Massachusetts of Lebanese descent who exhibit the industrious tradition that once so typified all of Lebanon. But today, this spirit in Lebanon is being crushed by those forces that would destroy rather than build.

When we look at what remains of Lebanon today, it is hard to imagine that this battlefield was once one of the most productive, peaceful and forward-looking countries of the Middle East. The coalition Government of Lebanon

once served as a model for other nations that sought to unite peoples of diverse cultures and religions under one flag. This flag of Lebanon was a symbol of a precious but tenuous peace that existed among its people. But in this decade, this fragile peace has been torn asunder by the forces of radicalism that now threaten much of the Middle East.

Since early April, in the exchange of shellfire from opposing forces in Beirut, well over 300 people have been killed. The population is suffering intense and prolonged devastation, as entire sections of the city have been left without water and electricity.

Syrian forces especially have been responsible for the latest violence that has pushed the country closer to the edge. We must demand that such forces stop the carnage and allow the voices of moderation and reason to rise again.

Mr. Speaker, amidst all the agony and suffering, now is the time to demand an end to the violence that has scarred this war-torn country.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. FEIGHAN and the minority leader, Mr. MICHEL, for taking this special order today. I rise to join them in calling attention to one of the world's most tragic crises.

Lebanon, not so long ago, one of the true garden spots of the Middle East, an economic an cultural crossroads, has been torn by religious strife and factional violence on an unprecedented scale. Now, Lebanon is being tortured again, this time in the name of expansionist hegemony.

While the television news cameras have focused our attention on Palestinian youths throwing stones at Israeli soldiers in the West Bank, Syrian artillery shells and rockets have been falling—and continue to fall—on Lebanon.

Already having overrun the majority of the country, Syria's occupation troops are intent on spreading Syria's Hafez Assad's cruel dream of a greater Syria to the sea. This dream is being bought with lives by the hundreds—the lives of the peace-loving yet helpless Lebanese citizens.

The fact that the world regards this madness with seeming disinterest makes it all the more horrifying. There have been no protests, no outrage, no condemnations from the United Nations.

It is time for all of us to express our solidarity with the Lebanese people, to call for an end to the shelling and for Syria to withdraw from Lebanese soil. However, more than that, we must call for an end to the repeated depradations Lebanon has suffered at so many hands. We must urge the international community to unite and do all it can to see the promise of Lebanon—once so bright and inspiring—restored.

Mr. Speaker, again, I commend my colleagues for their concern and commitment in taking this special order and for their leadership in focusing the attention of the Congress and the world on the dark and dismal tragedy in Lebanon today.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that Lebanon has been wracked by its 14-year-old civil war. What is less known—or at least less often spoken of—is the degree to which the carnage has spread in recent months.

The most disturbing facet of these developments is the relative timidity with which the United States and other governments have criticized the country most responsible for the recent hailstorm of attacks against the civilian population of Beirut. Syria, far from exercising its purported role as peacekeeper, has, for over 40 days, mercilessly shelled residential neighborhoods of east Beirut. Hundreds have died; thousands lie wounded in overcrowded and underequipped hospitals; and most of Beirut is dangerously without electricity, water, and fuel and is on the brink of running out of bread and other basic food supplies. Syria has even fought off French rescue ships attempting to evacuate the wounded.

How long will the international community stand in silence as Syrian gunners wipe our entire city blocks and the Damascus regime carves out its power niche with deadly impunity?

The United States has an abiding interest in peace in the Middle East. It is wrong that our efforts to promote peace and security in the region seem so often to be limited to the Arab-Israeli conflict. The taking of Arab life by an Arab should be of no less consequence than the taking of an Arab life by anyone else. The world's silence condones, by oversight or by indifference, the brutal power grab Syria now prosecutes in Lebanon.

The muted response of the international community can be understood by Syrian President Hafez Al-Assad only as tacit acceptance of Syria's attacks on the defenseless citizenry of Beirut. The United States, the Soviet Union, and other regional players must denounce, in the strongest terms, the Syrian aggression in Lebanon and work to bring about a crease-fire that will bring an end to the needless loss of innocent life in that tragic country. It is to our shame that the world community has tolerated this outrage thus far. It is time for concrete practical measures.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, Republican Leader BOB MICHEL and Congressman ED FEIGHAN for scheduling this timely special order. While the little country of Lebanon has suffered through 14 consecutive years of civil war and foreign military intervention, the brutal fighting of the past month has raised the levels of carnage and suffering to greatest yet. As a longtime friend of Lebanon with many historical and cultural ties, it is imperative for the United States to play an active role in halting the bloody fighting and promoting a negotiated settlement.

The United States has long played an active and constructive role in the development of Lebanon. From the time Lebanon was part of the Ottoman Empire we have promoted education, health, and better standards of living. Some of Lebanon's best known and best respected institutions, like the American University of Beirut and International College, are American. Today, like the much of the rest of Lebanon, they face daily shellings and uncertain futures.

The United States sent in the Marines twice, once in 1958 and then again as part of the multinational peacekeeping forces in 1982, in an effort to help stop war and promote peace. The price we have paid for our humanitarian efforts is very high. Hundreds of Americans, like our brave marines at the Embassy compounds and airport station who were killed by terrorist bombs, and like Ambassador Malloy who was murdered in 1976 while brokering a cease-fire have died trying to make Lebanon a better place. Others have been kidnaped and are still being held hostage for their efforts. Despite these tragedies, we should not give up. Just as others supported us in our time of need some 200 years ago, we should help our friends today, like the Lebanese, in their time of crisis.

The underlying causes behind the breakdown of Lebanon into civil war in 1975 were complex and difficult enough to begin with. The subsequent 14 years of war and intervention have only worsened the crisis and further complicated the already confounding situation. However, the bloodshed of the past month dictates that we not dwell upon the past, but focus on stopping today's heavy fighting and promoting an environment conducive for negotiating a peaceful future for Lebanon.

This latest round of fighting finds its origins in the inability to elect a successor to former President Amin Gemayel upon the expiration of his term in office last September. The result of this constitutional crisis was the establishment of two governments both vying for control and legitimacy. The crisis reached its present violent stage when the appointed interim caretaker government of General Aoun, utilizing its relative advantage of air and sea power, closed the illegal ports up and down the Lebanese coastline. These militia operated ports were denying the central government of critical tariff revenues and allowed the myriad of militias to have easy access to foreign arms. These ports were also a major transshipping point for illegal drugs like heroin and hashish—drugs which find their way from the Syrian controlled Bekaa Valley to the streets of the United States. It is in our direct interest to keep these ports closed.

While many debate the real motives and intentions behind the closing of these ports, the result has been a brutal power struggle over the future of Lebanon. There have been no winners and only the innocent civilian population caught in the middle and Lebanese nation have been the losers. The mass destruction of civilian population centers, like Beirut, has caused hundreds of deaths and thousands of casualties. Shelling is a very discriminate form of warfare—it targets the old, the infirm, families, and children. The cruel decision by the leftist Lebanese militia leaders and Syria to prevent French humanitarian supplies from reaching both sides of Beirut and from evacuating civilian wounded to French hospital ships must be condemned. Clearly, many of the combatants in Lebanon who claim to speak for the people do not care at all about the Lebanese people.

Playing a leading role in this recent carnage has been Syria. First invited in as part of an Arab League Peacekeeping Force in 1976, Syria, especially after the withdrawal of all other Arab Peacekeeping Forces, soon became one of the factions vying for power and control. Clearly, the Syrians have overstayed their welcome. They are a central part

of the current crisis and their occupation of much of Lebanon must end.

I think it is very telling that the Syrian Army is engaging the Lebanese Army in Lebanon! The world was quick to criticize the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. We correctly joined in demanding Israeli withdrawals. Yet, today, the Syrians are engaged in a far more brutal and violent occupation of Lebanon. Our standards have not changed and therefore we must continue to demand the immediate withdrawal of the Syrian Army. Syria has never relinquished its claim to Lebanon as part of greater Syria. I am very concerned that the longer Syria remains in Lebanon, the greater the chances for de facto Syrian annexation of Lebanon.

I fully recognize that the withdrawal of all foreign forces, including the Syrians and Israelis, will not solve the intricate problems facing Lebanon. In fact, fighting could escalate for a short time as the various militias and the central government vie for power and control. However, the removal of the principal occupying power—and troublemaker, Syria, would be an important step in creating an environment in which the Lebanese, free from Syrian arm twisting, could begin the process of rebuilding a free and independent Lebanon. However, for these efforts to be successful, compromise is necessary. The valid concerns of all of the different communities in Lebanon must be accommodated. Real political and societal reforms are necessary if reconciliation and reunification are to succeed.

While I believe we must be more vocal and increase the pressure on the warring parties in order to stop the current fighting, I strongly support President Bush and his commitment to Lebanon. As a senior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I stand ready to assist the President in any way I can with his efforts for peace in this troubled land. Additionally, I urge the Arab League Committee presently examining this crisis and brokering a cease-fire to do what is best for the future of a free and independent Lebanon, a founding member of the League.

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for the past 14 years, Lebanon has been a country at war. We are all too familiar with the demise of this country which was once one of the most productive and vital countries in the Middle East.

However, during the past month, Lebanon—and the people of Beirut—have been subjected to an unrelenting state of siege. Not only are they living amidst the day-to-day battle for control being waged between the Christian-Muslim factions but their city is being shelled, almost continuously, by Syria.

This latest round of violence began when General Aoun ordered a blockade of Moslem militia-run ports, which quickly escalated into a struggle to drive Syrian troops from Lebanon. The Syrians were initially asked to serve as peacekeepers in Lebanon and now number over 40,000 troops. While the Christian militia sees the Syrians as an occupying force, the Moslem factions view them as a presence and there is no unity between the Lebanese people as to the role Syria should play—if any at all—in Lebanon .

Now, after a month of shelling, Beirut and the people who have not left the city are in a most desperate situation. There are no services left. Stores which are still open are depleted of their wares. The city has been without electricty for weeks and there is no water available to city residents. The American University Hospital estimates that it may run out of antibiotics and other medicines within the month. And, unfortunately, it does not seem possible that a resolution can be found in that amount of time.

In the middle of this destruction, the people of Beirut are trying to survive. Although they realize that normal living is impossible, they struggle to maintain that normalcy in any way they can, ever conscious of the threat of death. They have lost loved ones and they are now watching their city and country being further ravaged.

The spirit of these people should be a testament to all of us. We have no concept of the adversity which they live with on a daily basis. They need and deserve peace; and, should peace come, they will need an international relief effort to help them rebuild their country. We should stand among those in support of them.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Lebanon is in one of the bloodiest, most costly phases of their 14-year-old civil war. According to conservative estimates, more than 150,000 have lost their lives since the fighting between the Christians and the Moslems began in 1975. Fighting resumed on March 14 when Christian leader Gen. Michel Aoun imposed a naval blockade on illegal ports run by Muslim militia. To date, the latest round of this endless battle has claimed more than 300 lives and left almost 1,000 wounded. The relentless, horrific shelling of the Christian enclave in East Beirut by Syrian backed Muslim forces is bloody, even by the Syrian standards, and shows little signs of residing.

As staggering as these numbers may be, they fall pitifully short of telling the entire story. These numbers fail to tell us that the majority of those who have died are not soldiers. Instead, they are ordinary citizens who finally fall prey to the countless bombs and bullets that are part of their daily lives. The shells exchanged between the Christians and Moslems are often aimed not at armed positions, but are targeted at school buses, homes, and markets. The civil war itself began April 13, 1975 when Christian gunmen killed 29 Palestinians in a bus ambush after an activist of the rightist Christian Phalange Party was assassinated. Furthermore, these statistics do not begin to consider the countless people who have watched as their homes have been destroyed, their children mutilated, their lives ruined. And, the numbers exclude the 15 Western hostages being held by pro-Iranian Shiite extremists.

The temporary repairs and restraints, regularly issued in an attempt to end the fighting, treat only the symptoms of this intricate problem. These efforts fail to address the illness which cripples all attempts to resolve the strife. Lebanon has become the battleground for regional powers. The civil war is no longer a division between opposing Lebanese factions. It is now a complex web of overlapping conflicts between rival regional factions that defies all attempts to find peace. The ill-fated intervention of the U.S.-led Multinational Force in 1982 which claimed the lives of more than 240 Marines servicemen still remains fresh on the mind of many Americans.

The ideal solution for this problem is to give Lebanon the chance to independently solve its internal divisions. Once conflicting outside interests are removed, the Lebanese could work toward a national reconciliation and an easing of the tension between Christians and Muslims. Hopefully, presidential elections could be held, solving the crisis which began this newest round of fighting. Before Lebanon can be given this vital opportunity, other countries must be willing to sacrifice their interests. Only a few hundred square miles in the East Beirut areas are free of foreign troops. The price they pay to maintain their independence is the bloodshed we hear about on a daily basis. With more than 40,000 troops stationed in Lebanon and control of 65 percent of the country, Syria is certainly the most prominent of the outside interests. Peace will not come to Lebanon until foreign powers such as Syria loosen their grip on the nation and seek other arenas to settle their disputes with rival nations. One of the proudest traditions of America is our efforts to help those countries struggling to embrace their democratic rights. Certainly, people deserve the right to decide the fate of their nation and to choose their leaders free from the oppressive presence of other nations.

I commend the efforts of international peace forces which continually work to explore new possibilities for securing peace. Initiatives by the Arab League have not produced a working solution, but they have certainly laid the groundwork for future efforts. The efforts of France should also be honored. Their work to ease the suffering of those involved in the Lebanese dispute—regardless of race or religion—should serve as an example to other nations.

I urge President Bush and Secretary of State James Baker to assert our influence in this region and make efforts to help return the future of Lebanon to its citizens. More importantly, I urge us to consider the peace which we could help to bring to the war-weary innocent victims whose lives are being repeatedly assaulted by the endless fighting.

In the future there will hopefully be a healing of the fractures which divide Lebanon, as well as the rest of this turbulent region. Until that day we must continue to provide hope and not falter in our efforts to weave through the intricate maze of countless turmoils which allow the carnage of Lebanon to persist.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on this special order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BATEMAN (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today until further notice on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes, on April 26 and 27.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DYSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DE LUGO, for 5 minutes, today and April 26.

Mr. COYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HARRIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 5 minutes, on April 27.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 60 minutes, today.

Mrs. BYRON, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. LELAND, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGLISH, for 60 minutes, on May 10.

Mr. ESPY, for 60 minutes, on May 10.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MICHEL, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. FEIGHAN) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TALLON, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. BROOMFIELD in two instances.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. BUECHNER.

Mr. GREEN.

Mr. GILMAN in seven instances.

Mr. HANSEN.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mrs. BENTLEY.

Mr. MARLENEE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DYSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. BEVILL.

Mr. OWENS of Utah.

Mr. DYSON.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

Mr. RAY.

Mr. TRAFICANT in five instances.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. SKELTON in two instances.

Mr. STARK in four instances.

Mr. BEILENSON.

Mr. MFUME in two instances.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. LAFALCE.

Mr. PEPPER in two instances.

Mr. RAHALL in two instances.

Mr. JONES of Georgia.

Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. FAZIO in two instances.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

Mr. LANTOS in two instances.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. DARDEN.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. SMITH of Florida.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. WYDEN.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to designate April 30, 1989, as "National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution Centennial Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 91. Joint resolution designating April 28, 1989, as "Flight Attendant Safety Professionals' Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to recognize the 75th anniversary of the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, and its role in establishing our Nation's system of State Cooperative Extension Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 26, 1989, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1010. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Chicago Mercantile Exchange, transmitting a copy of the report of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange to review trading practices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1011. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the mandatory timetable for implementation of marketwide service payments under Federal milk marketing orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1012. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary (Logistics), Department of the Air Force, transmitting notification of the decision to convert to contractor performance the commissary shelf stocking, custodial service, and resale warehouse function at Los Angeles Air Force Base, CA, pursuant to Public Law 99-190, section 8089 (99 Stat. 1216); Public Law 100-202, section 8074 (101 Stat. 1329-75); Public Law 100-463, title VIII, section 8061; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1013. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of April 1, 1989, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 101-51); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1014. A letter from the Director, Contracts Policy, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification of the decision that the construction of family housing units at Clark AB, Philippines, shall be restricted to joint ventures which include a minimum of one company each from the United States and the Philippines, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 nt.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1015. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting notification of the intent to give a dummy MK-14 torpedo shell to the town of Albany, Australia, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7545(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1016. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the first annual report summarizing the Agency's Housing Preservation Grant Program activities during fiscal years 1986 through 1988, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1490 m(j); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1017. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-17, "District of Columbia Business Corporation Act Amendment Act of 1989," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1018. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-23, "Commission on Mental Health Services Employees Retention Temporary Amendment Act of 1989," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1019. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-22, "Law Enforcement Temporary Amendment Act of 1989," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1020. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-21, "Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Implementation Date Amendment Temporary Act of 1989," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1021. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, "Fiscal Year 1988 Annual Report on Advisory Neighborhood Commissions," pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1022. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, "Annual Audit of the Boxing and Wrestling Commission for Fiscal Year 1988,"; pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1023. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a notice of final funding priority under the educational media research, production, distribution and training governmental subsidization for the manufacture and distribution of a Line 21 Decoder, pursuant to 20 U.S.C.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1024. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of final regulations for services for deaf-blind children and youth, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1025. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting notice of the delay of the national energy policy plan, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7321 (b), (c); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1026. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Medical Assistance Program under title XIX of the Social Security Act to increase coverage for pregnant women and infants and for childhood immunizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1027. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification that the Department provided the defense articles and services and training to Jamaica under the authority of P.D. B9-6, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2318(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1028. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a report that on April 21, 1989, Col. James Rowe was murdered while driving to work in Quezon City, Philippines, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761(c)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1029. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the Nicaraguan emergency is to continue in effect beyond May 1, 1989, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d) (H. Doc. No. 101-50); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1030. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by Peter F. Secchia, of Michigan, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the U.S.-designate to Italy, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1031. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by Walter J.P. Curley, of New York, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the U.S.-designate to France, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1032. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a list of all reports issued or released by GAO in March 1989, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1033. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, transmitting a report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act during the calendar year 1988, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1034. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting notice of a proposed new Federal records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(r); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1035. A letter from the Executive Director, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act during the calendar year 1988, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1036. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting a report to alert Congress that the Presidential Election Campaign Fund is running out of money, pursuant to 26 U.S.C. 9009(a)(5)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

1037. A letter from the Director for Collection and Disbursements, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1038. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursements, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1039. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursements, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1040. A letter from the Chairman, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, transmitting the 1988 annual report of the Corporation, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 880(a); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1041. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 22d in a series of reports on refugee resettlement in the United States covering the period October 1, 1987, through September 30, 1988, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1523(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1042. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Marine Fisheries Program Authorization Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1990, 1991, 1992, and 1993, to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1043. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1990 and 1991 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1044. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report on ocean pollution, monitoring, and research for fiscal year 1987, pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 1703(a); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

1045. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, and other provisions of law, to provide technical and conforming amendments to implement the Department of Veterans Affairs Act of 1988, Public Law 100-527; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1046. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the third quarterly country and commodity allocation table showing current programming plans for food assistance under title II of Public Law 480 for fiscal year 1989, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 1736b(a); jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

1047. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for exploration, prospecting, conservation, development, use, and operation of the naval petroleum reserves for fiscal year 1990 and fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Commerce.

1048. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the activities of countries within the United Nations and its specialized agencies, pursuant to Public Law 98-473, section 530a (98 Stat. 1900); Public Law 100-461, title II (102 Stat. 2268-26) (H. Doc. No. 101-52); jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1049. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General for Legislative Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the purpose of carrying out the activities of the Department of Justice for fiscal year 1990 and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

1050. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to restore lost compensation and establish the procedure for adjusting future compensation of justices and judges of the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and the Judiciary.

1051. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the report of progress on developing and certifying the traffic alert and collision avoidance system [ICAS], pursuant to Public Law 100-223, section 203(b) (101 Stat. 1518); jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Science, Space, and Technology.

1052. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the 1988 annual report on the number of applications that were made for orders and extension of orders approving electronic suveillance under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1807; jointly, to the Permament Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary.

1053. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the Department of Energy for civilian energy programs for fiscal year 1990 and fiscal year 1991, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce; Interior and Insular Affairs; and Science, Space, and Technology.

1054. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to maintain a competitive, financially strong, and secure uranium enrichment capability in the United States by reorganizing the uranium enrichment enterprise, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce; Interior and Insular Affairs; and Science, Space, and Technology.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 840. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1990 for the Federal Maritime Commission; with amendments (Rept. 101-31). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1223. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Nationial Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Marine Fisheries Program Act through fiscal year 1992 (Rept. 101-32). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1224. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act through fiscal year 1992 (Rept. 101-33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1225. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986 through fiscal year 1992; with amendments (Rept. 101-34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1763. A bill to authorize expenditures for fiscal year 1990 for the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes (Rept. 101-35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 87. Resolution impeaching Walter L. Nixon, Jr., judge of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi for high crimes and misdemeanors; with an amendment (Rept. 101-36). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 135. Resolution waiving certain points of order against consideration of H.R. 2072, a bill making dire emergency supplemental appropriations and transfers, urgent supplementals, and correcting enrollment errors for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes (Rept. 101-37). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FORD of Michigan: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 1149. A bill to allow Members of Congress to use the franking privilege to disseminate copies of the Constitution of the United States (Rept. 101-38). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1486. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1990 for the Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 101-39). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. APPLEGATE:

H.R. 2073. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny any deduction for cleanup and damage costs attributable to certain oil spills in navigable waters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2074. A bill to correct the tariff treatment accorded zinc printing type; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 2075. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the deduction for certain expenses incurred outside the United States to repair or maintain certain commercial aircraft; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WEISS, Mr. BLAZ, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 2076. A bill to amend the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act to improve consumer information and fuel efficiency with respect to passenger automobiles, light trucks, and tires, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on noncomplying manufacturers (in lieu of the penalty), and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Colorado:

H.R. 2077. A bill to suspend for a 3-year period the duty on certain fiberglass yarns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEMENT (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DARDEN, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. TANNER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. DE LUGO):

H.R. 2078. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to encourage the development and use of standardized plant designs and improve the nuclear licensing and regulatory process; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COYNE (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. WISE):

H.R. 2079. A bill to provide for the designation of, and provision of assistance to, economic growth zones for purposes of promoting economic growth within economically distressed communities; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DREIER of California:

H.R. 2080. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child's insurance benefits of a disabled individual who has attained age 18 will not terminate solely by reason of marriage to an individual eligible for supplemental security income benefits under title XVI of such act so long as the individual's eligibility under title XVI continues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 2081. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 2082. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to permit the disclosure to governmental authorities by electronic communication providers of the names and addresses associated with phone numbers supplied by such authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2083. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to punish corruption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KENNELLY:

H.R. 2084. A bill to establish a corporation to administer a program of voluntary national service, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, Armed Services, Veterans' Affairs, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 2085. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to limit the liability under that act of commercial lending institutions acquiring facilities through foreclosure or similar means and corporate fiduciaries administering estates or trusts; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LOWERY of California (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. DORNAN of California):

H.R. 2086. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to modify the penalties for certain kidnappings of children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS of New York:

H.R. 2087. A bill to transfer a certain program with respect to child abuse from title IV of Public Law 98-473 to the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OWENS of New York (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 2088. A bill to revise and extend the programs established in the Temporary Child Care for Handicapped Children and Crisis Nurseries Act of 1986; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 2089. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to limit the compensation of investigators who use medical devices under an exemption for investigational use; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 2090. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide civil and criminal forfeitures for mail and wire fraud, and to compensate victims of those offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2091. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require an annual report from the Director of the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment on changes in payment amounts for certain

surgical transplantation procedures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2092. A bill to make it unlawful for an individual to obtain a position as a physician or resident in a hospital receiving Federal funds if the individual's license to practice medicine was obtained through intentional misrepresentations; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 2093. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to requiring institutions to have residency training and fellowship programs in geriatric medicine as a condition for payment of direct medical education costs under the Medicare Program; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 2094. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a clinical trial to determine the efficiency and economic feasibility of providing Medicare coverage for personal emergency response systems; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 2095. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to reauthorize the collection of reclamation fees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 2096. A bill to designate an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Veterans' Affairs as the Chief Minority Affairs and to provide for the appointment of Deputy Officers of Minority Affairs of the Department; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MFUME, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. PAXON):

H.R. 2097. A bill to establish certain prohibitions with respect to the provision of sterile hypodermic needles or bleach to intravenous drug abusers and with respect to the medical treatment of narcotics addiction; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. STARK, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. SHAW, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 2098. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the targeted jobs credit through 1992 and to expand the targeted groups with respect to whom such credit is allowed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 2099. A bill to prohibit the disposal of solid waste in any State other than the State in which the waste was generated; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 2100. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of certain paper products and synthetic detergents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2101. A bill to amend titles 5 and 10, United States Code, to provide that any child who is ineligible for survivor annuity, life insurance, or health benefits coverage under such titles because of being married may qualify for such coverage if that marriage is terminated by reason of death, annulment, or divorce; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and Armed Services.

By Mr. TRAFICANT (for himself and Mr. JONES of Georgia):

H.R. 2102. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide the penalty of death for certain murders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 2103. A bill to establish the national dividend plan by reforming the budget process, and by amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the double tax on dividends, to allocate corporate income tax revenues for payments to qualified registered voters, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Rules.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. AKAKA):

H.R. 2104. A bill to amend and enhance existing renewable energy programs and Federal trade and export promotion programs in order to promote the United States renewable energy industry, improve the trade balance of the United States, and maintain the competitive and technical leadership of the United States in renewable energy development and trade; jointly, to the Committtees on Ways and Means Foreign Affairs; Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; Energy and Commerce; and Small Business.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2105. A bill to amend the Fur Seal Act to provide continued access to certain fisheries in the Bering Sea; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BEILENSON (for himself, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PEASE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. WOLPE):

H.J. Res. 245. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the President to call upon radio and television broadcasters, in cooperation with public health organizations, to educate the public about the dangers of cigarette smoking; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHANDLER (for himself and Mrs. BYRON):

H.J. Res. 246. Joint resolution expressing United States policy regarding reforms which should be taken by the Government of Nicaragua in order to bring about lasting peace, pluralism, and democracy in Nicaragua; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRANDY (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. NAGLE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. ECKART, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HORTON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. WEBER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. DE LA GARZA, and Mr. AKAKA):

H.J. Res. 247. Joint resolution designating May 29, 1989, as the "National Day of Remembrance for the Victims of the U.S.S. *Iowa*"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOODY (for himself, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FROST, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. OLIN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RAVENEL, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. WOLPE):

H.J. Res. 248. Joint resolution designating October 22 through 28, 1989, as "World Population Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STARK:

H.J. Res. 249. Joint resolution entitled: "Special Trade Management Act of 1989"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COURTER:

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that proposals to distribute needles to drug addicts in order to curb the spread of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome should be rejected; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS of Florida (for himself, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. GRANT, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BAKER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Air Force should continue to utilize the weather reconnaissance aircraft, WC-130, in coordination with National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration operated satellite technologies, for tracking hurricanes and collecting research data to enable scientists to predict and understand hurricane behavior; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Mr. COUGHLIN):

H. Res. 136. Resolution authorizing the printing of the committee print entitled "The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988: A Guide to Programs for State and Local Anti-Drug Assistance" as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. RITTER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WELDON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. WEBER, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LENT, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GALLO, Mr. PAXON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. ROE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. ENGLISH):

H. Res. 137. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the duties of the Sergeant-at-Arms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

70. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to shipments of hazardous waste; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 2106. A bill to transfer a parcel of land in Hyde Park, NY; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 2107. A bill for the relief of Pablo Cruz Patag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANGMEISTER:

H.R. 2108. A bill to extend the patent numbered 3,586,911 for a period of 10 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BATES, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STARK, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 5: Mr. ROTH, Mr. FAUNTROY, and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 7: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 17: Mrs. UNSOELD and Mr. WALGREN.

H.R. 22: Mr. JAMES, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. SYNAR, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 29: Mr. MAZZOLI.

H.R. 70: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. WELDON, Mr. PURSELL, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 82: Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SKEEN, and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 110: Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.R. 118: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. COYNE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 156: Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 159: Mr. COX.

H.R. 378: Mr. STANGELAND, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. COX.

H.R. 393: Mr. STANGELAND.

H.R. 394: Mr. DENNY SMITH.

H.R. 422: Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 446: Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. RHODES.

H.R. 488: Mr. ROBINSON.

H.R. 500: Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SKAGGS.

H.R. 520: Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 521: Mr. STANGELAND and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 522: Mr. STANGELAND and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 523: Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 529: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DARDEN, and Mr. FLORIO.

H.R. 530: Mr. FLORIO and Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 546: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 563: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. PRICE, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. BUNNING.

H.R. 586: Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 594: Ms. SCHNEIDER and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 598: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 682: Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 711: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 736: Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GORDON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. MAVROULES.

H.R. 857: Mr. SCHUMER.

H.R. 874: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 875: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 970: Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 984: Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.R. 995: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROE, and Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 1004: Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 1080: Mr. STANGELAND and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1083: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. LENT, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. COELHO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 1087: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CONTE, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 1095: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 1112: Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. BOSCO, and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 1128: Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 1129: Mr. ROE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 1134: Mr. BLAZ.

H.R. 1181: Mr. WELDON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. COURTER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 1190: Mr. ROE, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. RUSSO.

H.R. 1200: Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FISH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. STUMP, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. ROE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. CONTE, and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 1216: Mr. VENTO, Mr. MINETA, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1221: Mr. FISH, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 1248: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1250: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1260: Mr. BATES.

H.R. 1262: Mr. COX.

H.R. 1276: Mrs. BENTLEY and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 1287: Mr. HYDE, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. ROBINSON.

H.R. 1292: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1295: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 1304: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1317: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 1365: Mr. COX.

H.R. 1388: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.R. 1401: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 1416: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. AUCOIN, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 1486: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 1505: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. PARKER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.R. 1515: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. WEBER.

H.R. 1525: Mr. FRANK, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. WYDEN.

H.R. 1561: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FRANK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1574: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DYMALLY, and Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 1578: Mrs. COLLINS and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 1587: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

H.R. 1588: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.R. 1598: Mr. FUSTER.

H.R. 1613: Mr. PAXON, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, and Mr. SCHUETTE.

H.R. 1636: Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 1638: Mr. BARNARD, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, MORRISON of Washington, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1652: Mr. GEPHARDT.

H.R. 1656: Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 1666: Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 1703: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. PATTERSON, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 1704: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. PENNY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. DONNELLY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. FISH, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. FUSTER.

H.R. 1710: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. RAY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. PENNY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. TALLON, and Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.

H.R. 1836: Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 1870: Mr. COURTER, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 2015: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2041: Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. DICKS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.J. Res. 26: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. PETRI, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. AUCOIN, and Mr. COX.

H.J. Res. 28: Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.J. Res. 31: Mr. HORTON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.J. Res. 34: Mr. HANCOCK.

H.J. Res. 67: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. ANTHONY, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.J. Res. 68: Mr. NATCHER, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WALGREN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DYSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. ESPY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. HOPKINS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.J. Res. 74: Mr. BATES, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WHEAT.

H.J. Res. 84: Mr. STANGELAND and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.J. Res. 94: Mr. COX, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, and Mr. THOMAS of California.

H.J. Res. 120: Mr. BOSCO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GRANT, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mr. PEPPER.

H.J. Res. 134: Mr. YATRON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LENT, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. BOSCO, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. PRICE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. DIXON, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. WEISS, Mr. GOSS, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. RAY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SABO, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. WISE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. OBEY, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.J. Res. 136: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. REGULA, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. JONTZ, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. WILSON, Mr. DYSON, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. UDALL, Mr. IRELAND, and Mr. WEBER.

H.J. Res 150: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. NELSON of Florida.

H.J. Res. 183: Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BUECHNER, and Mr. FISH.

H.J. Res. 186: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. RAY, Mr. STAGGERS, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. GRANT, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BATES, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PARKER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. REGULA, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. GREEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CARPER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TAUKE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PACKARD, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.J. Res. 212: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. CARR, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. TAUKE.

H.J. Res. 215: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, and Mr. Gejdenson.

H.J. Res. 221: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. WALSH.

H.J. Res. 223: Mr. WALSH, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Mr. Engel.

H.J. Res. 231: Mr. Neal of North Carolina, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. DYSON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.J. Res. 237: Mr. DENNY SMITH.

H.Con. Res. 70: Mr. HASTERT.

H. Con. Res. 74: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 77: Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Con. Res. 78 Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. PENNY, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. FROST, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H. Con. Res. 93: Mr. BLAZ.

H. Res. 122: Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, and Mr. ROE.

H. Res. 125: Mr. GALLO.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

32. The Speaker presented a petition of city/borough of Juneau, AK, relative to Alaska salmon and steelhead; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HOW CANADA DEALS WITH PHYSICIAN COSTS

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, one of life's mysteries is how Canada does so well in the health sector, and the United States does so poorly: on average, they live a year longer than we do, they insure all their people, and spend only 8.5 percent of their GNP on health. In the United States, on the other hand, one out of six of our people have no health insurance, another one out of six have very deficient health insurance policies, and we spend about 11.2 percent of our GNP on health.

The following material from the New England Journal of Medicine of March 2, 1989, entitled "Controlling Health Expenditures—The Canadian Reality," describes how the Canadian program impacts on physicians:

CONTROLLING HEALTH EXPENDITURES—THE CANADIAN REALITY

THE EFFECT ON PHYSICIANS

From 1971 to 1985, the share of the American GNP going to physicians has risen by over 40 percent. By contrast, Canadian physicians had an increase of only 10 percent. The stories that U.S. physicians hear about disaffected Canadian physicians, outmigration, underfunding, and occasional strikes correspond to an underlying reality of less generous funding. Despite the rhetoric, however, there has been no mass bailout of physicians from Canada. The supply of physicians per capita has risen throughout the period, is currently growing at between 1.5 and 2 percent per year, and is projected to continue its growth for the foreseeable future. At the end of 1985 there were about 490 people per physician in Canada—very similar to the U.S. ratio. As in the United States, the policy concern is with surpluses, not shortages. There may be some loss of superstars to the United States, but that is hard to document—individual anecdotes do not make a trend. In any case, there is always some leakage of stars in any field from countries with small populations to populous neighbors (the Gretzky effect).

The main explanation for the difference in outlays to physicians is that real fees have increased much faster in the United States than in Canada. This difference, in turn, has resulted from the effect of universal public coverage on the process of fee determination. Increases in the general levels of fees and rules of payment are negotiated periodically between provincial medical associations and Ministries of Health. Over the long term, this complex negotiation process has had a major impact on the overall rate of escalation of fees. Ironically, for a society that believes in the influence of competitive markets, the increasing supply of physicians in the United States seems to be associated with an acceleration in fee increases. In 1986, the rise in fees relative to the overall Consumer Price Index was one of the largest on record.

Two other related issues have been particularly contentious for Canadian physicians—billing at rates above those reimbursed by the provincial plans ("extra billing") and the growth in the use of services per physician. Since 1971 these factors have become increasingly prominent in the political negotiating process, although the first one may at last have been pushed off center stage.

With the passage of the Canada Health Act in 1984, the right to "extra bill" was removed in all provinces in which such billing had previously occurred. This act, passed unanimously by the House of Commons, was a response to public perceptions that extra billing was undermining the fundamental principle of universal access on uniform terms and conditions. The termination of extra billing was met with intense opposition from physicians in some provinces, however, culminating in a lengthy strike in Ontario. Physicians argued that the threat of widespread extra billing was a safety valve, protecting them against overly aggressive bargaining by the Ministries of Health and helping to push up public reimbursement rates. Although relatively few physicians engaged in extra billing, the majority strongly supported the option. They were unable to mobilize any sizable public support, however.

The extreme distress among physicians in Ontario appears to have been based largely on symbolic considerations. The right of ultimate access to the patient's economic resources seems to have had a meaning difficult for nonphysicians to understand. In fact, no change has occurred in the prevailing pattern of private, fee-for-service practice with reimbursement at uniform, negotiated rates. But Canadian physicians do have real concerns about the future, which have been linked to the extra-billing issue.

Once governments have achieved control over fee levels by ensuring that the public reimbursement rates represent payment in full, it is feared that the next step in cost control will be to restrict the amount or type of care provided, or at least the number and mix of services for which reimbursement will be made. This is particularly likely if physicians increase their delivery of services to compensate for the loss of extra billing, for a stagnant fee structure, or both.

The latter possibility has been an important consideration in recent American discussions of physicians' reimbursement under Medicare. Analyses of the U.S. experience with fee freezes in the early 1970s clearly demonstrated that increased billing occurred as a response. Billing activity per physician has risen faster in Canada than in the United States since 1971, in a manner consistent with this concern, although in Canada fee controls have clearly moderated the rate of escalation of expenditures for physicians' services, not just that of fees. Until recently, the provincial governments have been willing to accept an additional rise in expenditures (increases in physicians' productivity or more creative billing, depending on one's point of view) over and above increases in fees and numbers of physicians. Nationally, this has averaged 1 to 2 percent per year since 1971.

The exception was Quebec, where over a four-year period of unchanged fees (1971 to 1975) the increase became so large as to create a fiscal problem. Starting in 1976, Quebec introduced modifications to the reimbursement process that limited its liability for increases in services, billings, or both (per practitioner and in the aggregate) that exceeded preset target levels. From a billing standpoint, 26 office-based diagnostic and therapeutic procedures were bundled into the office visit. These procedures had been billable separately, in addition to the basic visit fee, and during the early 1970s their number and cost per office visit had risen rapidly. Their consolidation into the office-visit fee removed one of the principal mechanisms by which Quebec physicians had been able to stem some of the erosion in their real incomes during the period of unchanged fees.

In addition, there are ceilings on the quarterly gross billings of individual practitioners, above which physicians are reimbursed at only 25 percent of the allowable fee. For the profession as a whole, negotiated fee increases are implemented in steps, conditional on the rate of increase in use. If the rate of use per physician (i.e., average gross receipts) rises faster than a predetermined percentage, subsequent fee increases are scaled down or eliminated.

None of these measures impinge directly on the autonomy of individual physicians in their practices, however. Specific clinical decisions are not reviewed by the reimbursement agency, nor are therapeutic protocols established. If the aggregated bill for all clinical decisions exceeds the limits, then fees to either the individual or the group as a whole will be scaled down, but physicians remain free to determine their own practice patterns.

Committees to review patterns of practice have existed for years in each province, under various names. But they were established to monitor a very small number of practitioners whose patterns deviated radically from those of their peers, and to look for fraud or incompetence. Such committees have neither the mandate nor the resources to go beyond statistical outliers in their investigations; even in this role, a recent commentary suggests that they are not very aggressive or effective.

Since 1985, British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Ontario have all negotiated contracts setting limits on aggregate billings. British Columbia attempted to go further, by restricting the numbers of new physicians entitled to reimbursement by the provincial plan and controlling their locations of practice. This policy, however, was successfully challenged on constitutional grounds. It was sustained at the provincial court, but overturned on appeal, and leave to appeal further was denied by the Supreme Court of Canada.

The absence of intrusion by any of these measures into the autonomy of individual practice contrasts markedly with the situation in the United States, where managed care systems and prospective payment, designed to alter individual physicians' care of

individual patients, have become the principal tools for the control of expenditures for physicians' services. In the absence of a centralized bargaining mechanism between physicians and payers—a single-source payer—there is no way to limit the overall levels of billings. Hence the leap from constraints on capacity (as by a certificate of need) straight to the level of minute scrutiny of the behavior of individual physicians or the treatment of specific diseases.

Thus, many Americans already feel the threats to clinical freedom that Canadian physicians fear for the future. Whether such fears actually materialize will probably depend in large part on whether the provincial governments can continue to contain overall expenditures. What is disturbing, however, is that the current aggregate approaches to control of the use of services leave unexplored the cost-effectiveness, and even the efficacy, of the actual services provided. Such concerns, if left unaddressed by the profession itself, may become the catalysts for more detailed scrutiny of the use of services within the fee-negotiation process in Canada. To date, we see little evidence of this, but a decade ago there was little sign of the now widespread practice of bargaining over aggregate use along with fees. The context of policy decisions changes more slowly in Canada than in the United States, but it does move forward.

ORCHESTRATED OUTRAGE VERSUS DIFFUSE DISTRESS

Thus, the major difference between the two countries with respect to health expenditures lies in the degree of centralization of the cost-control process. In the United States the battles are fought in a myriad of private struggles between physicians and their employers, or their hospitals (or their competitors). When the struggle becomes public, as in the call by Minnesota physicians for unionization, it takes the form of a series of isolated and localized incidents. The general pattern is obscured. In Canada, by contrast, the struggle over shares of income between physicians and the rest of the society is played out as large-scale public theater with all the rhetorical threats and flourishes that political clashes require. Physicians in Canada, and perhaps also in the United States, may perceive the Canadian conflicts as more severe and as arising from the presence of a universal public-payment system. That system serves to focus and channel such conflicts and to bring them into the headlines, but it has also afforded Canadian physicians a greater degree of professional autonomy.

Whatever the liabilities of such an overt and at times rancorous process, the Canadian approach has controlled health care costs more effectively. In the end, this may be the root of the sense of unease among Canadian physicians, who face a problem common to physicians in every country with a rapidly rising supply, including the United States. In such circumstances, every community of physicians must struggle for an ever-increasing share of national income or accept falling personal incomes. In the process, they must urge on the rest of society the benefits of buying the additional services that the additional numbers of physicians make possible (some would say inevitable)—and of doing so at fees that will sustain their own incomes. Whether such benefits are real or illusory is important from the standpoint of health policy, but irrelevant to the needs of the medical community.

The rest of society, or at least a sector of it, attempts to resist this expansion under the banner of cost control. When such resistance is organized collectively through public insurance, it is relatively successful. When it is disorganized and fragmented, an inconsistent and contradictory mix of strategies, as in the United States, it has so far been unsuccessful. Again, that observation is logically independent of whether the lack of success in the United States reflects waste, or whether the Canadian success leads to "underfunding."

In such an environment the pressure on physicians can only grow. To the extent that they resist such pressures successfully and continue to expand their share of the national income, as in the United States, the public and private responses to cost escalation will become increasingly radical. Major institutional changes are already transforming the American health care system to an extent much greater than has been the case in the more conservative Canadian environment. Fears and anecdotes about the erosion of professional autonomy, and even of incomes, are becoming increasingly widespread. In the United States, corporate competitors or employers may turn out to be more ruthless than public regulators.

Such are the costs of economic success. The Canadian environment is more stable and predictable precisely because its cost-control processes work relatively well. But in Canada, whatever has happened or may happen can be blamed on government and on the evils of "socialized medicine." Anxiety and dissatisfaction are easily, if not always accurately, focused and channeled collectively through the process of public negotiation. In the United States, it is harder for individual practitioners to find the villains, and still harder to identify an effective response. At the same time, it is easier to misinterpret the experience of other countries with more visible bargaining processes.

PAPUA, NEW GUINEA

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Papua, New Guinea, located 500 miles north of Australia, is a strategically important nation in the Pacific Basin. Many who served in the Pacific during World War II are familiar with the area, especially Port Moresby in the southern part of the country which was an important allied base that the Japanese repeatedly sought to capture.

Representing the United States in Papua, New Guinea is Everett E. Bierman. As many of my colleagues will recall, he served as the minority staff director of the Foreign Affairs Committee for almost 20 years. During this time, he earned a reputation as the consummate professional respected by both Members of Congress and the committee staff. On October 17, 1986, he was sworn in as Ambassador to Papua, New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu.

In the April 16, 1989, issue of the Washington Post an article appeared describing Papua, New Guinea, its culture, and customs. From this perspective, I would like to share excerpts with my colleagues.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 16, 1989]

FORBIDDINGLY RUGGED, OFTEN DANGEROUS—AND THE ULTIMATE IN EXOTIC

(By Phil McCombs)

As the plane began its descent, far out over the Coral Sea, the deep green mountain ranges of Papua, New Guinea slowly took shape in the distance—dark, forbidding lines of cloud-misty jaggedness rising from a vast sparkling ocean.

I'd been out to New Zealand and Tahiti the previous year, but this would be nothing like those polished destinations. In the fastnesses of the Papuan cordillera, I knew, people continued to live much as they had tens of thousands of years ago. Only in the past two decades have tourists regularly penetrated many of these areas, where traditions of tribal warfare continue and where, despite government denials, it's by no means certain that ritualistic cannibalism has been eliminated.

PNG, an independent island nation 500 miles north of Australia, is familiar to many Americans who served or passed through during the Second World War. Consisting of the eastern half of the huge island of New Guinea (Indonesia owns the other half), plus a 1,000-mile necklace of tropical islands flung out in archipelagos to the north and east, it is today one of the globe's most fascinating, exotic and least-visited destinations.

"Land of the unexpected," proclaims a typical Air Nuigini poster under a colorful drawing of a bird of paradise—and this is indeed an understatement.

Port Moresby—a dusty combination of the Old Tropics that you might find in a W. Somerset Maugham story, along with an overlay of modern hotels and government buildings—may be one of the few national capitals in the world where "Crocodile Farms" is a substantial listing in the yellow pages (the grilled meat tastes like a combination of chicken and pork), where you can buy half a dozen beautiful primitive art objects for the equivalent of $200, and where, when somebody points to the sky and says "bigpella mixmaster bilong Jesu Christ," you know he's talking in pidgin about a helicopter.

The Trobriands, Port Moresby—an important Allied base during the war that the Japanese repeatedly sought to capture—and the highlands with their exotic tribal customs and perennial gold-rush fewer (U.S. officials think the country could become the world's third largest gold producer) are only a few of PNG's unique travel opportunities.

You can go by jungle steamer up the savage Sepik River, which twists for 700 miles out of the highlands and across the malarial swamps of the northern New Guinea coast, where beautiful artworks may be purchased directly from the people; or climb some of the roughest and highest mountains in the world (yep, it snows up there!). You can walk the rugged Kokoda Trail north of Port Moresby, where Australian troops—plus some Papuans and Americans—narrowly held the Japanese at bay in one of the Pacific war's more desperate and memorable campaigns. You can check into a luxury hotel in the relaxed north-coast city of Madang, lie around the pool and eat a fabulous array of seafood specialties, taking off when you feel like it to go diving nearby on stunning coral reefs and war wrecks in some of the most beautiful waters in the

world. Or, if you really want to rough it, you can even sign up for a guided "adventure tour" by foot and canoe into truly uncharted territory.

The official language of Papua, New Guinea is English, and that, at least, makes things nice and manageable for Americans. You can get around easily and quickly get the flavor of the country's culture—particularly the wild political gyrations that the Papuans not only tolerate but seem to relish. The government is, as an American official delicately phrased it for me recently, "a vigorous democratic system with free press and free speech." The catch is that the politics are so volatile that the government just might rise or fall overnight—"sort of like Italy in the '50s," according to my official friend, "although that may be unfair to Italy."

All this is partly explained, in a strange way, by PNG's unique geography. Tribal groups were kept so isolated by the rugged terrain that 700 or more separate languages are spoken in the country—perhaps a quarter of the world's tongues. Fierce loyalties developed among those in the same "wontak" (literally "one talk" or linguistic group), and when people moved out of the mountains into the cities this translated into a intensively fought coalition-building style of national politics. . . .

Before independence in 1975 the country was run, at various times, by the Germans, English and Australians—and these influences have hung on. Much of the civil service is still dominated by the Australian "expats" who ran the place before independence, although now they're being gradually phased out. There's an enduring missionary tradition, and you get glimpses of it in some charming ways: You're likely to go into a supermarket, as I did to buy necessities such as peanut butter and Ritz Crackers, and find they're playing "When the Saints Come Marching In" as background music.

The country's educated community is relatively small—including an indigenous elite, ex-pats, university professors, and foreign diplomats and businessmen. I found these types interesting—you can easily strike up conversations in the hotels and restaurants—and was equally charmed to receive detailed analyses of the country's culture and the various insanities of the political situation, delivered cheerfully in flawless English by taxi drivers, office workers and other everyday folks I bumped into while shopping, stopping for an ice-cream cone downtown or just roaming around.

Another regular at the Islander, journalist Biga Lebasi of the lively Nuigini Nius, had some irreverent advice for travelers. "Tell the Americans not to visit here because it's too expensive!" he exclaimed with a hearty laugh. Unfortunately, he's got a point. Air fares, hotels and food are all expensive.

In addition, PNG can be dangerous. The State Department's current travel advisory warns of "a continuing crime problem" throughout the country and advises people "not to travel alone into rural areas. Tourists are urged to book in-country tours only through established agencies." Just last month there was a riot in Moresby that somehow grew out of what had begun as a peaceful demonstration against increasing criminal violence. The good news is that foreigners didn't seem to be a target in the general melee.

"These are a violent people we're talking about," said my official friend, "so be careful. The major travel destinations are okay, but with that proviso." Actually, I doubt that Papuans are more violent at heart than anyone else, but what has happened is this: Rapid modernization and economic development since independence have brought highlanders flooding into Moresby and other urban centers. Many of them haven't found the jobs they wanted, and their housing needs haven't been met. Thus many thousands of poor and idle "squatters" are located on the fringes of the city, and some of them pose a danger.

Robbery and rape—particularly in the form of anger directed against "rich" foreigners and expats—were constant topics of discussion during my visit. The newspapers were full of reports of criminal violence. On the other hand, I went all over the Moresby area—visiting the facinating National Museum, Gen. Douglas MacArthur's former headquarters downtown, the war museum, the university and the open-air farmers' market in suburban Gordon, among other points of interest—without any problems. At night I took cabs, although during the day I often took the bus or walked from my hotel to nearby shopping areas.

It's also important to bear in mind that PNG is a disease-ridden country. The first thing you see as you walk into the fetid airline terminal outside Moresby is a sign warning of malaria. In fact, the whole country is malarial—urban areas included—and you would be well advised to start taking your pills before you arrive. On the Sepik River, I noticed that the mosquitoes started swarming well before sundown—and they meant business; repellent is an absolute necessity. . . .

My Australian civil servant friend and his wife picked me up on a bright Sunday morning in their car. With the kids laughing and playing in the back, we wended our way out of the Moresby area to the east, heading toward the village of Sogeri 25 miles away in the mountains—"really the only place you can drive from Moresby," as my friend said.

That's not strictly true. You can drive—renting a car in Moresby—along the coast of the Gulf of Papua in two directions, and there are beaches, but "you're likely to get attacked and robbed at the beach," according to my friend. Apparently thieves not infrequently lie in wait at likely bathing locations, although if you can find a populated beach—Idler's Bay is said to be a good bet—you ought to be all right. At some beaches there are private entrepreneurs who will guard you for a fee.

Up and up we went, alongside the Laloki River, past the copper mine where Errol Flynn once worked, arriving finally at the beginning of the Kokoda Trail. We got out to stretch and read the dedication on the monument there "in memory of the officers, NCOs and men of the Australian military forces who gave their lives on the Kokoda Track. July-November 1942. To strive, to seek, to find and not to yield."

It was hot even at that altitude (about 4,500 feet) and I imagined the hell that fighting must have been. It's volcanic terrain, forested but rocky. Pacific Expeditions' adventure travel brochure describes the trail as "a challenge to test the fittest bushwalker. The trail cuts across knife-edged ridges and over teasing mountains. We trek through rainforest, jungles of ferns, orchids and towering trees. . . . In case of an emergency it is comforting to know that . . . airstrips are handy. . . . We take an extensive medical kit with us."

You get the idea.

We piled back into the car and continued to the Kokoda Trail Motel, run by a towering giant of an Australian ex-pat named Phillip Wilcock who left Melbourne 20 years ago, as he put it, over some trouble with a neighbor's wife; he hasn't looked back since.

And what a place he has! On his 30 acres there's a park with deer, goats, wallabies, Guinea fowl, turkeys and other creatures. "And I'm setting up a sanctuary for birds of paradise," he said proudly. The kids petted some of the animals and then made straight for the large outdoor pool, while Wilcock popped some beers for us and we sat around talking on the shaded stone patio with other luncheon guests.

I had the marinated crocodile shish kebab, and my friends had sausages and venison steaks—all grilled outdoors, along with vegetables. Around us the sunlight splashed off the green jungled hills and the orchids on the trees, colorful parrots talked in the rafters, and the day seemed relaxing and heavenly. Lunch for three adults and three children was about $70—not outrageous, but not exactly cheap, either.

TRIBUTE TO THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE WOMEN

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the National Association of Insurance Women who have proclaimed May 21 through May 27 as "National Insurance Women's Week."

Insurance women are dedicated, devoted, diligent professionals who have made and continue to make a significant contribution to the risk and insurance industry. They have become extremely effective on a local and State level in promoting public awareness of several important issues such as: tort reform, automobile safety, and the problem of drinking and driving.

The Insurance Women of Trumbull County is an organization in my 17th District of Ohio that best exemplifies the standards of professionalism and excellence that have been set by women in the risk and insurance industry.

Mr. Speaker, professional insurance women should be granted recognition for their untiring efforts and outstanding accomplishments in the insurance field. Today I ask the citizens of the United States as well as my colleagues to honor these women on May 21 through May 27 as they celebrate "National Insurance Women's Week."

CHARLES BACON

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding Missouri lawyer and former national commander of the American Legion, Charles L. Bacon, died in Kansas City at the age of 79. I knew him well through the years, beginning back in the mid 1940's when he was a prac-

ticing lawyer in Marshall, MO. He was a good friend and will be missed by so many.

The Kansas City Star editorial of April 5, 1989, is an excellent reflection of the life of Charles Bacon, and I include it herewith.

CHARLES BACON

The highlight list of accomplishments of Charles L. Bacon tells a lot about his varied interests and loyalty to those causes. The long-time Kansas City lawyer was an honor graduate at Missouri Valley College in Marshall, Mo., where he served as a trustee for more than half a century. He was national commander of the American Legion, a veterans organization of 2.7 million members when he headed the group in 1961-62. He was president of the Board of Governors of the Liberty Memorial Association. The Kansas City chapter of the Sons of the Revolution named him Patriot of the Year. The Marshall native headed the re-election campaigns of former Sen. Stuart Symington in 1958 and 1964.

Beneath the titles was an individual genuinely dedicated to enhancing his college, his country and a deeper understanding of our system of politics and government. On a personal basis Bacon, easy-going and considerate of others, was a wellspring of energy and, and as one admirer said, "practical wisdom." Professionally, he was for years the focal point and spokesman for Shook Hardy & Bacon, the law firm where he was a senior partner. Charlie Bacon, who is gone at age 79, will be remembered, not only for his public achievements but for his abiding interest in the persons whose lives he touched through a lifetime of achievement.

THE PRESIDENT'S EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE ACT OF 1989

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to have been a guest of the President in the White House Rose Garden recently as he graciously honored the National Teacher of the Year, and also unveiled his Educational Excellence Act of 1989.

I have gone on record from the beginning of President Bush's term stating that I wanted to help him become the education President. I mean that in the spirit of cooperation and comity necessary for the White House and the Congress to come to terms with each other. Only through diplomacy and negotiation on what can and should be done to improve education, and how to fund it adequately, will we assure that the necessary educational opportunities accrue to children in our schools. If we negotiate with the courage of our collective convictions, we will achieve our mutual goal of educating America's children for the 21st century, and protect our national security at the same time.

But, Mr. Speaker, I also am compelled to comment on two outstanding misconceptions—that could lead to confusion—about the President's educational excellence package.

First, nearly every one of his proposals are duplicative of programs in existing law—some of which are funded and some not. The second misconception is that funding for his "excellence" programs will be in addition to funds which would be needed for existing education programs, when in fact budget analysis shows massive cuts would be made if the President's flexible freeze proposal is adopted.

Following are examples of his educational excellence programs that are duplicative. His emergency teacher certification proposal could be carried out, at least as demonstration projects, under the existing Mid-Career Teacher Training Program contained in title V of the Higher Education Act which has never been funded. The funding level of $25 million is $20 million higher than that authorized for the mid-career program in law, but when you consider 50 State and territorial needs, $25 million will not go very far toward meeting the probable demand nationwide. The Mid-Career Teacher Training Demonstration Program is designed to develop and demonstrate exemplary programs to provide State higher education institutions with the information they would need to set up and finance their own efforts toward bringing mid-career professionals into the teaching force. Teacher certification, in my view, is not something the Federal Government ought to interfere with, since it is historically a State responsibility. But if the Federal Government proposes to supply funds for the national demand for qualified teachers, particularly math and science teachers, the demand will far exceed the $25 million proposed by the President.

Another duplicative effort, even though it would be a welcome add-on of funds for education programs, is the Presidential Merit School Awards Program. Under the Hawkins-Stafford School Improvement Act Amendments of 1988, just signed into law last year, Congress authorized the Blue Ribbon Schools Program to achieve the same goal of rewarding excellence in schools. This program is more modestly funded than that proposed by the President, because of the scarcity of education dollars and the need to drive available dollars down to the local schools for direct services to children. By using scarce dollars in this way, we bring up achievement levels and test scores of children, which we expect to have a ripple effect of bringing the schools involved into the ranks of excellence at the same time. In other words, if we improve the quality of education, we improve the quality and effectiveness of schools as well.

The Magnet School of Excellence is a good idea, but it is not new either, and it is certainly controversial. During the last Congress, under the Hawkins-Stafford School Improvement Act, a new program was authorized patterned after the highly successful Magnet School Program—called the Alternative Curriculum Schools Program. The President's new initiative calls for $100 million in new funds. Yet the existing Magnet School Program, which was originally enacted to replace school desegregation funds lost under the consolidation of categorical education programs in 1981's famous Gramm-Latta reconciliation bill, has not yet been fully funded at its newly authorized funding level of $165 million. Funds had previously been available under the Emergency Education Assistance Act, but were no longer available under the block grant in amounts sufficient to continue many desegregation programs. Magnet schools programs, reauthorized last year under the Hawkins-Stafford School Improvement Act were previously fully funded at $75 million. But the real issue here is that the new Alternative Curriculum Schools Program is strikingly similar to the President's proposal in that it does not have a mandate for serving desegregation needs and would be available to parents of children in school districts that would not be eligible for a magnet schools program. The new program was adopted only after a hold-harmless provision was included prohibiting funding for the new program until and unless the magnet schools program reached its maximum funding level of $165 million.

Current year funding for magnet schools, regrettably, has reached only $115 million—leaving a funding gap of $50 million before the new, competing program can be triggered. The question then becomes: Does the President's proposal mean that he expects Congress not to fund the existing, highly visible, popular and successful magnet school program, thus deliberately precluding funding for the alternative curriculum schools program? And if this is what is expected of Congress, is it just in order that his initiative can be funded so that he will look as though he has made good his promise to provide for educational excellence? We need to put first things first—and the first is to fully fund the magnet schools program so that necessary desegregation efforts can continue, and especially for those States who have either voluntary or court-ordered desegregation plans in effect. It is crucial to assuring the civil rights of those intended to be served. By doing so, we automatically enable the Appropriations Committees to fund the new alternative curriculum schools program, an action that would and should preclude any need to enact or fund the President's duplicative proposal.

The Presidential Awards for Excellence in Education, intended for model teachers, is again a great idea, but it is not a new idea. Already in law is the Christa McAuliffe Talented Teacher Fellowship Program, which is modestly funded. The better part of wisdom might be to add to the funding for this popular program, rather than pretending to be doing something new and innovative by creating a duplicative program that will unfairly compete with the Christa McAuliffe program for scarce dollars.

His "Urban Emergency Grants" for areas having the most severe drug problems among schoolchildren, funded at $25 million, has several things wrong with it. First the money, if intended to really assist these school districts, is a pittance compared with the need out there. Second, we are currently providing anti-drug abuse funding for schools and communities under the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act reauthorized just last year. And third, as a Member from a State and district predominantly rural—63 percent of West Virginia is rural—and one which has its own drug abuse problems, I wonder why the President left out rural needs in his emergency package?

Mr. Speaker, I raise these issues only because the need for full funding for existing programs of grave concern to Congress, to parents, teachers, and communities, such as

chapter 1 remedial education, Even Start, meeting children's nutritional needs, training and retraining America's work force, and strengthening higher education, to name only a few.

I believe the President has been ill-served by his so-called advisers who allowed him to announce, with apparent pride and belief in what he was doing, his so-called Educational Excellence bill, which has nothing in it that is new or richly innovative for education.

I believe the President meant it when he said he wanted to be a leader in education—and I believe that the Congress and the Nation would have been perfectly willing to wait until the President and his advisers could work out an education package that truly is innovative in terms of educating our young. Instead, the President was rushed into the fray with duplicative programs costing $441 million in new dollars which, according to his own education budget proposal, would be funded at the expense of existing education programs mentioned above.

With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I believe the President can do better than to place those of us who welcomed his promise to become the education President in a position of having to oppose his proposals because most of them address problems already being addressed by Congress in existing law, and because he would offer us $441 million in exchange for massive cutbacks in other educational excellence programs—cuts which could total as much as $3 billion between fiscal year 1990 and fiscal year 1993.

Finally, I believe that the most urgent item on the congressional agenda right now is to fully implement the Hawkins-Stafford Schools Improvement Act. If the President wants my advice, his educational excellence package needs only to be called Full Funding for Educational Excellence in fiscal year 1990 and beyond.

FAIRNESS FOR LENDING INSTITUTIONS

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would first, clarify the limitation upon the liability of financial institutions under the Comprehensive Environment Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 [CERCLA], 42 U.S.C. 9601, et seq., and second, add an express exemption so that financial institutions administering trusts or estates would not be exposed to personal liability under CERCLA for liabilities incurred or assumed by the particular trust or estate they were administering.

The existing exemption afforded by CERCLA 42 U.S.C. 9601 (20)(A) provides that an "owner or operator * * * does not include a person who, without participating in the management of a vessel or facility, holds indicia of ownership primarily to protect his security interest in the vessel or facility." This provision was inserted to recognize that in certain States which have the "title" theory of mortgages, actual title to a facility is deeded by a borrower via a deed of trust to either the financial institution making the loan or to a trustee for the financial institution lending the money. In other States where the "lien" theory prevails, the borrower grants a mortgage lien to the lender.

The practical problem created by this limited exemption is that despite all the precautionary testing, evaluation, representations and warranties which may be required of a borrower by a lender prior to the closing of the loan, and despite any monitoring and inspection of the facility once the loan is made, there is no assurance for the lender that contamination of a vessel or facility may either be overlooked or deliberately concealed. Furthermore, one of the practical realities of secured asset lending is that ultimately the lender must have the ability to realize upon its collateral, partly because absent a legal or procedural threat to initiating foreclosure proceedings, there is a possibility that the borrower will not take demands, requests or claims by the lender seriously.

Sometimes in a foreclosure no bidders other than the foreclosing mortgagee are willing to step forward and bid on a particular property, regardless of how much advertising or other publicity surrounding the sale has been made. In that instance, if the mortgagee fails to bid anything, there is a realistic possibility that the borrower might itself or through a nominee bid a nominal or token sum, such as $1, and claim the property, free and clear from the mortgage. In many States it is thereafter almost practically impossible for the lender to secure a deficiency judgment against the borrower without meeting an extremely high level of proof. Thus, effectively, the lender is left with letting security interest vanish for a nominal sum, or risk the possibility that—particularly with respect to industrial and commerical properties—notwithstanding how diligent it has been, it is either saddled with the potential environmental burdens of ownership, or at the least subject to a very difficult standard for which there is minimal guidance at this time of the requirements for an "innocent landowner" under provisions of CERCLA 42 U.S.C. 9607(b).

There is no question that the backbone of our economy is small and growing businesses. These startup or relatively small businesses which do not have substantial capital resources or direct access to equity markets, are by their very nature highly dependent upon lines of credit and other borrowings from commercial banks. Unfortunately, because of the problems mentioned above, a recent survey which my staff undertook in the Rochester, New York area indicates that because of the concerns of lenders, small businesses face the following problems:

First, inability to obtain financing for construction of new or expanded facilities;

Second, inability to refinance existing mortgages with balloon payments coming due;

Third, inability to refinance existing mortgages to reduce debt service or generate working capital;

Fourth, inability to use real estate as security for working capital loans; and

Fifth, inability to sell properties not needed for current operations or vacated because of relocation.

Furthermore, it has been brought to my attention that many lenders may be unwilling to provide financing to businesses located generally in an area where a possibility of hazardous waste contamination exists, even if there is absolutely no showing that the specific property owned by a prospective borrower—or any adjacent properties—are contaminated. My staff has discussed this problem at length with the Small Business Administration office in Buffalo in connection with an approved development company financing which fell apart because the proposed site was near another site which was still under investigation by the State Environmental Conservation Department for potential contamination.

The need for protection for corporate trustees is even more pressing. As set forth in an article that appeared in the November/December 1988 Probate and Property publication of the American Bar Association entitled "The Fouled Fiduciary: Seeking Relief From Toxic Waste Liability," there are virtually no cases construing criteria which would be used to conclusively judge the liability of fiduciaries. Moreover, it would appear that even in the routine performance of fiduciary obligations, the fiduciary may be personally liable for what previously would have been seen as solely the liability of the particular trust or estate—in effect representing a virtual windfall for CERCLA claimants in the sense that the assets of the fiduciary are added to the already exposed assets of the owner/operator who passed away or established the trust in the first place.

In many instances bank trust departments are not advised of their appointment under an estate until shortly before the will is offered for probate in the surrogate's court. Thus, the fiduciary may not have any time in which to take those steps which are described for purposes of the "innocent landowner defense" in 42 U.S.C. 9607(b). Although it is possible that, upon learning of specific problems, the trustee may decide to renounce its position, such renunciation does nothing for any liability that may have already been incurred under existing law. Also, if the trustee or executor is not replaced, it could leave the trust or estate without any guidance. In effect, the trust or the estate would be set adrift like a ship without a rudder, thereby compounding the problem, and realistically exposing any employees of a business owned by the trust of the estate to a loss of their jobs.

My bill would solve these problems by permitting commercial lending institutions to foreclose on their security without subjecting themselves as innocent parties to the liability under CERCLA. In effect it perfects the policy decision we already made in exempting a mortgagee from liability by virtue of its loan. Unless it can realize on its security, the encouragement to lenders we have already enacted is severely limited.

The second provision would exempt the fiduciary that administers an estate or trust from its own assets being exposed to liability. The beneficial owners—through the assets of the estate or trust—would remain subject to

CERCLA's provisions. Since the fiduciary is really a manager, there is no policy reason to expose its own assets.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will encourage sound business financing and administration without impairment of CERCLA's objectives.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT TO COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSE, COMPENSATION, AND LIABILITY ACT OF 1980.

(a) AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION OF OWNER OR OPERATOR.—

(1) EXCLUSION.—Subparagraph (D) of section 101(20) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(20)(D)) is amended as follows:

(A) After the first sentence insert: "Such term also does not include any of the following:

"(i) A commercial lending institution which acquires ownership or control of a property to realize on a security interest held by the person in that property.

"(ii) A corporate fiduciary which has legal title to any property for purposes of administering an estate or trust of which such property is a part.".

(B) In the existing second sentence strike out "State or local government" and insert "person" in both places it appears and strike out "nongovernmental entity" and insert "other person".

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Clause (iii) of section 101(20)(A) of such Act is amended by inserting after "to a unit of State or local government" the following: "or to any other person covered by subparagraph (D)".

(3) DEFINITION OF COMMERCIAL LENDING INSTITUTION.—Section 101 of such Act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(39) The term 'commercial lending institution' means a person that is a commercial or savings bank, industrial savings bank, savings and loan association, or trust company."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

THE BLACK REVOLUTIONARY WAR PATRIOTS MEMORIAL

HON. KWEISI MFUME

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, today I'd like to take a moment to share with my colleagues the remarks of Maurice A. Barboza, president and founder of the Patriots Foundation's National Advisory Council, concerning the Black Revolutionary War Patriots Memorial.

AT LAST, A MEMORIAL FOR US ON THE NATIONAL MALL

(By Maurice A. Barboza)

There is a long stretch of Earth in Washington, D.C., known as the Mall. It is the most important land in America. On either end are the U.S. Capitol and the Lincoln Memorial. In the center, the Washington Monument eclipses the White House, the Jefferson Memorial and the entire city. This hallowed ground was set-aside to honor the Nation's most revered men and events. Tourists come to the Mall from all over the country to confirm their American roots. But they leave unaware that the trip was partly a failure.

Marble columns, sculpted bronze, manicured lawns and reflecting pools convey a picture of American history much like the one taught for generations in our schools. With the exception of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, few could ever discern from this traditional depiction that real American history is the combined history of the American people, whose roots are black, brown, red, yellow, white and every hue and color in between.

However, this could change soon. If contributions are forthcoming, this "history gap" will be closed when the Black Revolutionary War Patriots Memorial rises on the Mall. All that is left to be done is to raise about $4 million by October 1991.

The Patriots Memorial will honor the 5,000 black soldiers of the American Revolution, as well as the countless men, women and children who fled slavery or petitioned courts and legislatures to set them free. It will be a monument to their fight for freedom and a symbol in our search for identity and true equality. It will illuminate the subsequent 200 year history of struggle and military service.

This first memorial for us on the National Mall will stand midway between the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument—just two blocks from the popular Vietnam Veterans Memorial. There, in its proximity to those symbols, the Patriots Memorial will tell how we, too, helped give birth to America and helped mold her history and laws for the common good.

Predictably, the battle for this extraordinary site raged long and hard for nearly four years. There was substantial media coverage and public praise. At one point, a congressional committee considered seriously a ban on the construction of any new memorial on the Mall.

The crusade in Congress was led by Rep. Nancy L. Johnson (R-CT), Sen. Albert Gore, Jr. (D-TN) and Rep. Charles B. Rangel (D-NY). Spearheaded by the Black Revolutionary War Patriots Foundation, an unusual and inspired coalition backed the effort. It includes the National Urban League, Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR), Prince Hall Masons, American Jewish Congress, American Bar Association, Vietnam Veterans of America, AFL-CIO, National Education Association, Sons of the American Revolution and the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

A question commonly asked is, "Why a memorial to Revolutionary era blacks?" The answer is simple. The Revolutionary era is the Nation's most sacred history. It is where much of the Nation's greatness and many of its greatest mistakes may be traced. If the Nation were a person, it would be where a psychiatrist would begin to probe for answers that could free us from our confining and confounding ignorance and prejudice.

The replacement of stereotypes, ignominy and years thought to be without content with true facts about patriotism, struggle and perseverance would close the "history gap" and give us common ground on which to build understanding and tolerance between our diverse people.

The American Revolution sent hope soaring in black people and gave some of them a viable, although risky, alternative for gaining freedom. The words of the Declaration of Independence, ". . . all men are created equal" and "unalienable rights", gave voice to salves' natural feelings about whom they really were and what they, their children and America could be. Building the Patriots Memorial will make us hear those voices again.

Historians say that 5,000 blacks (an estimated 1 in 60, according to historian Robert Ewell Greene) fought in the Continental Army and Navy, largely as substitutes for their masters, in exchange for promises of freedom. Free blacks served also in the hopes of winning equal rights. They were engaged in all of the major battles, from Lexington and Concord to Yorktown.

These invisible soldiers left tens of thousands of descendants, most of whom are sadly unaware of their ancestry and of this history. It is an awful irony that a master would send a slave to fight for the master's freedom and historians would relegate the slave's contribution to obscurity. But thanks to the prodding of Lena Santos Ferguson, who waged a successful four year fight for membership in the DAR, the organization is now identifying those soldiers in publication.

When the army was being formed in 1775, blacks were barred from service for fear that they might be understandably inclined to use their weapons against their former masters. Free blacks of Boston, who had already been in the Army, protested. The order was partially reversed with respect to them. However, recruiters, hard-pressed to fill quotas, continued to ignore the order and accepted runaway slaves, free blacks and others.

In the face of successful British attempts to entice slaves to run away to their side (in exchange for promises of freedom), the States began to reverse these exclusionary policies. By 1778, blacks were being officially welcomed, and efforts were initiated, particularly in the South (but without much success), to raise all-black regiments.

Black soldiers hailed from all of the States, however, a majority were from the North, as were the bulk of the fighting men. For the most part, they served in integrated units, although Rhode Island and a few other States fielded notable all-black units. Black soldiers performed a variety of military tasks on an equal basis and suffered all of the war's horrors and hardships.

Zechery Prince was freed posthumously. Gad Asher was blinded. Thomas Lively lost his right eye at Monmounth. Richard Primes was wounded in the head at Camden. Cuff Slade's feet were frozen. Robert Greene was wounded in the face. Ephraim Hearn was a prisoner for 9 months. Hundreds of blacks were at Valley Forge in the winter of 1777-1778. Prince Whipple, who was born in Africa, helped row Washington's boat across the Delware on Christmas Eve 1776; Oliver Cromwell was at the ensuing battles.

In addition to them, the Patriots Memorial will honor men like Edward Hector, a hero of the Battle of Brandywine; Austin Dabney, a hero of the Battle of Kettle Creek; and Lambert Lathan, who was executed by the British for his heroics at the Battle of Groton Heights. It will honor James Lafayette, a spy, who secured from Gen. Cornwallis crucial information that led to the victory at Yorktown. Besides well-known names like Salem Poor and Peter Salem, it will honor hundreds of anonymous black soldiers, who are identified on muster roles simply by the word "Negro" or by assumed names without racial designation.

The Patriots Memorial will not be a war memorial and not just a symbol for men. Besides Richard Allen, who paid the last installment on his freedom in 1783, the memorial would honor women and men who provided civilian assistance and those like Elizabeth Freeman, whose freedom suit ended slavery in Massachusetts. It will honor a group of Connecticut slaves, who in 1779 petitioned for freedom, saying that they did not want their children "training up * * * for a like state of bondage." More than 100,000 nameless runaway slaves will be honored.

While the spirit of the Revolution proved to be the death knell for slavery in the North, the promise of universal freedom was dashed with the adoption of the Constitution. But black patriots carried on the fight. In the Spring of 1787, while the framers debated the Constitution, other Founding Fathers were laying the foundation of another America—black America.

Richard Allen and Absalom Jones organized Philadelphia's Free African Society. This led to the founding of the African Methodist and Episcopal Church. Prince Hall, a war veteran, received a charter for the first black Masonic lodge in America and petitioned for equal school facilities in Boston.

Paul Cuffe and James Forten became wealthy black entrepreneurs who established schools and petitioned for equal treatment of blacks. Cuffe had been a blockade runner and Forten a sailor who had been imprisoned. These patriots built institutions that continued the American Revolution long after the Revolutionary War ended, and their legacy is the rock upon which the modern civil rights movement sits.

This powerful story will echo in the Capital's sweeping vistas through the interrelationship of the Patriots Memorial with other landmarks that are nearby and within view of the site. The view to the Lincoln Memorial will tell how thousands of blacks had successfully sought freedom decades before the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863 and how 180,000 of us served in the Civil War. It will link the freedom struggles of the Revolution to the contemporary civil rights movement and show us how that movement was born of more than 180 years of unheralded toil. It will evoke the memory of the dream Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., revealed there in 1963, which he said was "deeply rooted in the American dream."

The view to the Washington Monument will tell how Washington recruited black soldiers and how they served bravely. The view from the nearby Memorial to the Signers of the Declaration of Independence will remind us of how blacks kept the spirit of that document alive long after America had turned its back on it. Its connection to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial will tell how blacks have served in all of America's wars, from the Revolution to Vietnam. The view from DAR Constitution Hall, where black contralto Marian Anderson was barred from performing in 1939, will link forever the deeds of black patriots with their long-honored and deserving white compatriots.

The axial view to the White House, the Capitol and the Supreme Court will be a reminder of how our leaders squandered opportunities at the end of the 18th and 19th centuries to end slavery and assure the triumph of equality. It will keep us vigilant as we approach the 21st century. The memorial will tell black and white Americans that the greatest barrier to the fulfillment of the Pledge of Allegiance, "one Nation, under God, indivisible," is our collective state of mind, which can change only with knowledge and understanding. Clearly, this memorial for Revolutionary era blacks will be a memorial for the future and for us all. If we resolve to make it so, it could even usher in a new age of national unity and pride in our lifetimes.

But the Patriots Memorial cannot be built without a concerted nation-wide campaign. No government funds may be used. Every American has a stake in seeing the memorial built, especially blacks. The estimated $4 million must be raised by no later than October, 1991, or the grant of land on the Mall will lapse. A series of idea/design forums will be conducted in early 1989. The goal is to construct the memorial before the end of 1991.

(For further information, direct inquiries to The Patriots Foundation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 9, Washington, DC 20036.)

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO TIMOTHY L. AND SUSAN M. STRADER, RECIPIENTS OF THE 1989 MARDEN CENTER OF EDUCATIONAL THERAPY AWARD

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep pride in which I rise today to pay tribute to Timothy L. and Susan M. Strader, recipients of the 1989 Marden Center of Educational Therapy Award.

Marden Center, located in Orange County, CA, is a private, not-for-profit school for children with normal or above intelligence who have learned disabilities sometimes coupled with behavior or emotional problems. The Marden Award is presented annually to persons who are actively involved with the Marden Center and who are of high integrity, extraordinary leadership, great dignity, compassion, and a commitment to the community. Tim and Susan Strader have an abundance of these required qualities which explains why they are the first couple ever to be selected as corecipients of this prestigious award.

Growing up in a large family in the steelmaking town of Warren, OH, I would guess that Tim never could imagine all the contributions he would one day make as an attorney, a developer, an educational philanthropist, and a patron of the performing arts in southern California.

Determined never to be limited by the lack of education, Tim worked his way through John Carroll University and later graduated from the UCLA School of Law. Tim's strong support for UCLA continues today in the form of a scholarship he and Susan established in 1987. As a partner in the Koll Co., Tim was involved in some of Orange County's finest developments. He then formed his own business, the Legacy Co., which continues the quality development with which he has always been associated.

Susan Strader was born in California, the middle daughter in a family of four children who lost their father when Susan was 12 years old. Committed to pursuing a Catholic education, Susan received a scholarship to Marymount High School where the nuns describe her as "a woman with presence, loyalty, and commitment." In appreciation for her opportunity at Marymount, Susan has since established a 4-year scholarship for a needy student from a single parent home. Ever the one to focus on strong family values, Susan knew early that children were important to her and she attended UCLA in order to prepare for her career as a kindergarten teacher.

Mr. Speaker, Tim and Susan have always shared a sense of purpose. Tim, as he helped Irvine citizens form the new city of Irvine; as he helped found the Industrial League of Orange County; as he led the Orange County Performing Arts Center through the successful capital campaign to its opening in 1986; and, as he participates on the board of the UCLA Foundation. Susan, as she helped found the Performing Arts Juniors and three Performing Arts Center chapters; as she serves on the Center's Education Committee which formulates youth programs for Orange County; as she chaired the Imagination Celebration; as she served with Tim to raise the funds which made Santa Margarita Catholic High School a reality; and, as she worked with Children's Home Society, the House Ear Institute, Red Ribbon 100, Founders Guild of Casa Teresa, Concern of Orange, Inc., UCLA Chancellors, and UC Irvine Chancellors Club.

My wife, Lee, joins me in honoring Tim and Susan Strader who have made a positive difference in the community. On this special occasion, we commend them for their selfless dedication and know that the Legacy of Learning they helped make possible will continue for years to come. We wish them and their children, Tim, Jr., Stephanie, Patrick, and Megan continued success and happiness in all their future endeavors.

ALLIANCE FOR AGING RESEARCH ON PUBLIC OPINION

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to introduce into the RECORD the results of a nationwide survey recently conducted for the Alliance for Aging Research. This study reveals that three out of every four Americans think the Federal Government should make the same kind of effort to ensure the health and independence of older Americans as it did to put a man on the Moon. In addition, it shows that 59 percent of Americans say that despite the current deficit more money should be spent for health care research to help reduce health care costs in the future.

I hope my colleagues in the House will take a moment to read the following summary, which makes a convincing case for greater funding for health care and medical research, especially into the prevention and cure of the diseases of old age:

REPORT TO THE ALLIANCE FOR AGING RESEARCH ON PUBLIC OPINION

(Prepared by Penn + Schoen Associates, Inc.)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Americans strongly support additional expenditures for health care and medical research, especially research into the prevention and cure of the diseases of old age. Large majorities of Americans regardless of race, region, income, or age favor an increase in monies spent on medical research intended to ensure the independence of senior citizens. In fact, better than three in four say the Federal government should make a NASA-like commitment to a research effort aimed to restrict or eliminate the diseases associated with old age.

The public believes there is a linkage between raising research expenditures to prevent and cure the afflictions of old age and reducing health care costs. And the degree of support for a major research effort in aging remains strong even when measured against other pressing medical research concerns and the need to reduce the federal deficit. Our results indicate:

Sixty-one percent of Americans favor increasing federal support to find cures or ways to prevent diseases closely associated with old age—such as arthritis, Alzheimer's, hearing loss, and osteoporosis—over increasing other critical areas of health care research, such as AIDS.

Fifty-nine percent of Americans say that despite the current deficit more money should be spent for health care research to help reduce health care costs in the future.

Seventy-six percent of all Americans favor a NASA-like government project intended to ensure the health and independence of our older citizens.

While Americans of every age favor increasing research into the prevention and cure of aging diseases, support is greatest among younger Americans. Fully 63 percent of the people between the ages of 25-34 say we need to spend more on research as a means to control health care costs, compared to 58 percent of those between the ages of 35-64, and 45 percent of those 65 years or older.

In fact, the more Americans know the more they favor increased funding to spur research, rather than decreasing funding. For example, once respondents learned that aging disease research represents less than one-half of one percent of health care costs incurred by older Americans, the 67 percent of all Americans who want a change in spending say it should increase by a 20-1 margin.

In addition, better than three in four Americans support two proposals to address the need for a better funded and more comprehensive research effort. A 76 percent majority say the government should make a significant and concerted effort, much like the original NASA program, to ensure the health and independence of older Americans. An identical 76 percent majority say Congress should support an amendment to long-term care legislation to provide that up to one percent of the money for such a program should be set aside for research into the diseases associated with old age.

Finally, better than eight in ten (82%) of Americans favor one or the other proposed changes in the health care delivery system in order to reduce health care costs. The two most popular choices for change were mandating health benefits for all Americans or increasing research into diseases associated with aging. Less than 10 percent of Americans favor either reducing health care benefits or services to the elderly as a means to control health care costs.

FEDERAL SPENDING AND RESEARCH

Seven in ten Americans believe health care and medical research is the single most worthy candidate for additional funding. A 71 percent majority say health care/medical research is the most critical area for more funding. NASA research was a distant second at 8 percent.

While support is strong among all demographic groups, more women favor old age research than men by an 81%-62% margin. Among the various age groups, support for medical/health care research is the very greatest (78%) among older Americans.

TABLE 1.—AREA OF RESEARCH MOST WORTHY OF ADDITIONAL FUNDING

[In percent]

	NASA/space	Health/medical	Don't know
All	8	71	2
Men	12	62	3
Women	5	81	2
65+	7	78	3

SPEND MORE ON RESEARCH TO REDUCE LONG-TERM COSTS

Americans say there is a need to spend more on research meant to reduce long-term health care costs, even though health care costs are high now and the need to reduce the Federal deficit is great. By a 59 percent-30 percent margin, most people say that more resources must be devoted to long-term health care research.

Perhaps not surprisingly, support for more funding of health care research is greatest among younger Americans who see the most value for themselves in additional long-term research. Sixty-three percent of 25-34 year-old Americans say we need to spend more. By a 45 percent-36 percent margin, senior citizens are significantly less likely to endorse this view, though they do remain generally supportive of more research. Liberals, too, are more supportive (70%) than conservatives (52%), though Americans of every ideological persuasion support more research despite deficit concerns.

TABLE 2.—SPEND MORE ON RESEARCH OR KEEP THE SAME

[In percent]

	Spend more	Keep the same	Don't know
All	59	30	11
25 to 34	63	32	5
65+	45	36	18
Liberals	70	26	4
Conservative	52	35	13

SPEND MORE ON RESEARCH INTO DISEASES OF OLD AGE

Americans also believe that more money needs to be spent on specific research into the cure and prevention of the afflictions of old age, such as Alzheimer's, arthritis, hearing loss, and osteoporosis.

By a better than 2-1 margin, Americans say we must increase research funding into the diseases of old age, despite other critical health care needs such as AIDS. Sixty-one percent support increased funding, while 28 percent say that funding will need to stay the same given the pressing needs of other diseases.

While majority support for increased funding is consistent across all major demographic sub-groups, there is slightly more support in the Northeast (65%) and South (65%) than there is in the Midwest (57%) and West (55%).

TABLE 3.—INCREASE FUNDING FOR DISEASES OF OLD AGE OR LEAVE IT THE SAME GIVEN OTHER MEDICAL RESEARCH NEEDS

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Stop funding	Don't know
All	61	28	1	10
North	65	24	0	10
South	65	25	1	9
Midwest	57	29	2	12
West	55	36	2	7

PERCENT OF TOTAL MEDICAL COSTS SPENT ON OLD AGE MEDICAL RESEARCH

Even though most Americans assume we need to spend more on research, most remain optimistically uninformed about current funding levels. We asked the public to give their best estimate of the percent of the total cost of old age health care that is now being spent on research. Only 26 percent chose the correct percentage range (0%-2%), while 55 percent chose higher percentages than most current figures indicate is being spent on research.

SHOULD FUNDING BE INCREASED GIVEN THE COSTS OF DISEASES OF OLD AGE?

Once Americans are aware of current funding levels, and the health care costs of Americans over 65, they are especially likely to favor increased funding into research. By a 20-1 margin, people say Federal funding for research should be increased rather than decreased. Sixty-four percent say funding should be increased, while only 3 percent disagree.

TABLE 4.—GIVEN CURRENT RESEARCH SPENDING SHOULD FEDERAL FUNDING BE INCREASED OR DECREASED?

	Increased	Decreased	Same	Don't know
All	64	3	29	4

THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF NINTH DISTRICT DENTAL SOCIETY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised that the Ninth District Dental Society in New York State is about to mark its 80th anniversary with a luncheon in Tarrytown.

It was 1868 when New York State Gov. Reuben E. Fenton signed the bill creating the Dental Society of the State of New York. However, it was not until April 29, 1909, that the Ninth District Dental Society was formed, after five counties were split off from an older district to form the ninth district.

At the first organizational meeting, held on April 29, 1909, a decision was made to notify all ethical dentists in the five affected counties

establishing a deadline of July 1, 1909, to join as a charter member. By that date, 35 dentists were found desiring charter membership: 23 from Orange County, 9 from Dutchess County, 2 from Westchester, and 1 from Rockland.

By the time of United States entry into World War I, the membership had grown to 126 dentists, of which 18 served in the armed services. By the time of the Second World War, the society totaled approximately 375 with 180 in the military, and from 1945 until 1959 the membership more than doubled to better than 850. Today, in 1989, the Ninth District Dental Society numbers about 1,500.

The increase in the dental society membership can be attributed both to the greater number of dentists practicing in the area and the wide range of benefits and services the society has offered. For example, educational opportunities, insurance benefits, public relations, a relief program, public health measures, guidance about professional behavior, and communications from the administration concerning all of these advantages are provided to its members.

Mr. Speaker, I invite our colleagues to join with me in congratulating the Ninth District Dental Society of New York State upon their 80th anniversary celebration, and extending best wishes for many more years of professional excellence.

DISAPPROVING RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMISSION ON BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNY SMITH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1989

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 165), disapproving the recommendations of the Committee on Base Realignment and Closure, pursuant to Public Law 100-526.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my opposition to the passage of House Resolution 165, to disapprove the recommendations of the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure. I fully support the work of the Commission, have faith in the accuracy of its findings, and applaud this rare exhibition of good sense by Congress to deal with a sensitive issue.

As most people know, I am a strong believer in responsible military reform. Thanks principally to a well-established record of opposition to wasteful and ineffective weapons systems such as the Sergeant York antiaircraft gun and the Aegis missile system, I have earned the title of "Cheap Hawk." Critics may have intended the comment in a derogatory manner, but I am proud to think that I have so distinguished myself. As a veteran of the Vietnam war and former Air Force pilot, I am firmly committed to ensuring that the U.S. Armed Forces remain strong and soundly able to carry out their constitutional duty to defend this country and their moral duty to defend the free world. At the same time, however, I believe we must recognize the limits to our resources and make a concerted effort to use what we have in the most effective manner possible.

Thus I support the Commission's efforts and oppose this resolution to disapprove its recommendations for the same reasons that I have occasionally found myself battling the Pentagon and the military-industrial complex. If America wants a strong military, she cannot fill her arsenals with guns that don't shoot, planes that don't fly and bombs that don't explode. I am not ashamed to be known as a "Cheap Hawk," and I challenge any Member of Congress to tell me why we should spend billions of dollars on weapons we don't need or that don't work.

Similarly, I have long advocated a reexamination of our military bases as a necessary step for military reform. As far back as the 98th Congress, I introduced the Military Real Property Disposal Act of 1982 to initiate the base closure process. I felt then—and still believe—that in times of mounting pressure on the Federal budget, we cannot as a nation afford to keep military bases operating for any reasons other than purely military ones. Given these budgetary constraints, I believe more than ever that we must spend taxpayers, dollars wisely: On weapons we need, on military facilities with the maximum amount of value, and on domestic programs which meet the legitimate needs of our population.

Some people who are unhappy with the results of the Commission have criticized the rationale behind its creation. And I agree that establishing a commission to decide which bases are needed and which are not is in some respects an abdication of responsibility by Congress. I certainly regret the fact that we are unable to sit down as a legislative body to make the tough choices that need to be made. Congress' handling of the budget deficit is a perfect example of the inability on the part of a great many in this body to say "no" to anybody for anything.

Nevertheless, the business of government must continue. One way or another, we must cut the fat out of the budget, from both military and domestic spending, in order to reduce a deficit of truly scandalous proportions. In an attempt to do just that, the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure was created to carefully, thoughtfully, and objectively examine our Nation's military bases and to make a rational, apolitical judgment about them. The Commission has effectively accomplished the job it was intended to do. While I heartily sympathize with those communities losing a substantial source of income because of the closures, I do not sympathize with those wishing to overturn the results of this exhaustive review, which represents Congress' best effort to begin the process of facing up to fiscal reality.

For these reasons, I applaud the Commission's hard work and wish to go on record in support of its recommendations. Issues like these must be frankly and honestly faced—and overcome—if we are to begin to responsibly govern this Nation.

DRUG ABUSE TREATMENT POLICY ACT OF 1989

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Drug Abuse Treatment Policy Act of 1989. Joining me as cosponsors of this measure were the following 15 members of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, which I chair: Mr. COUGHLIN, the committee's ranking minority member, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MFUME, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. PAXON.

This bill would ban the use of Federal funds for, and bar Federal activities in support of, programs to distribute needles or bleach to intravenous drug users. The bill also would stop the Department of Health and Human Services from implementing proposed regulations authorizing "interim" or "minimum" methadone maintenance which would allow the distribution of methadone to drug addicts without any counseling or rehabilitative services.

In the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, Congress specifically prohibited States from using Federal funds under the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services [ADMS] block grant, "to carry out any program of distributing sterile needles for the hypodermic injection of any illegal drug or distributing bleach for the purpose of cleansing needles for such hypodermic injection"—section 2025, Public Law 100-690. The ADMS block grant program is the primary vehicle for Federal assistance to community-based drug abuse treatment programs. By including this very specific prohibition in the ADMS block grant, Congress made clear that Federal policy should not support or condone needle exchange and bleach distribution programs.

Despite this specific ban and the strong statement of congressional intent it made, Dr. Louis Sullivan, in one of his first public interviews as Secretary of Health and Human Services, encouraged local needle exchange programs to help stop the spread of AIDS by drug addicts. He said the Federal Government would be supportive of such efforts and could help by providing information, trained personnel and funding to set up local programs. Apparently, the Federal funds he would make available for these local efforts would not be ADMS block grant moneys since last year's drug bill specifically bans use of ADMS funds for needle exchange programs.

Dr. Sullivan's proposal is a sad indictment of our national drug policy. Before the Federal Government has even developed a national drug treatment strategy, the Nation's chief health official proposes the distribution of free needles to halt the spread of the AIDS virus without regard to the impact of such a proposal on our antidrug policy.

In my view, the only thing free needles would accomplish would be to continue addiction. It would sweep addicts under the rug, keep them out of sight and out of mind. It

would put public authorities in the business of death on the installment plan, rather than developing the comprehensive treatment options needed to help addicts regain their dignity and give them a chance to lead productive, drug-free lives. It would do little, if anything, to halt the spread of AIDS.

My bill expands the prohibition contained in the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988. It would bar the use of any Federal funds for needle and bleach distribution programs, and it would prohibit any other Federal activities in support of such programs. By establishing a total ban on Federal support for such efforts, the bill would clarify the congressional intent of last year's omnibus drug legislation.

In addition to banning Federal support for needle exchange and bleach distribution programs, my bill bars the Department of Health and Human Services from implementing a proposal that would allow treatment programs to give addicts methadone without providing drug counseling or comprehensive rehabilitative services.

On March 2, 1989, the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institute on Drug Abuse published a proposed rule in the Federal Register to allow minimum service, or interim, methadone maintenance. According to the FDA and NIDA, this proposal was made in response to the AIDS epidemic and is intended to get more addicts into treatment more quickly, thereby decreasing intravenous drug use, needle sharing and AIDS transmission. Public comments on this proposal originally were due by April 3, 1989, but the deadline has since been extended to May 3, 1989.

This "no frills" methadone maintenance proposal falls into the same category of "quick fix" responses to the AIDS/IV drug problem as needle exchange and bleach programs. It is not drug treatment, and it will not reduce the spread of AIDS. Recent research shows that comprehensive counseling and support services are essential to effective methadone treatment.

There are no short cuts around the AIDS/IV drug problem. The sooner we accept that, the sooner we can begin to address the need for comprehensive drug abuse treatment programs.

I have outlined my objections to "no frills" methadone in a letter to FDA and NIDA. A copy of my letter appears at the end of my remarks. A number of treatment professionals and organizations representing both methadone maintenance and drug free service providers also are opposed to the HHS proposal, including: the Northeast Regional Methadone Treatment Coalition, Inc.; the New York State Committee of Methadone Program Administrators; the New York Regional Chapter of the Therapeutic Communities of America; the State of Connecticut Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission; and Beny J. Primm, M.D., executive director of the Addiction Research and Treatment Corporation, Brooklyn, NY, and a former member of President Reagan's AIDS Commission.

My bill would prohibit methadone maintenance and long term—up to 180 days—detoxification treatment with methadone unless a treatment program provides a comprehensive range of rehabilitative services, including counseling, to each client. The bill's requirements would not apply to short-term detoxification—30 days or less. This exception is consistent with existing law which does not require comprehensive services for short-term detoxification.

Federal drug abuse treatment policy should not offer drug addicts a choice between free needles to continue injecting drugs or addiction to methadone without supportive services that can give addicts hope of becoming drug free. My bill would emphatically reject these options. I urge Members to join me as a cosponsors.

The text of the bill and my letter commenting on the minimum maintenance proposal follow.

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Drug Abuse Treatment Policy Act of 1989".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROHIBITION AGAINST FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT IN NEEDLE-EXCHANGE OR BLEACH PROGRAMS WITH RESPECT TO INTRAVENOUS DRUG ABUSE.

(a) USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—None of the amounts made available in any Federal appropriations Act for any fiscal year may be expended to assist in carrying out any program of distributing sterile needles for the hypodermic injection of any illegal drug or distributing bleach for the purpose of cleansing needles for such hypodermic injection.

(b) FEDERAL ACTIVITIES.—Officers and employees of the Federal Government may not, in carrying out their duties as such officers or employees, provide advice with respect to carrying out any program described in subsection (a) or otherwise assist in carrying out any such program.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROHIBITION AGAINST CERTAIN TREATMENT OF NARCOTICS ADDICTION WITHOUT REHABILITATIVE SERVICES.

(a) REHABILITATIVE SERVICES IN LONG-TERM DETOXIFICATION AND OTHER MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to any program providing for the medical treatment of the narcotic addiction of various classes of narcotic addicts, which program is authorized under any of the provisions of law specified in paragraph (3), the program may not, subject to paragraph (2), provide any narcotic drug to an individual for purposes of treating the individual for dependence on heroin (or any similar drug) unless the program, throughout each stage of the program, provides a comprehensive range of rehabilitative services to the individual, including counseling services.

(2) INAPPLICABILITY TO SHORT-TERM DETOXIFICATION PROGRAMS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any program described in such paragraph in which, as a method of bringing an individual to a narcotic drug-free state, a narcotic drug is provided to the individual in decreasing doses over a period not in excess of 30 days in order to alleviate adverse physiological or psychological effects incident to withdrawal from the continuous or sustained use of a narcotic drug.

(3) RELEVANT ACTS.—The provisions of law referred to in paragraph (1) are the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the Controlled Substances Act, the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970, the Public Health Service Act, and any other provision of Federal law relating to the regulation of the availability or use of drugs.

(b) CLARIFICATION WITH RESPECT TO PROPOSED RULE FOR USE OF METHADONE IN INTERIM MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS.—With respect to the provision of methadone to any individual under a program of medical treatment described in subsection (a)(1), the Secretary of Health and Human Services or the Attorney General may not authorize the program to be carried out under the terms and conditions proposed on March 2, 1989, through publication in the Federal Register (54 Fed. Reg. 8973 et seq.).

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL,
Washington, DC, March 23, 1989.

Re: Docket No. 88N-0444.

DOCKETS MANAGEMENT BRANCH [HFA-305],
Food and Drug Administration, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD.

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my strong objections—indeed, my outrage—at the proposed rule to allow minimum service, or interim, methadone maintenance to patients on drug treatment waiting lists. This proposed rule was published in the March 2, 1989, Federal Register.

First, on a procedural note, the justification for requiring comments on this proposal within 30 days, instead of the customary 60 days, is insulting to this Member of Congress. For years, I have been urging the executive branch to propose a comprehensive response to the AIDS/IV drug epidemic that is ravaging inner city minority communities like the district I represent. For years, the Reagan Administration's silence on this issue was deafening. Now, after years of neglect, the Department of Health and Human Services is proposing to unleash "no-frills" methadone addiction on these same communities, citing "the imminent threat to the public health posed by the HIV epidemic" as justification for curtailing comment and debate on this controversial proposal. Minimum maintenance is unlikely to succeed in its goals, but it could have devastating consequences for drug addicts and the communities in which they live. I strongly urge the Department to take minimum maintenance off the fast track and avoid a tragic mistake.

Substantively, the concept of minimum maintenance is seriously, if not fatally, flawed. The basis for this proposal is the assumption that minimum maintenance will allow more addicts into treatment more quickly, thereby decreasing intravenous drug use, needle sharing and HIV transmission. But, apparently, no one has stopped to ask what kind of treatment.

There is little reason to believe that doling out methadone to addicts, without providing a full range of counseling and rehabilitative services, will be effective in curtailing drug use and needle sharing. In fact, a recently published study cited by NIDA and FDA as supporting the minimum maintenance approach actually draws much different conclusions. This intensive, three-year project studied six large, stable methadone maintenance programs in the northeastern United States, where the majority of IV heroin users are concentrated. Even though great care was taken to exclude "transitory or grossly inadequate programs," the study found marked variations in treatment effectiveness with respect to

reduction of IV drug use and needle sharing. Program differences, not patient characteristics, were of "paramount importance" in reducing IV drug usage, the researchers found. They concluded that the most effective treatment programs were those that provided consistent long-term counseling and other support services. Long-term rehabilitation, not just methadone, was the critical factor for successful methadone maintenance treatment, the studied showed.

The minimum maintenance treatment proposal flies in the face of these findings. It is a prescription for failure. It will allow methadone to be distributed to addicts without any requirements for counseling or rehabilitative services. It will also permit this "no frills" methadone distribution without random testing to see if clients are staying off drugs. This is foolhardy. If an addict's methadone dose is too low, he will continue to cop heroin to relieve withdrawal symptoms. Moreover, most addicts today are polydrug abusers. In addition to heroin, they often use other drugs which are not blocked by methadone, such as cocaine or methamphetamine, and they use needles to shoot these drug intravenously. Under minimum maintenance, methadone will be passed out merely in the hope that addicts will stay off drugs and needles without ever checking to see if they are.

In explaining the need for this proposal, NIDA and FDA say that minimum maintenance is not intended to become an alternative to comprehensive treatment. Several aspects of this so-called "interim" maintenance, however, appear destined to ensure that this "treatment" becomes the norm and not just an intermediate step to comprehensive treatment. Stand-alone minimum maintenance programs would not be permitted, but there is nothing in the proposal to prevent programs from reducing or holding down the number of full-service slots just to get more bodies into "interim" maintenance. In fact, minimum maintenance will encourage such choices. Since funding for drug abuse treatment is already grossly inadequate, programs will see minimum maintenance as a way to "maximize" their resources. Minimum maintenance will be a disaster to the expansion of comprehensive treatment services needed to rehabilitate drug addicts and give them a chance to lead decent lives.

This proposal also sets no timetable for the transfer of patients to comprehensive treatment, and it does not require addicts to move out on interim maintenance into comprehensive treatment even when a slot becomes available. Rather, it would allow addicts to linger indefinitely in the limbo of interim maintenance, with only a perfunctory review of the patient's status at 6-month intervals.

Minimum maintenance is the wrong policy at the wrong time. There has been no demonstration that this approach is effective. Only one experiment in minimum maintenance has been conducted—in my district—and this program has not been adequately evaluated. As noted above, however, there is substantial evidence to indicate that "no frills" methadone will fail miserably.

Why are NIDA and FDA proposing a major, nationwide change in methadone regulations to meet a problem that is heavily concentrated in New York City, northern New Jersey, southern Florida and a few other localities? There is no indication that NIDA and FDA have explored any other alternatives that would better target the problem. For example, even in those cities that have treatment programs with long waiting lists, there may be other programs that are under utilized. NIDA and FDA could provide technical assistance to establish central intake procedures in these areas. By keeping track of available slots, where they are located and the treatment modality offered, a central intake system could help assure the most efficient use of existing resources. For addicts, getting treatment and the type of treatment received would not depend on whose door they happened to walk through. They could find out where help is available the quickest and also be made aware of options other than methadone.

Minimum maintenance is being proposed before any effort is made to see what can be done to alleviate treatment shortages with new funds recently earmarked by Congress for this purpose. The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 authorized $100 million for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make discretionary grants to treatment programs to reduce waiting lists. For fiscal year 1989, Congress appropriated $75 million for this new program, and the President's 1990 budget requests the remainder. These funds should be allocated to expand comprehensive treatment services for intravenous drug abusers in those areas of the country where the need for additional treatment capacity is the greatest and the AIDS/IV drug problem is most severe. The 1989 omnibus drug Act also increased funding available for IV drug treatment under the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services Block Grant. If the additional resources for these programs are not enough to provide quality drug abuse services to IV drug users, the Administration should come to Congress with a realistic proposal of what is needed. It makes no sense to waste these scarce treatment dollars on minimum maintenance.

Finally, in the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, Congress established a new Director of National Drug Control Policy and directed him to develop a comprehensive national strategy to fight drug trafficking and abuse. Congress intended that the "drug czar" would work in concern with HHS and other affected agencies in developing a national drug treatment strategy that would include a plan to deal with the AIDS/IV drug abuse problem.

Unfortunately, before the new administration and new drug czar have even had a chance to put together a coherent treatment policy, NIDA and FDA are pursuing a piecemeal approach to the AIDS/IV drug problem that holds little promise of success. The minimum maintenance proposal should be withdrawn.

"No frills" methadone maintenance is not drug treatment, and it will not reduce the transmission of AIDS. It is wishful thinking that will waste scarce public resources without producing any measurable public health benefit. It substitutes methadone addiction for heroin addiction without giving addicts any hope of becoming productive, drug-free members of society.

What we need are comprehensive drug treatment programs that address not only heroin addiction but an addict's dependence on other drugs as well and provide a full range of counseling and rehabilitative services. There are no shortcuts around the AIDS/IV drug problem, and the sooner we accept that, the sooner we can begin doing what needs to be done.

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Chairman.

IT'S TIME TO CHANGE THE 1872 MINING LAW

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge each and every Member to read the March 1989, GAO report entitled "Federal Land Management: The Mining Law of 1872 Needs Revision." To some of you, this may sound a little dull or arcane. I can assure you, it is not.

This is a story of multimillion—perhaps billion—dollar Federal giveaways.

This is a story of the Federal Government transferring title to lands and mineral rights under an antiquated mining law at 1872 prices.

Let me give you some real world examples of what is happening:

First, a 310-acre site near Las Vegas was patented under the mining law in 1983 for $775. Under the mining law, this land can now be sold or leased by the patent holder. This land now has an estimated market value of $1.2 million.

Second, a 160-acre site near Keystone, CO, was patented for $400 in 1983; 44 acres of this site, near the ski area, were recently put on the market for $484,000. The estimated value of the entire 160 acres is now $1.8 million.

Third, two sites, comprising 449 acres, again near Las Vegas, were patented for $1.124 million in 1981. The estimated value now is over $2 million.

Fourth, in western Colorado, patent holders sold 17,000 acres of oil shale land to major oil companies for $37 million. These lands had been acquired for $42,500 from the Government only weeks before the sale.

It is unconscionable that this outrageous profiteering can and is taking place at the expense of the Federal Treasury and our public resources. We have a responsibility to take steps to stop this practice.

The chart that appears below details the findings of the sites investigated by the GAO. Keep in mind that these patents were acquired for either $2.50 or $5 an acre. With a little arithmetic, you can quickly see the huge disparity between the cost to the patent holder and the potential fair market value. Of the 20 sites reviewed by the GAO, the Government received less than $4,500. Present value is estimated between $13.8 million and $47.9 million.

Also, keep in mind that what you are seeing is the tip of the iceberg. Some 611 patent applications were approved in the past decade. GAO investigated 20. What other horror stories would an investigation of all of the patents reveal?

The GAO came to a number of conclusions, several of which I wish to share with you:

First, the Federal Government stands to lose between $14.4 million and $47.1 million if 12 pending applications are patented, and tens of millions more if the patent provision of the mining law of 1872 is not amended.

Second, patenting does not ensure that a mineral claim will be developed * * * escalating land prices in certain areas have made the act's patent provision an attractive means to acquiring title to land for purposes other than mining.

Third, * * * the patent provision of the mining law of 1872 clearly runs counter to other national natural resources policies and legislation relating to Federal stewardship and multiple-use management of public lands. Patenting is not essential for mineral exploration and development.

It is clear to me that changes must be made in the 1872 mining law so that it will reflect present day realities and values. I am pleased that my colleague from West Virginia, Mr. RAHALL, plans to take a hard look at the mining law this year with a view to making much needed changes. I will be pleased to work with him on this most important issue. I'm sure you will too when you read the GAO report.

APPENDIX II.—PATENT AND PATENT APPLICATION SITES GAO VISITED

Name	Nearest town/city	Date patented	Acres	Type of claim	Mineral	Status	Estimated value	
							Low	High
Phelps Dodge Corp	Prescott, AZ	May 1982	7.0	Lode	Copper	Inactive	$3,150	$3,150
Johnson & Johnson	Mesa, AZ	Fiscal year 1983	40.0	Placer	Sand and gravel	Active	400,000	400,000
Melluzzo & Nichols	Phoenix, AZ	October 1987	18.8	do	Granite	do	376,000	3,832,493
Phoenix Sand & Rock	do	September 1985	15.0	do	Sand and gravel	do	272,445	272,445
Melluzzo	do	November 1970	61.3	do	Building stone	Inactive	6,130,000	6,130,000
M. Batesel	Carson City, NV	July 1974	140.0	do	Cinder	do	56,000	70,000
H. Bunkowski	do	April 1978	80.0	do	Gypsite	do	125,000	135,000
Do.	do	do	20.0	do	do	do	400,000	500,000
Do.	do	do	20.0	do	do	do	40,000	40,000
Gornowich Sand & Gravel	Boulder City, NV	October 1981	120.0	do	Sand	do	38,400	38,400
Yeager	Searchlight, NV	January 1983	25.7	Lode and mill	Gold	do	5,132	7,698
Paul Brawer	Las Vegas, NV	September 1983	310.0	Placer	Gypsum	do	1,240,000	1,240,000
Stocks Mill & Supply Co	do	December 1981	200.0	do	Sand and gravel	Active	1,000,000	1,000,000
Do.	do	do	249.4	do	do	do	1,196,971	1,196,971
Pitkin Iron Corp	Aspen, CO	March 1983	15.0	Mill	None	Inactive	225,000	525,000
Webster	Leadville, CO	March 1986	140.0	Placer	Sand and garvel	Active	420,000	1,400,000
Hinton-Keystone Co	Keystone, CO	December 1983	160.0	do	Gold	Inacative	1,600,000	30,400,000
Paul Graham	Tuttletown, CA	August 1985	34.0	Lode	do	do	49,300	510,000
Paul & Judith Ramm	Jackson, CA	Fiscal year 1983	9.0	do	do	Active	90,000	90,000
J&D Marquis	West Point, CA	November 1982	12.3	do	do	Inactive	125,005	125,005
Total			1,677.0				13,792,403	47,916,162

A TRIBUTE TO FRANK AND ANN LATELL

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I stand today to congratulate Frank and Ann Latell, two wonderful people in my 17th District of Ohio, who will be celebrating their 50th wedding anniversary on April 29, 1989.

Frank and Ann were married in St. Rose Church on April 29, 1939. Frank is a very skillful electrical inspector for the city of Girard and is also a member of the Knights of Columbus. He also spent 4 years in the Navy where he served on the *Lexington* aircraft carrier. Ann previously worked as a beautician. She is very active in the community. She served 2 years with Help Hotline, was a member of the Girard Parent Drug Awareness League, is active in Mount Carmel Society and her church, and is a member of the Girard Federated Democratic Women.

Ann and Frank have three wonderful children: Genevieve Hartman, who lives in Cozumel, Mexico; Mary Teresa Vivona of Flagstaff, AZ; and a son, Frank, who currently resides in North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, these children are the product of the special love Ann and Frank have for one another. I personally know Frank and Ann and can attest to the beautiful relationship that they share. In a society where divorce is so common, it is refreshing to know that the institution of marriage can and does last. April 29, 1989, marks a very special occasion as well as a great accomplishment for both Ann and Frank. And, I stand here today not only to congratulate them, but to wish them happiness, joy and many more years together.

ETHNIC HARMONY, NOT HATRED, IS NEEDED IN YUGOSLAVIA

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues a thoughtful and insightful editorial from the New York Times concerning the rise of ethnic tensions in Yugoslavia. Now is the time to work for peace and cooperation in that multiethnic country. This is not the time to inflame the ancient ethnic passions which will only rekindle violence and separatist causes in Yugoslavia.

I am deeply concerned about the goals and ambitions of Slobodan Milosevic, the current head of the Communist Party in Serbia. He appears to be determined to reshape Yugoslavia and, in the process, promote himself and Serbia in positions of domination and control in a politically fragile nation.

The autonomous Provinces of Kosovo and Vosvodina were Milosevic's first targets and he succeeded in taking away some of the legal autonomy that they had maintained over the years. Deaths, violence, and deep resentment among the ethnic Albanians in the Kosovo region are the results of his efforts against that province.

Mr. Milosevic's efforts are disturbing the fine balance established in the 1974 constitution for that country. At that time, eight provinces and two autonomous regions were created. The current efforts to upset that finely tuned balance can quickly destabilize that country and cruelly divide Yugoslavia into a collection of small and weak ethnic states. The people of Yugoslavia do not want this to happen and will not benefit from the dissolution of their country.

I commend the following article to my colleagues in the Congress who share my concern about the future of Yugoslavia.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 10, 1989]

BULLYING IN THE BALKANS

Only a cynical demagogue would recklessly inflame ancient ethnic hatreds for the sake of his own political ambitions. Solbodan Milosevic, Serbia's Communist Party chief and thus the leader of Yugoslavia's largest component republic, has done just that.

Most recently he magnified his dangerous mischief. Backed by troops and armed police, he suppressed local resistance to his drive against the legal autonomy of Kosovo, an ethnic Albanian enclave within Serbia. At least 24 people, including two policemen were killed.

Yugoslavia's survival as a federal republic depends on the peaceful coexistence of historically hostile ethnic groups. The quarrelsome collection of mini-states that preceded modern Yugoslavia made "Balkanization" synonymous with chronic division and conflict. Their feuds also became a flashpoint for wider European war.

Mr. Milosevic, 47 years old, started out as an industrial and financial executive and only became Serbia's Communist Party boss in 1987. Since then he has pressed a relentless political campaign, complete with mass rallies, fiery rhetoric and bureaucratic purges, all aimed at making Serbia, and its party leader, supreme in a reshaped Yugoslavia.

Already he has forced changes in the leadership of Kosovo and Vojvodina, another autonomous province within Serbia, and in the neighboring republic of Montenegro. But thus far Mr. Milosevic's efforts to impose his will at the national level have been rebuffed.

His willingness to play to ethnic and sectarian feelings has caused considerable uneasiness in Yugoslavia's Roman Catholic republics, Croatia and Slovenia. The latter is also the country's most economically advanced and politically enlightened region.

Critics fear that Mr. Milosevic and his allies could build a bloc combining Serbia, Kosovo, Vojvodina and the two other Orthodox Christian republics, Montenegro and Macedonia, and then, with backing from the armed forces, become Yugoslavia's unchallenged master.

Past reports of Yugoslavia's imminent breakdown have proved premature. The forces now arrayed against Mr. Milosevic's pretensions are themselves considerable. Yet his course is worrisome, for Yugoslavia and for its neighbors—none of whom are eager to see the Balkans turned into The Balkans once again.

SUPPORT MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

HON. KWEISI MFUME

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, during the 100th Congress, I introduced legislation to establish the Minority Business Development Administration within the Department of Commerce and to clarify the relationship between such Administration and the Small Business Administration [SBA]. Thanks to the assistance of members of the Small Business Committee and my colleagues in the House of Representatives, the legislation made it through the committee process and was passed on the floor of the House of Representatives. However, the Senate companion legislation was not considered further than the appropriate Senate committee, and I have therefore reintroduced the legislation as H.R. 1769 in the 101st Congress.

Administration proposals to transfer the Minority Business Development Agency [MBDA], which now exist in the Department of Commerce pursuant to a 1969 Executive order, to the SBA are what led to my initial effort to codify the Agency. Transfer proposals had been a part of administration budget proposals since 1987, and notwithstanding congressional action to the contrary, the outgoing President's fiscal year 1990 budget called for more of the same.

The new administration, however, has indicated an interest in reinvigorating the MBDA within the Department of Commerce. The first step in this task, Mr. Speaker, is the codification of this Agency. Once the MBDA is placed on solid ground and recognized as serving a separate and distinct business community, the commitment to aiding minority business will be on its way to becoming a fundamental, integrated part of the American economic system.

The MBDA was established to coordinate and implement specially designed programs for minority business enterprises. It serves as a means to contribute to the establishment, preservation, and strengthening of these enterprises by arranging loan packages, contract agreements, and other resources for minority businesses in need of assistance. The Agency seeks to protect the fundamental rights of minority businesses to fully participate in this Nation's economic structure. Yet, the potential of this Agency has yet to be fully realized because of decreases in funding and shortsightedness in terms of the Agency's proper place.

Mr. Speaker, I am inspired that the current administration may be ready to realize the necessity and purpose of an agency such as the MBDA. I hope my colleagues today will, as well, join me in riding the MBDA of its vulnerable status by cosponsoring the Minority Business Development Act of 1989. Now is the time to bring control of this Agency within greater reach of the Congress and provide ourselves with the chance to play a direct role in the furthering and strengthening of the Agency's goals and objectives. I strongly urge my colleagues to lend their support to this effort. This minority business community deserves nothing less.

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO HON. KENNETH J. CLEVELAND, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF BELLFLOWER, CA

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to rise and pay tribute to Kenneth Cleveland, a constituent and friend of mine, who has just ended his tenure as mayor of the city of Bellflower.

Although he wrapped up his term as mayor on April 10, a position he has occupied since 1988, Ken has been serving on the Bellflower city council since 1986, and will continue to do so until his term expires in 1990. This is not, however, Ken's first round of service to the people of Bellflower.

Ken first took a seat on the city council in 1970. He occupied that position until 1978. During that period, he served twice as mayor, the first time from 1972 to 1973, and the second time from 1977 until 1978. And in addition to his service in city government, the people of Bellflower have been served by Ken Cleveland in other ways as well.

As a private businessman, Ken Cleveland is familiar to anyone who has had dealings with Hammond Lumber and Cleveland Development, Inc. Some know him through his membership and presidency at the Bellflower Chamber of Commerce. Others may know his wife, Judy, or their four children. And after 44 years as a resident of Bellflower, a good many people know Ken Cleveland as neighbor.

Ken has also served the people of the area in other ways as well. He has been a delegate to California Contract Cities Association, the Central Water Basin Water Association, the County Sanitation District No. 2, the California League of Cities, and the Private Industry Council, southeast Los Angeles County service delivery area.

If everything I have just mentioned is not enough, Ken Cleveland has had the honor to serve as president of the Bellflower Kiwanis Club, and as past member in the Bellflower Little League and Bellflower Pony League. I think that all of my colleagues who reflect upon what I have said with recognize a record of distinction when they look at the accomplishments of this man.

My wife Lee joins me in extending our most sincere thanks and congratulations to Mayor Ken Cleveland, for his years of dedication and commitment to the citizens of Bellflower. We also wish Ken, his wife Judy, and their children, all the best in the years to come.

ASSISTANCE TO CIVILIAN AND MILITARY DISABLED DEPENDENTS DISQUALIFIED FROM BENEFITS DUE TO BRIEF MARRIAGES

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide help to the disabled dependents of civilian and military employees of the Federal Government in the case where the disabled dependent is temporarily married and thus loses entitlement to the needed benefits.

This is a generic bill. The need for it was brought to my attention by a constituent whose son suffered a severe mental trauma and was determined by Navy doctors to be disabled before reaching the age of 18. The son then married for a brief time when he was about 21; the marriage ended shortly thereafter. But under the current law, the disabled son's benefits have ended forever. As the mother wrote me:

I've spent sleepless nights for several years worrying over what will become of my disabled son after I pass on (I am 73). My husband had been with the Navy over 25 years. I toss and turn every night wondering how my son can survive on his "below poverty level" disability check.

I hope that this legislation can be considered favorably.

FLAG DESERVES RESPECT OF ALL AMERICANS

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, much attention has been focused on two incidents involving the desecration of our most precious national symbol. At the Art Institute of Chicago, a student drew outrage from veterans, politicians, and others by displaying an American flag stretched on the floor. On March 21, the Supreme Court heard arguments in Texas against Johnson, a case in which the defendants challenged the constitutionality of a Texas law that prohibits the desecration, mutilation, and destruction of our flag.

It is my hope that these unfortunate events will remind us of the respect we owe to our flag and the men and women who have de-

fended it. In an address on Flag Day in 1915, President Woodrow Wilson said:

The flag is the embodiment, not of sentiment, but of history. It represents the experiences made by men and women, the experiences of those who do and live under that flag.

Indeed, the unfurling of the Stars and Stripes has marked significant events in American history. From Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima on March 16, 1945, to the *Apollo 11* landing on the Moon on July 20, 1969, the flag has been a symbol of achievement as well as hope for the future.

The sight of the flag rippling in the wind has also served as encouragement for other important events in our history. The vision of this symbol fluttering in the early morning breeze at Fort McHenry inspired a young Washington attorney named Francis Scott Key to pen the poem that became our national anthem.

For more than 200 years, millions of Americans have risked their lives so that we might remain free under this flag. Veterans know best the price of peace and freedom that we enjoy today. They have carried the torch of democracy for our country, putting their lives on the line for the preservation and protection of our Nation, under the flag.

Our fallen American heroes, those who have made the ultimate sacrifice, also reflect the fact that democracy is not a gift, but a constant challenge.

Of our flag, Massachusetts Senator Charles Sumner wrote in 1867:

He must be cold indeed, who can look upon its folds rippling in the breeze without pride of country. If in a foreign land, the flag is companionship, and country itself, with all its endearments.

The flag is indeed companionship to our servicemen stationed around the world. It represents the land, government, people and ideals of our great Nation. It is a constant remainder of the freedoms for which our veterans and fallen American heroes have fought during our wars.

Our flag is also the embodiment of our American heritage. In 1777, the Continental Congress passed a resolution stating that the new American flag should have 13 stars and stripes representing the Original Colonies. After adding two stars and stripes in 1794, Congress decided that a 15-stripe flag would be used after May 1, 1795.

After more States were added to the Union, Navy Capt. Samuel Chester Reid suggested maintaining a flag of 13 stripes and adding a star for each State. Congress accepted this proposal in 1818, and the current design was established when the 50th star was added in 1960.

Each June 14, we Americans formally take the time to honor the foundation, tradition, and ideals of this country by paying tribute to our flag. Although we set aside this day to pay homage to this national symbol, we cannot limit our tribute to only one day of the year.

In schools across our Nation, many students recite the Pledge of Allegiance before classes each morning. The House of Representatives commences business each day by pledging allegiance to our flag.

Our children must be taught to respect the flag not only in our schools, but by our example. We must instruct them to allow proper methods by which to display and salute our flag. Just as important, we must stress the appropriate uses of our national colors. Veterans groups, Scouting organizations, and other groups are to be commended for their efforts in this fundamental endeavor.

Both Houses of Congress have responded to these incidents with legislation denouncing flag desecration. The Senate unanimously passed a measure that would make it a crime to display the American flag on the floor or ground. I have cosponsored legislation expressing the sense of Congress that flag desecration is not speech protected by the first amendment to the Constitution.

The Texas law challenged by Mr. Johnson is similar to other State and Federal laws punishing those who desecrate this most precious national symbol. It is my sincere belief that laws expressing penalties for willful and knowing desecration of the flag should be strictly enforced.

We must encourage our children and every future generation to value the freedoms we enjoy and the pride of being an American. We must instill in them a strong sense of the heritage embodied in this flag. Finally, we must ensure that they continue to recognize and honor the great sacrifices made by previous generations of Americans, Americans who gave their lives so we could live free.

TRIBUTE TO REV. RICHARD J. ONDREYKA

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I stand today to pay tribute to Rev. Richard J. Ondreyka, the Slovak Community of Greater Cleveland's choice for Slovak Man of the Year 1989.

Reverend Ondreyka first attended St. Gregory Seminary in Cincinnati and St. Mary Seminary in Cleveland. He then attended Ashland College in Ashland and St. John College in Cleveland. On December 18, 1954, he was ordained to the priesthood by Archibishop Edward F. Hoban. Since then he has been most admirably serving the religious needs of the people in several communities throughout Ohio. Currently, he is pastor of SS. Cyril and Methodius Church in Lakewood, Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, it is a true honor to pay tribute to Reverend Ondreyka. He is a fine man and a truly magnificent religious leader. Please join me today in extending to Rev. Richard J. Ondreyka our congratulations for receiving the 1989 Slovak Man of the Year Award and our deepest appreciation for the lifetime he has dedicated to serving the people of our communities.

GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION: MEDICARE FUNDS MUST BE TIED TO GERIATRIC TRAINING

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which I believe will greatly enhance this Nation's ability to provide for the special medical care needs of our large and ever growing older population. It will establish the proper prominent position of geriatrics, the field of medicine dealing with the problems and diseases of older people, in graduate medical education supported by the Medicare Program.

In 1965, by amending the Social Security Act, we established Medicare, the health insurance program for the aged. This vitally important program, which celebrates its 20th anniversary this summer, has been instrumental in improving the quality of health care offered our Nation's senior citizens. Medicare has also contributed significantly to a most important function in our society—the training of those who provide medical care to all Americans. Medicare support of graduate medical education has helped our Nation to strengthen what is and has been the best medical education system in the world. It has offered opportunities to thousands of young doctors to learn specialized skills so that they might go on to offer Americans the best medical care available.

There is, however, a sad irony to the success enjoyed by Medicare's support for graduate medical education. Medicare is the health insurance program for the elderly. Yet, not $1 of what this year will be some $3.6 billion in Medicare money paid in support of medical education is required to go toward training in geriatrics. In fact, most institutions receiving reimbursement from Medicare for GME offer little or nothing in the way of graduate training in the field of geriatric medicine. The number of graduate fellowships in geriatrics pales in comparison to those in other medical specialties. For example, in 1983 while there were some 800 doctors beginning graduate fellowships in cardiology, there were a mere 50 beginning the like in geriatrics.

A recent report by the Department of Health and Human Services projected a need of up to 10,000 physician faculty members to meet the educational responsibilities of medical schools in aging. The same report indicates current staffing levels are woefully short of these needs. Currently only 250 to 300 full-time physicians are involved in teaching some aspect of geriatric medicine, one-fortieth of the projected need. It is truly a sad commentary that, despite the population served by Medicare and the critical shortage of geriatricians, there is today so little graduate training in geriatrics supported by Medicare.

To begin to address this clear shortcoming, the legislation I am introducing today will make Medicare reimbursement for reasonable direct costs associated with graduate medical education conditional upon a hospital or

skilled nursing facility having in place within 3 years a residency training program in the field of geriatric medicine as well as a certain number of fellowships in geriatrics. It mandates that our graduate medical education system recognize and respond to the large and growing need for physicians specially trained in the needs of our skyrocketing elderly population. Recognizing the overwhelming need for increased attention to the special needs of the thousands of mentally, retarded, developmentally disabled, and mentally retarded elderly Americans, this legislation also requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to encourage an emphasis in these areas within the residency programs and fellowships to be established.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this timely and important legislation which will place the study of aging in its proper prominent place in this Nation's health insurance program for the aged at no additional cost to the American taxpayer.

CENTENNIAL OF MAXWELL ANDERSON

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Maxwell Anderson, the most American of our playwrights. It is indeed appropriate that as we celebrate the 200th anniversary of Congress, we honor a dramatist born at the halfway point in our history. For Maxwell Anderson's works personified the fears, the hopes, and the aspirations of the America people.

We in New York's mid-Hudson Valley take special pride in Maxwell Anderson, for he lived and worked among us in Rockland County and we are proud to have had him as a neighbor. He borrowed $500 from a Nyack, NY, bank in 1922 to purchase 3 acres and a waterfall in New City. By 1953, "Current Biography" reported, "he owns 60 acres and the same waterfall."

In Rockland County, Maxwell Anderson wrote his plays, in a 10 by 12 foot shack in back of his home. His first drafts, always written in longhand in a ledger book, required very little rewriting. According to "Twentieth Century Authors," "he has never written a play that has failed to entertain and to stimulate some portion of the theatergoing public."

Maxwell Anderson's first play, "White Desert," did not do very well with either the critics or the public. His second play, "What Price Glory?," cowritten with Laurence Stallings, was an instant sensation. It is remembered today, 65 years after its first presentation, as one of the most searing and realistic depictions of war ever produced on the American stage.

For over three decades after that initial success, Maxwell Anderson's plays again and again touched the nerve of theatergoers. A partial list recalls the glory which was the stage from the 1920's through the 1950's: "Elizabeth the Queen," "Mary of Scotland," "Knickerbocker Holiday," "Candle in the Wind," "The Eve of St. Mark," "Joan of Lorraine," and "The Bad Seed."

"Both Your Houses," produced in 1933, was awarded the Pulitzer Prize, and was quite critical of our Congress. The late Carl Carmer, a writer who also holds a special place in the hearts of the mid-Hudson Valley, wrote that "Both Your Houses," "uses expertly the devices of the theatre to say something forcibly."

The following year, Anderson's play "Valley Forge" prompted Time magazine to devote a cover story to the playwright. Time noted that "Mr. Anderson's feelings about historical plays is that the form is only useful when it is related to a problem of the present."

For "Winterset," Maxwell Anderson won the 1936 Drama Critics' Circle Award. He repeated that feat the following year, winning again for "High Tor," a play that is held in especially high esteem by Rockland residents, for it is set in our County. Current Biography wrote in 1942 that "High Tor," although a comedy, "has a warning message: The hero yields in his fight against the spiritless industrialism around him. In the end he sells the symbol of his struggle, High Tor—a mountain (in Haverstraw, New York) which he inherited—to the trap rock company * * *"

In his acceptance speech for "High Tor's" Critics' Circle Award, Mr. Anderson stated that, in the theater, "the better you think you are the harder the floor will seem to you when you hit it, as you surely will."

Another Anderson play, "Key Largo," has been immortalized for future generations by the motion picture version featuring Humphrey Bogart, Lauren Bacall, and Edward G. Robinson.

Maxwell Anderson was honored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews in 1950. On that occasion, he stated: "So long as weapons of war were comparatively inefficient men could afford to hate each other. But when we begin to use hydrogen bombs it's possible that the survivors will be few or none. If men have got to the point where they can achieve anything they can imagine, maybe they will begin to imagine the most difficult thing of all, a way to get along without wars."

Maxwell Anderson passed away on February 28, 1959, but his works live on. In a tribute this past Sunday, Washington Post theater critic Richard L. Coe wrote: "So though Maxwell Anderson's life ended 30 years ago, his plays live on with strangely contemporary themes." Mr. Coe calls Maxwell Anderson "a man with a mind and a vision in many ways ahead of his time."

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to host a ceremony in the Library of Congress tomorrow evening honoring Maxwell Anderson. Mr. Anderson's widow will be there, as will his three sons, and as will the first lady of the American theater, Miss Helen Hayes. They will present Dr. James H. Billington, Librarian of Congress, with an original manuscript of "Both Your Houses," the prize-winning play that lampooned Congress. It is a tribute to our American way of life that Congress can now honor a man who pointed to our foibles.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow's ceremony would not be possible were it not for the hard work of the Maxwell Anderson Centennial Celebration. Spearheaded by Miss Helen Hayes and by Dr. Martin F. Schwartz, the hard-driving chair of business at Rockland County Community College, the celebration has treated our region to a full year of events underscoring the remarkable career of Maxwell Anderson, Rockland County Community College, under the skilled leadership of Dr. F. Thomas Clark, has been the focal point of the Maxwell Anderson Centennial festivities.

Mr. Speaker, I invite all of our colleagues to join with us in celebrating the career of this outstanding dramatist, a man ahead of his own time.

TRIBUTE TO PRIME MINISTER MICHAEL NORMAN MANLEY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to pay honor and tribute to the new Prime Minister of Jamaica, Michael Norman Manley. Prime Minister Manley first achieved national recognition in the 1950's for his very skillful negotiation of labor disputes. In 1962 he was appointed to the Senate, the upper house in Jamaica's bicameral legislature and 7 years later was elected to the House of Representatives. It was here that he spoke out in favor of Caribbean regionalism. He felt that "national survival, like business survival, is a matter of margins. Regionalism can provide the framework in which international markets are increased, external bargaining power enhanced, and international recognition maximized."

Michael Manley first became Prime Minister in 1972 and now has returned, taking charge of one of the most richly endowed countries in the Caribbean with an economy that is steadily on the rise. He is a compassionate man who genuinely cares about the welfare of the people of Jamaica, especially that of the poor. He has a tremendous amount of good will and intelligence that I know will enable him to yield much success in this term as Prime Minister.

It is an honor and a pleasure to speak of a great leader such as Prime Minister Michael Manley and at this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you and my colleagues an article from the Carib News which speaks of the acknowledged leader of Jamaica. I commend this article to you and ask that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Carib News, N.Y. Week Ending Mar. 7, 1989]

MICHAEL MANLEY—ACKNOWLDGED LEADER OF DEVELOPING WORLD

(By Prof. Rex Nettleford)

Michael Manley, Prime Minister-designate of Jamaica, is described in various ways by the international press. This is done in the understandable effort to pigeon-hole him in a cubicle that can have him fit neatly into the North Atlantic's perception of the planet as a place divided between something called capitalism and that other thing called communism—between what used to be Mr. Reagan's (and now Mr. Bush's) Oval Office and Mr. Gorbachev's Kremlin with its reputed Caribbean outhouse in Havana.

Mr. Manley has always defined such simplistic categorization and has given to the

volcabulary of politics the notion of "the third path." But he has also been long tuned into a tradition of Jamaican and West Indian Politics which sets greater store by the indigenous discoveries of self and society rather than by hallowed imports which admittedly find fertile soil in these parts but which can just as easily get buried under the pragmatism collective wisdom of the mass of our population.

Mr. Manley's return may well be seen as a celebration of such common sense. How effectively he performs from here on is, however, the core of the challenge he faces. Despite his legendary popularity among the masses and the ancestral pedigree he enjoys as a member of Jamaica's leading political/cultural family, he is human enough to be insecure even with power. For he knows that he is the servant of the people, for all their submission to his charismatic powers, are never slow to remind him that they are also his employer.

He has always haunted us with his gift of contradictions. We will remember that although he lost an election in 1980 by an overwhelming defeat (i.e. if we count seats rather than popular votes), he has remained the most popular leader among his countrymen. How often have we heard people fulminating against him behind his back, even threatening to do him in for his acts of commission during the 70s, only to melt in admiration, if not uncontrollable adoration, the moment he appears? They hate themselves for being so vulnerable and love him for being such a "lovable rascal." Added to this is his tremendous gift of persuasion and advocacy honed not in a School of Law, but around the bargaining tables where for nearly two decades he performed as a shaper of the modern industrial relations system of Jamaica.

He was to develop, for many in the wider society and throughout the Commonwealth Caribbean, into a model representative of some of the finest things that have emerged in the expression of Caribbean life and development over the past 50 years at least. He represents, as well, much that has long been the hope of humanity wherever human beings have struggled against severance from decency and suffering in oppression.

For Michael Manley is an acknowledged leader of the developing world, and more specifically of the developing Caribbean (recently downgraded into a 'Basin'). He, after all, served as Prime Minister of one of the most challenging little countries which he inherited with all the concerns and problems faced by countries which belong to the so-called Third World.

Those concerns and problems have not disappeared in any significant way since he demitted office in 1980 which, in part, accounts for his return in 1989. His vision for humanity's future remains as relevant and immediate as they were in 1970 when he started to speak out, having spent long and arduous years of apprenticeship in trade unionism which deepened his insights into the human condition and fueled his convictions about the rightness of his objectives.

His efforts to improve the conditions for the people of his country were to be intimately linked with the wider struggle for improved conditions for the poor of the world, for the simple reason that he saw the problems as all forming a totality and the likely solutions as interdependent.

It is a view that came to be understood and appreciated by supporters and detractors alike much later than he and many others had hoped; but this merely confirmed the rightness of the vision and the determination and fixity of purpose of the warrior.

He can be untiring and exasperatingly stubborn in the pursuit of what he firmly believes in. It has been said that at all times he demonstrates an originality of expression and is often an inspiration to the faint-hearted. His commitment to that form of democracy which exalts cooperation and consultation, the right to dissent and peaceful co-existence over authoritarianism and violence in the resolution of conflict, is impatient of debate as he would put it.

His return to national leadership should be well served by what he has displayed in the past in negotiations with the powerful—namely, a flexibility and creativity of approach as well as a willingness to be innovative in order to maximize gains and to secure his real objective which remains the improved conditions for those he once termed "the victims of the world."

To this must be added his magnanimity and generosity of spirit and the civility he brings to his interaction with friends and foes alike. The tone and content of his acceptance speech on election night and his repeated calls for peace and consensus in tackling certain national issues are born of such a spirit.

Such are the qualities of leadership poor developing countries like ours in the Caribbean will need in order to cope in a world of faceless bureaucracies and hegemonic ambitions on the part of those among the powerful who are hostile to self-determination and the dignity of peoples they regard as less than whole.

Mr. Manley will be remembered in history, when it comes to be written, for his sterling contributions to the fight against apartheid, the liberation of Zimbabwe, the sharpening of the non-aligned movement as an instrument directed toward the world economic struggle, the revitalization of Caribbean regionalism in the form of CARICOM and other initiatives as the linking of bauxite workers in Guyana, Suriname, Haiti, Jamaica and Trinidad, and the giving to ordinary human beings (many of them the sons and daughters of ex-slaves) a sense of place and purpose in what is supposed to be their homeland—in short, the "smadditisation" of Jamaica.

Someone once said something significant (and very true) about Michael Manley. Let me repeat it: "More than any other man, he has articulated the fears, concerns and aspirations of the peoples of the Third World. He has been like the conscience of the developed world, calling them to the fact of their own responsibility for the fate of the peoples of the Third World. But even more than that, Michael Manley has awakened the people of Jamaica and much of the Third World to a sense of their own worth, their own dignity. And in so doing, he has set their feet firmly on the path to self-reliant development".

A great many, if not all, of the people of Jamaica seemingly share this view and have expressed their concurrence by giving him a second chance. It is to Mr. Manley's credit that he has grown even wiser to the fact that such expression of confidence has its price. The years ahead will be a time of testing and he knows by now that the passing of the tests set not by the IMF, but by the people of Jamaica will be the only justification for his return. Many have good reason to believe that he also knows that this requires hard work, good sense, political sanity and humility.

IMPLEMENTING THE BIPARTISAN ACCORD ON CENTRAL AMERICA

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNY SMITH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1989

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union has under consideration the bill (H.R. 1750) to implement the Bipartisan Accord on Central America of March 24, 1989.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express both my support and my admiration for the brave young men and women fighting for freedom and democracy in Nicaragua against the repressive Soviet-backed Sandinista regime. I have consistently voted in favor of military and humanitarian aid to the freedom fighters to assist them in the struggle for democracy.

Consistent with this previous support, I stand in favor of passage of H.R. 1750, although I harbor grave doubts about the wisdom of many of the provisions contained therein.

Principally, I question both the advisability and the constitutionality of the gentlemen's agreement negotiated between Secretary Baker and congressional leaders of the Democratic Party. Several constitutional scholars, including Judge Robert Bork, contend that it is indeed unconstitutional, a violation of separation of powers. The agreement clearly sets a bad precedent for future legislative branch/executive branch foreign policy debates.

Furthermore, of the designated committee chairmen and Democratic leaders whose written approval is required in order for aid to the freedom fighters to continue after November 30, several have failed, throughout the entire history of the Nicaraguan conflict, to vote a single dime of aid money for the Nicaraguan resistance. What reasonable promise do we now have that this will possibly change by November? I believe that by granting powers to a few individual Members of Congress, powers traditionally belonging either solely to the President or solely to the whole Congress, this agreement circumvents the proper role of Congress in the legislative process, and diminishes the powers of the President.

Nevertheless, given little alternative, I support this measure of continued humanitarian aid to the freedom fighters, which will ensure their survival as a military force. This, in turn, is the only possible way to ensure that the Sandinistas honor their promises and treaty commitments. The future of democracy in Central America depends upon a fair vote next February. Let us help make sure this happens.

Because of the above stated reservations, however, let the record show that I favor Mr. DORNAN's motion to recommit H.R. 1750 with instructions to report the bill with two amendments. These amendments solidify the President's power to conduct foreign policy and clarify the intent of the legislation to rearm the Nicaraguan freedom fighters in the event the Sandinistas fail to hold free and fair elections

in February 1990. In the light of repeated Sandinista failures to keep promises in the past, this provision seems not only warranted, but indeed quite wise. Let us hope that we in Congress someday learn to listen to wisdom when given the chance.

EUNICE KENNEDY SHRIVER ON ABORTION

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, in a letter published yesterday by the Washington Post, Eunice Kennedy Shriver eloquently and forcefully made the case for a balanced view by which the rights of an unborn fetus must be weighed against the rights of the mother.

I personally found the logic of the article irrefutable and I commend its reading to all those who are trying to struggle with the moral, legal, medical, and political complexities of one of the most important issues facing our society: abortion.

This fundamental issue—like too many in recent years—has been reduced to buzzwords and slogans. The Shriver article, however, focuses on basic, fundamental values and decisions which define a society.

Eunice Kennedy Shriver makes a compelling call to life-affirming values, and I want to share her views with all of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, the full text of the letter follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 1989]

THE DANGEROUS IRONY OF THE ABORTION-RIGHTS MESSAGE

I watched the recent March for Women's Equality/Women's Lives with both pride and dismay; pride that so many thousands of women could come together to affirm significant issues affecting their lives; dismay at the sight of mothers and daughters parading together under the banner of "control of our bodies."

Whatever the arguments pro- or anti-abortion, the assertion of unlimited "control of our bodies" sends a dangerously confusing and ambiguous message to all women, but especially to our generation of teenagers.

For the fact is, our most often-repeated message to teens who would claim their right to control everything that involves their bodies is, "Just say no!" We challenge their right to take drugs, to smoke, to become addicted to alcohol, even to enhance their bodies' strength through steroids.

We say that "control of your body" must be limited to those actions and behaviors that are life-affirming. And this includes the ways in which we express and use our sexuality, and the way in which we treat the life that our sexuality creates.

When a pregnant teen-ager (or any pregnant woman) goes to see her obstetrician for prenatal care, the obstetrician tells her to eat correctly, stop smoking, stop drinking, don't do drugs, exercise and get proper rest. Is this advice just for her, or is the physician thinking beyond the mother to the fetus? Isn't it strange and confusing that we ask a physician to perform an abortion without regard for the life of the fetus, whereas at the same time, in other cases, we expend great medical resources to treat a fetus in the womb?

There is far more to this issue than control of one's body. There is the overwhelming principle of the affirmation of life; the absolute right for the fetus, as a life, to be considered in making a life-threatening decision.

In a rational and moral society, how can we expect the physician to be responsible both for the welfare of the fetus and for its destruction? Does this affirm the meaning of life or deny it? And what message does this send to our teen-age children concerning the proper "control over their bodies"?

Morality and law should protect the life of the fetus against the absolute "control" of anyone. Even the mother. I am not a lawyer, but if I were pursuing the legal arguments, I would take the position that the courts have already affirmed the civil right of the fetus.

If a product such as thalidomide damages the young fetus, that fetus at birth has legitimate basis for a claim of personal injury against the manufacturer, and large awards have been granted in such cases.

Similarly, if abortion is attempted but is incompleted, and the fetus is born later as a damaged baby, I believe that the fetus, now a baby, has cause for damages resulting from injury during the pregnancy. Certainly, being deprived of life—as guaranteed by the Constitution—should be even more a cause for action than being damaged.

Under the Constitution, and our traditions of ethics and morality, no one should exercise absolute control over another. What is missing from the easy acceptance of "control of our bodies" is due process by which the rights of the fetus must be weighed against the rights of the mother.

Such an application of due process would permit the weighing of circumstances and the legitimate claims of both the mother and the fetus. It would make the taking of the life a serious, even agonizing decision for the physician and the mother, not an easy, forgettable act. It would make getting pregnant or making another pregnant a serious, not a cavalier, act. And with hope, it would move us to a more responsible and more life-affirming citizenry in matters of sex.

If we are to be a life-affirming society, we must articulate the values that underlie both our private acts and our public policy: housing for the homeless, food for the hungry, quality education and health care for the poor, the disabled and the young. And then, reflecting on our values, shouldn't we also be a society that cares for and respects and protects life in the womb?

EUNICE KENNEDY SHRIVER.

TRIBUTE TO REV. RICHARD SPEICHER

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest admiration that I rise today to salute a truly outstanding religious leader and community servant, Rev. Richard Speicher.

Reverend Speicher has served the people of the Mahoning Valley for the last 28 years. He was instrumental in founding Volunteer Service to Seniors and Interfaith Home Maintenance Service. He has also served on various boards and committees such as: Citizens League of Youngstown, Cooperative Campus Ministry, CROP of Mahoning County, Interfaith Home Maintenance Service, Interracial Clergy Dialogue, Review Board for St. Elizabeth Hospital Medical Center, Mahoning County AIDS Task Force, Religious Koinonia, and the Private Industry Council.

In 1984, when tornadoes swept our valley, Reverend Speicher was there to lend a helping hand. He not only brought money into the community to ease the burdens of the victims, but more importantly he offered comfort and support to them.

Reverend Speicher has spent a lifetime serving others as a church pastor. He had a pastorate at Woodworth Church of the Brethern locally, in campus ministries at Youngstown State University and finally as executive director of the Mahoning Valley Association of Churches.

Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention that Reverend Speicher will be honored at a retirement banquet on May 2, 1989. I would at this time, like to congratulate and thank him for his service to the people of our community as well as to wish him happiness and success in the future.

HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL DAY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this weekend organizations and synagogues throughout the Nation will be conducting services to remind us all of the barbaric tragedy that was the Nazi holocaust.

Over 6 million Jewish martyrs needlessly and senselessly gave their lives during this shocking 20th century brutality. Many of us do not appreciate the fact that 1½ million of these martyrs were innocent little children.

The Holocaust came about gradually, due as much to the apathy of disinterested persons as to the cruelty of inhumane leaders. If one must pinpoint the date the Holocaust began in earnest, that date would be November 9, 1938, the Night of Broken Glass [Kristallnacht]. That one tragic evening of violence resulted in 100 murdered Jews, the destruction of over 7,500 Jewish businesses, the obliteration of 275 synagogues, and the deportation of 30,000 Jewish men to the concentration camps of Dachau, Buchenwald, and Sachsenhausen.

The Holocaust may possibly have been halted in its tracks on that night, had only the world cared. The knowledge that the liquidation of the Jewish people in Europe had begun was acknowledged in the New York Times on November 13, 1938, when it stated: "Germany issued a new series of decrees yesterday to complete the liquidation of the Jews." Unbelievably, no one in the international community responded to this statement, which proved to be a horrifying prophecy. As a result of worldwide indifference, Hitler escalated his mad scheme to obliterate an entire people from the face of the Earth.

It is fitting that memorials of the Holocaust be held at this time of year. The Jewish people are currently celebrating the festival of Passover, in which we are reminded of our heritage by recalling our first flight to freedom from Egypt thousands of years ago.

This month is also the 46th anniversary of the ghetto uprising in Warsaw. After weeks of preparation, the Jews of Warsaw conducted a courageous, yet futile, uprising against their Nazi oppressors. A grave decision was made that the Jews of Warsaw would rather die on their feet fighting for freedom than live on their knees before a cruel oppressor. The Warsaw ghetto uprising was the first organized civilian opposition to Nazi rule. These martyrs held off the Nazis, giving the Red army valuable time to mount its counteroffensive across the Polish plains.

And yet, while this unprecedented display of human courage took place, the entire world looked on mutely, not lifting a finger to assist.

Next month, in May, the State of Israel celebrates its 41st anniversary of independence, a beacon of hope for those who were without hope all the years of the Holocaust. Israel remains a living monument to the inhumanity of which the human race is capable. Israel remains a constant reminder that nothing like this will ever happen again.

Some well-meaning people question why we continue to memoralize the Holocaust. Why, they ask, do we not simply allow the Holocaust to recede into the grey mists of history?

The answer is: we must not forget, because we must never allow this to happen again.

Just a few weeks ago, a Jewish center in Monroe, NY, in my own 22d Congressional District, was descecrated with painted-on swastikas. The horror of this event cannot be trivialized. It indicates, at best, an awesome ignorance of the horror that was the Holocaust. It is indication that, despite years of progress, hatred still continues to exist in the hearts of human beings.

In a recent Newsweek editorial, former U.S. Senator Birch Bayh listed a host of recent events, compiled by the National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence, of what the Senator calls "hate-filled acts" which, "when viewed from a national perspective, presents a truly alarming picture."

Among the incidents cited are: the desecration of a Community Holocaust Memorial in San Francisco; swastikas and Nazi slogans scrawled on Temple B'nai Abraham in Beverly, MA; the bombing of a Federal building, a business, and a home in Coeur d'Alene, ID; a black man shot to death, allegedly by "Skinhead" supporters, in Reno, NV; and the assassination of a State Trooper by a member of an extremist group in Ridgedale, MI.

Mr. Speaker, these—coupled with the recent incident in my own congressional district—only underscore why it is so important that we remember the millions of victims of the Holocaust. The Holocaust began with similar acts of hatred which did not attract the attention of the world.

Constant vigilance is the price we must pay to make certain that it will never happen again.

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION PROGRAM

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation aimed at continuing the commitment made by title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 [SMCRA] to ensure the reclamation of abandoned coal mine lands.

The abandoned mine reclamation fund—often referred to as the AML Program—was established by SMCRA to address public health, safety, and environmental problems resulting from past surface and underground coal mining.

Financing for the AML Program is generated from a fee assessed on every ton of coal mined, with collections authorized until August 1992. The AML fund is divided into the State/tribal and secretarial shares with each State with an approved program entitled to 50 percent of the collections obtained from that State. The secretarial share of the fund is allocated among a number of Federal programs such as emergency projects, high-priority reclamation projects in States and tribes without approved programs, the Rural Abandoned Mine Program [RAMP] and the Small Operators Assistance Program [SOAP] with remaining funds distributed to the States under an allocation formula. At present, 23 States and 3 tribes have approved abandoned mine reclamation programs.

According to a recent report by the Office of Surface Mining [OSM], from the beginning of the program through September 1988, fee collections into the AML fund amounted to $2.3 billion. However, OSM estimates that when the current authorization expires, there will remain over 4 billion dollars' worth of high priority abandoned coal mine reclamation projects. For this reason, it is my intention to move forward with legislation to reauthorize this most important program.

The legislation I am introducing, entitled the "Abandoned Mine Reclamation Act of 1989," would reauthorize the collection of the current reclamation fees—35 cents per ton of surface mined coal and 15 cents per ton of deep mined coal—for an additional 15-year period, through September 30, 2007. The fees, however, would be reduced by approximately 50 percent—18 cents per ton of surface mined coal and 8 cents per ton of deep mined coal—when a State certifies it has completed all abandoned coal mine reclamation work. In addition, the bill would authorize interest to accrue to amounts deposited into the abandoned mine reclamation fund.

The legislation also would provide for the allocation of amounts deposited into the AML fund. While the bill generally tracts the current method used to distribute amounts in the fund, it would clarify certain aspects of the existing formula as well as make some significant modifications to it. First, 50 percent of the reclamation fees collected in a State or tribe with approved reclamation programs would be allocated to those States and tribes until completion of all eligible abandoned coal mine reclamation projects. Second, once a State certifies that it has completed all of its abandoned coal mine reclamation projects, it would continue to receive 50 percent of the reclamation fees collected in that State or tribe to address other abandoned mine reclamation projects. The Secretary would make annual grants to the States and tribes from the amounts allocated to them.

The balance of the AML fund, including interest, would be allocated, and expended, for the Rural Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program—20 percent of the fund's balance after the State 50 percent allocations—the Small Operators Assistance Program—not more than $10 million per year pursuant to current law—Federal emergency projects, Federal abandoned coal mine reclamation projects in States and tribes where the reclamation fees are collected but which do not have approved reclamation programs, and for the administration of the program.

Finally, the balance of the AML fund remaining after all of these allocations and expenditures would be allocated to States and tribes with approved reclamation programs, and which have not completed priority 1 and 2 abandoned coal mine reclamation projects, through a formula based on historical coal production. Further, the bill would provide a minimum allocation of not less than 1 percent—in no event less than $2 million per year—to States with approved reclamation programs.

This legislation does not purport to reflect a final product. Rather, I am introducing it for the consideration of the Subcommittee on Mining and Natural Resources during our May 16 legislative hearing. At that time, we will also receive testimony on any other bill that has been introduced dealing with abandoned mine reclamation, including H.R. 538 introduced by Representative FRANK MCCLOSKEY and H.R. 1315 sponsored by Representative CHRIS PERKINS.

CHALLENGE OF TOMORROW'S WORK FORCE

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, we have within the Washington, DC, higher educational community one of America's finest institutions, the George Washington University. On April 16, the university inaugurated its 15th president, Stephen Joel Trachtenberg.

Mr. Trachtenberg came to GW last August after 11 years as president and professor of law and public administration at the University of Hartford, CT. His previous academic career includes 8 years at Boston University in successive administrative positions.

In the 1960's, Mr. Trachtenberg served as special assistant to the U.S. Education Commissioner, secretary for a White House Task Force on Education, and as an aid to former Congressman John Brademas.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, with a keen interest in both

education and labor issues, I found an April 6, 1989, speech by Mr. Trachtenberg to the Baltimore-Washington Business Outlook 1989 conference to be particularly insightful.

In excerpts from the speech, which follows, President Trachtenberg asserts that the U.S. education system is "up for grabs." He says, "The system isn't successfully meeting our needs * * * and compares badly with those of other industrialized nations."

Mr. Trachtenberg challenges American business to become involved in changing the business education system so that it meets the realities of the work challenges that will surely face graduates.

President Trachtenberg's remarks are relevant to discussion of important higher education and labor issues today, and I recommend them to my colleagues for their consideration.

MAKING THE TRADE: THE CHALLENGE OF TOMORROW'S WORK FORCE

(By Stephen Joel Trachtenberg)

I've been asked to shed some light, from a higher education point of view, on the challenge of tomorrow's work force as it will be experienced in the 1990's.

Many critics focus in on one specific aspect of higher education—the study of business. They claim that if much of what's being taught in our universities bears a dubious relationship to actual practice, then the connection between what gets taught by business schools and what life is really like in the business world is in a state of total crisis.

In December 1988, to cite only one example, the magazine Business Month published an article by Michael McGill, a professor of organizational behavior at Southern Methodist University.

Corporate insistence on the MBA as the degree an applicant has to have to even be considered for a management-trainee position, McGill argued, and corporate willingness to pay very high salaries to recently minted MBAs, is luring into these degree programs the kinds of people whose ambition is concentrated on their paychecks rather than on developing needed skills or meeting the true challenges of a business career.

And McGill went on in his most pointed sentence—quote: "Significant numbers of business leaders are critical of MBAs' written-and-oral-presentation skills, their awareness of social and political events, their knowledge of sales and manufacturing (as opposed to marketing and strategy), their exposure to international business, and their business ethics."

What makes this situation even worse, he continued, is the fact that corporate leaders are making no real effort to change it by putting pressure on the universities themselves. How serious that may prove is suggested by a talk on the internationalization of the regional economy delivered last June to the Greater Washington Research Center by Robert R. Nathan. Nathan lamented the fact that Americans expect those from other nations to be able to communicate in English while making no concerted attempt to speak with them in their own tongues. Given the growing importance of the regional involvement in international trade, Nathan concluded, the Washington business and professional community "must build up a climate of knowledge, a climate of hospitality, and a climate of receptivity to foreign organizations and institutions that are now here, and to the many others that will emerge."

Clearly, therefore, those concerned about the future ought to be pressuring the nation's business schools right now to see to it that no student starts or ends an MBA program without mastering the language and culture of at least one major West European or Asian industrial power. But the problem of international awareness among business school graduates is only one of those now causing such concern among those who run America's major companies. Of even greater significance are the limitations of so many of those with MBAs when it comes to speaking and writing their own language. That, to me, is an even more serious fact, because the economy is faced by two facts that don't go terribly well together.

The first is the fact that the two manufacturing subsectors experiencing major expansion in the Common Market are, according to the Washington-Baltimore Regional Association, "directly related to the boom in information technology." One of the industries is electronics; the other is printing and publishing. And, frankly, I wouldn't want to be an executive in either one if communication problems were the ones that typically afflicted my subordinates. Indeed, I wouldn't even care to be an executive in other rising industries like commercial biotechnology, which are so deeply dependent on the electronic storing and transmission of information—some of it in the form of numbers, and a lot of it in the form of words.

To adapt an old American saying, America's business is business education. Our new definition of a manager is that he or she is a person who holds a B.A. and an MBA. In that case, our prevailing modes of business education had better be rock-solid. Instead, we are being assured that they more closely resemble an enormous bowl of jello, in which few can find their footing and none are, therefore, truly effective. What is typical of business schools today is that they are being forced, by student demand, to qualify for a type of accreditation that insists on a lot of Ph.D.'s—even for teachers of basic accounting—a lot of books in the library, and not much in the way of hands-on experience to accompany classroom learning.

That kind of an emphasis on abstract theory works best when students are trying for careers in fields like finance or marketing. It works badly if what we are trying to convey to a student is that corporate mergers and clever ad campaigns don't cut much ice with a world that is interested in superior products. It's especially ominous, therefore, that the allergy to manufacturing so evident among our MBAs has also been detected in our engineering schools, where the study of manufacturing engineering is still battling its way, not always very successfully, back into the curriculum.

Universities operating as coherent organized units—joining together the work of their business schools, their schools of education, their schools of public administration and their communication departments—must become very deeply and creatively involved with the education and training needs of the companies in their regions.

What we have learned since the 1960's is that where people are concerned, the ability to influence bears a direct ratio to the earliness of the influence. What we have started to recognize in a very serious way is that the educational deficits that afflict so many center-city residents often begin at the prenatal stage, when disadvantaged mothers receive markedly lower levels of care and attention than mothers in nearby suburbs. Those educational deficits are intensified in infancy and very early childhood, when the suburban child is receiving all kinds of educational support from parents who don't have to fear for their next meal, much less their lives. And those educational deficits don't receive much societal attention until the child has reached the so-called "preschool" age of three or four years. By that time, the suburban child has had so much physical care, so much bolstering of intellectual capacity, and so much dinnertable prepping that he or she is probably debating the relative merits of Harvard and Amherst, and wondering whether to major in biochemistry or computer science!

To an increasing extent in recent years, universities have declared their desire to get involved with the public education systems, at both the elementary and secondary levels, of their surrounding communities. Quite a few have tried mounting programs to accomplish that, with very uneven results. The whole effort has lacked any nationwide coherence or solid grounding, and is in danger of eventually fading away.

Those efforts by our schools of higher education need to be expanded and intensified—but in the right direction.

The question is whether our universities, working in cooperation with government and the business community, can actually make their influence felt when it comes to these early life stages and to the trainable workers they do or don't produce.

What I have been suggesting is that the higher education system of the United States, including those parts aiming to produce executives and engineers, is "up for grabs" to an extent that hasn't been seen since the years immediately following the Second World War. All we know at the moment is that the system isn't successfully meeting our national and regional needs, and that it compares badly with those of other industrialized nations—especially those of Western Europe and Japan, that mostly leave business education to be conducted by employers.

The key now is for American business to get deeply involved in the process of defining how our business education system needs to be changed—above all, how we can make it less theoretical, more attuned to the real work challenges that students will face after graduation, and much more effective in providing linguistic and cross-cultural skills to those who will soon be responsible for particular companies and the health of the American economy as a whole.

The fact that I am saying all these critical things about American business and engineering education is a direct result of the fact that I preside over a Washington-based university whose consciousness is a little ahead of that being manifested elsewhere in the academic world. For example, The George Washington University is one of only two in this region that offers degree programs in manufacturing. That's an accurate sign of the extent to which all of its schools and departments are becoming with my personal encouragement, ever more deeply involved with the realities of daily life in the actual world we occupy today.

A very large percentage of GW's undergraduates come to us because we offer them the chance to participate, as interns or cooperative education trainees, in actual government work—over and above their classroom experiences. In much the same way,

the many students who come to us from other countries are people destined to play important roles in guiding those nations through the stressful 1990's.

In related ways, our medical school and our law school play important hands-on roles in meeting the needs of our region. Our education school is becoming the focus for discussions of how we can reach young people early enough and sensitively enough to make a difference in their lives and in the contributions they can make to our region and our country.

In short, I have the pleasure of presiding over a university that's headed in the right direction, and is serving as a role model for other schools of higher education in the United States.

SHANNON KOCHENOUR WINS DAR FLAG ESSAY CONTEST

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I go home every weekend is to be reminded that there is a great reservoir of patriotism and love of country in the small towns of villages of America.

That's why I was especially pleased to discover that the grandaughter of a friend of mine was singled out for her understanding of those virtues.

Shannon Kochenour is a student at W.B. Howard Elementary School in New Lebanon, Columbia County, N.Y. She recently took first place honors in the Hendrick Hudson Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution flag essay contest. I'm proud to say that she is the granddaughter of Mr. Russell Terry, chairman of the Washington County Republican Committee.

Her essay, which I place in today's RECORD, advanced to the statewide DAR competition. If there are more young people like Miss Shannon Kochenour, the future of America is in good hands.

WHAT THE AMERICAN FLAG MEANS FOR ME BY SHANNON KOCHENOUR

Our American Flag means a lot of things to me.

Freedom: when the flag is waved high in the air it shouts out in a quiet way you are free!

When an immigrant has had a tough road to follow our beautiful flag is like their loving mother calling them home.

It is like a silky ribbon a queen would be honored to wear in her hair.

Every morning when I pledge my allegiance to our flag I put my hand on my heart and feel proud and grateful that I am free.

From the stars in the sky to the hill on the earth our flag represents a lot of what we have worked for and what we have earned.

For many people from so many lands have traveled so far to be free and to live under our flag. That is something we very often take for granted. We shouldn't do that. I'm sure a lot of people don't know what it is like in other countries. The people wait in long lines just for things like bread and even a pair of socks. But in our country under our flag that is very different.

The flag is like a big beautiful patchwork quilt with a lot of work put into it by everyone.

On the rainiest day when you see our flag waving high in the air it brings sunshine to our day.

In my essay I have written many times "our flag." That is because it is our flag. It is what we have worked for and it is what I hope will always stay the same.

TRIBUTE TO HON. BILL CHAPPELL

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1989

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened by the recent death of former Congressman Bill Chappell. Throughout his distinguished life, Bill Chappell was a man of commitment—commitment to his country, commitment to duty and commitment to the Congress he loved so much.

Bill Chappell was a naval aviator in World War II. He served for years in the Naval Reserves and eventually retired as a captain. He fought long and hard for a strong national defense while serving in Congress. When Bill began his service on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee in the late 1970's, the condition of our Armed Forces was mediocre—planes couldn't fly because of the lack of spare parts, a high percentage of recruits were not high school graduates, morale of the troops was at rock bottom, and the Soviets were expanding their empire into Afghanistan and other areas of the world.

When Bill Chappell ended his service in Congress as chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, America was standing tall in the world. Morale of the troops was excellent, 96 percent of recruits were high school graduates, spare parts for aircraft were ample, the Soviets had withdrawn from Afghanistan, and the global balance of power had shifted in the favor of the free countries of the world.

These great historical achievements were in no small part due to the commitment, energy and influence of Congressman William Chappell, Jr., who fought so diligently for a strong national security.

Every aspect of Bill Chappell's life was a commitment to duty—his duty in World War II, his duty in the Naval Reserves, his duty in the Florida State Legislature where he became Speaker of the House, and his duty in the Congress where he so ably represented his constituents and his country.

But was not something that Bill Chappell consciously thought about. Duty was in the fiber of his soul. Duty was the most natural thing in the world to him. To Bill Chappell, duty was not something you considered doing, or you contemplated doing, duty was simply a way of life.

I extend my condolences to his wife and family. We all miss Bill Chappell and I commend him for his life of commitment to his country, to duty and to his constituents.

DISAPPROVING RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMISSION ON BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

SPEECH OF

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1989

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 165), disapproving the recommendations of the Committee on Base Realignment and Closure, pursuant to Public Law 100-526.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Chairman. I rise in opposition to this resolution of disapproval of the recommendations of the Commission on Base Closures and Realignments. I have thought over this question carefully. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, I am aware of the administration's fiscal year 1990 funding request for the base closure account. That request is for $500 million.

As the representative of the 16th Congressional District of Texas, which includes Fort Bliss, I have looked at the Commission's recommendations from a second angle. I am not convinced that the proposed relocation of the Basic Combat Training mission component from Fort Bliss to Fort Jackson, SC, makes sense either in terms of cost savings or in terms of readiness. Fort Bliss is a mobilization post, and it appears to make good sense to have a basic training function at an installation where you want to call up the reserves and remote units in the event of a conflict. I have also heard and read about realignments and outright closures at a number of other installations around the country where the cost savings to U.S. taxpayers are far from evident and where the economies of local communities are certainly going to be damaged.

The difficulty lies in the bill we enacted last year. We made the package indivisible. The Congress prejudiced itself from being able to pick and choose among the recommendations once the report was submitted. I would have liked to have included overseas bases among those open to the Commission's recommendations. I would have preferred that the Commission had had more time and resources available to it—and I would have wished that the Commission had been able to testify before the Congress during its deliberations on issues such as force modernization. The point to consider in reference to the Resolution on the floor today is that we did not provide for these kinds of oversight in last year's bill—and we did not provide for them because of the demonstrated near-impossibility of passing a bill subject to being broken out and cannibalized in the future.

A substantial amount of evidence regarding realigned force structure, the regional medical needs of the active duty and retired military populations and community dependence on military installations has already been gathered during the 3½ months since Secretary Carlucci submitted the Commission's report. That evidence should be weighed in the con-

text of whether or not the Congress wants to implement the findings as they have been referred to us. The question of implementation lies within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. We should be prepared to look at it there—and we should look at the report in the context of whether or not it does what the Congress originally intended it to do—achieve real and lasting budgetary savings. Like all the other legislation we will be considering this year, the first test ought to be the impact on the deficit. In my view, this is still an open question where base closure is concerned. But we cannot at this time cavalierly pretend that the question is moot—and that is what a yes vote here amounts to. I urge that you vote down this resolution of disapproval.

SLOVAK INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JAMES A TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, 1989, the Slovak Community of Greater Cleveland will be commemorating Slovak Independence Day with both joy and sorrow; joy in remembering that on March 14, 1939, the Slovak Parliament declared Slovakia's independence, and that these peoples desire for freedom was finally satisfied. The sorrow following when that independence was forcibly usurped after the end of World War II by the Soviet Union.

The Slovaks in Slovakia have spent the past 45 years fiercely resisting Communist tyranny. And in spite of brutal suppression and oppression, their hunger for freedom and independence grows stronger and stronger. They have fought and will continue to fight until their country is released from the grip of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, there are not many who cherish the principles of freedom and democracy to the extent in which the Slovakian people do. They are a people of passion, devotion, and great courage. It is with great honor that I stand today not only to salute the Slovakians who have struggled for their independence and freedom, but I would also like to wish the Slovak Community of Greater Cleveland a joyous celebration.

DR. GAETANO A. IANNACE: AN OUTSTANDING AMERICAN

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues the outstanding public services performed by Prof. Gaetano A. Iannace. The brilliant career of this sterling individual has been called to my attention by our former colleague, the gentleman from New York, Mr. DioGuardi, who has had the honor of representing and working with Dr. Iannace.

Dr. Iannace has recently been awarded the Outstanding Teacher and Scholar Award at Fordham University, as a long-overdue recognition of his excellent teaching record at New York University, at Fordham, at Pace University, and at the Central Connecticut State University. In addition to being an inspirational teacher, Dr. Iannace has participated in a multitude of scholarly activities.

Professor Iannace's contributions to his profession are a constant credit to himself, to his field, and to all the institutions with which he has been associated. An internationally renowned scholar, he is a frequently invited lecturer at the most prestigious universities in our country, including Harvard, Yale, and Boston College. He has also served as lecturer at the University of Philology in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, and at centers of higher learning in Italy and Canada.

In addition to being a tireless researcher and writer, Dr. Iannace is a trusted adviser to several other leading editors and scholars.

His commitment to scholarship includes translations of Italian poetry and scholarly studies of Italian dialects. He has contributed to important professional journals—such as World Literature Today, Italica, and Osiris—and is active in the Italian Historical Society, UNICO, and other fraternal and intellectual organizations.

Professor Iannace's students can attest to the time and effort he spends with them, helping them achieve the excellence which he has come to personify. It is in great part due to his efforts that all of the institutions with which he has been associated now boast fine Italian programs.

Dr. Iannace has been active in the teacher's union struggle for dignity and excellence, as an organizer and president of his local chapter of the American Federation of Teachers.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress are all aware of the significant contributions made by Italian-Americans to our culture. In good part, this awareness is due to Dr. Iannace, who has dedicated his life to shining the spotlight on these outstanding achievements. His scholarship has touched the consciousness of every major activity of Italian-American fraternal, civic, and cultural organizations. He also has made outstanding contributions to better relations between his university and the community at large, as well as between the United States and Italy.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the honor being bestowed upon Dr. Iannace by Fordham University's Italian Honor Society, I invite our colleagues to join with me in congratulating Dr. Iannace, his loving wife Aldona, his devoted son Carmine, and the over 100 members of Dr. Iannace's family in southeastern New York and in Connecticut, for a job well done.

Although Dr. Iannace does not reside in my own 22d Congressional District of New York, I do have the privilege of representing many members of his family. We all share their pride in this recognition of an outstanding career.

Dr. Iannace is an inspiration to us all. His recent award is highly deserved.

REINTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO END TRADE PROBLEMS WITH JAPAN AND TO MAINTAIN VITAL UNITED STATES-JAPAN RELATIONS

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago I introduced legislation to improve United States-Japan relations by ending trade frictions through trade management. The idea has been reraised by U.S. Trade Representative, Ambassador Carla Hills, as described in the March 2, 1989, Washington Post article that follows.

I would like to reprint my 1985 speech explaining the reasoning for this unusual trade approach. I think the speech is still quite accurate. Despite a massive decline in the value of the dollar and appreciation in the value of the yen, the only thing that has really changed in the past 4 years, is that we have piled up $223.6 billion in trade deficit with Japan. At least one-third of that deficit is due to the cultural barriers I cited in my speech. That means that $74.5 billion in foreign debt—the sale of American assets to Japan—is due to unfair trade practices.

I renew my call for a new trade approach to one of our best allies.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 2, 1989]

U.S. EYES TARGETS FOR JAPANESE BUYING—HILLS SAYS TOUGHER APPROACH IS PART OF TRADE IMBALANCE REVIEW

(By Stuart Auerbach)

In a reversal of laissez-faire United States trade policy, the Bush administration is considering setting specific targets for Japanese purchases of U.S. products to force major reductions in the $52 billion trade imbalance between the two nations, U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills revealed yesterday.

The proposal to move away from the free-trade, open-market approach that has been in place for nearly a decade is part of a wide-ranging review that Hills has ordered into U.S. trade policy toward Japan. The trade deficit with Japan—the largest shortfall the United States has with any country—accounted for 44 percent of the U.S. trade deficit last year.

Hills was vague over what form the new trade relationship might take, but, in a departure from the past policy of the Reagan administration, indicated she did not oppose setting specific targets on a product-by-product basis for U.S. sales in Japan.

An administration task force is considering recommendations by outside groups to limit Japanese sales in this country by mutually agreed amounts, though Hills did not say whether she favored this additional step.

The interagency review is the first admission by the new administration that the free-trade policies of former president Reagan may not work with a country such as Japan, where a variety of cultural and economic factors work against purchases of imported goods.

While the U.S. trade deficit with Japan fell last year, the 7 percent drop was far smaller than the decreases with other major

trading partners. The U.S. deficit with the 12-nation European Community, for instance, fell 56 percent in 1988.

Further, the U.S. trade deficit with Japan edged upward in the last three months of 1988, indicating this improvement is likely to stall this year.

"There is an accumulation of frustration in dealing with Japan," acknowledged Hills, who assumed her post just 30 days ago.

The task force she established as a result of this frustration is considering at least two reports from private business organizations that recommend a managed type of trade relationship with Japan.

The group also is looking at a suggestion by former secretaries of state Henry Kissinger and Cyrus Vance that the two countries negotiate an overall trade balance.

"Within that balance, Japan would have the choice of either reducing its exports or increasing its imports, thus removing the need for sector-by-sector industrial negotiations," Kissinger and Vance wrote in a recent issue of Foreign Affairs, a quarterly journal.

Conversely, a joint industry-labor advisory committee to Hills' agency suggested last month that the Bush administration take a position somewhere between free and managed trade, but said the government should "insist" that Japan buy an agreed amount of specified U.S. products to "properly reflect the international competitiveness of U.S. suppliers."

Another industry proposal, submitted in draft form by the Emergency Committee for American Trade (ECAT), made up of large exporting companies, recommended that the United States and Japan agree to cut the U.S. trade deficit in half, to about $25 billion within five years, leaving it to the government to decide how that can be accomplished.

In testimony before the Senate Finance Committee yesterday, Hills showed her clear distaste for managed trade, but recognized that it might be the best way to deal with Japan's seemingly intractable surpluses.

"The world community will be better off with open trade. Managed trade does not do as well," Hills said. "But if there is a country that we cannot deal with" through the preferred approach of trying to open markets through agreements to end trade barriers, "we have to look for other means."

That could be "a choice between managed trade"—where major imports and exports are held to overall targets—"or taking a course somewhat akin" to the recommendation of the labor-industry advisory group for sectoral targets, she continued.

Hills did not get into how she would enforce any agreement with Japan, which has been accused by U.S. industry groups and some lawmakers of backing away from trade commitments after they are reached and U.S. political pressure eases.

[From the Congressional Record, Apr. 4, 1985]

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO END TRADE PROBLEMS WITH JAPAN AND TO MAINTAIN VITAL UNITED STATES-JAPAN RELATIONS

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am today, reintroducing a resolution to cap our trade deficits with Japan. This bill is an effort to end the increasingly bitter trade dispute between our two nations, which is threatening the even more important political alliance.

The latest telecommunications agreements between our two nations announced this week are not going to solve the trade problem. We are going to be back, justifiably hammering at the Japanese on something else within a few days. We are going to continue to have $100 million a day trade deficits with Japan.

On paper, she is going to appear to be an open trading partner—and yet she is different. She is a poor importer. A people (some have used the word clan) who have lived by themselves on a set of islands for nearly 2,000 years of recorded time do not buy readily from outsiders. There is no GATT, there is no law, there is no treaty, there is no negotiation that is going to change that.

Time might change it. But we don't have time, not with our trade deficits and not with our high unemployment and not with the overvalued dollar which, even if it corrects itself overnight, will not provide trade relief for 1 year to 18 months.

We can all admit that much of the trade problem is America's fault: the high deficits and high interest rates have brought us an overvalued dollar that makes imports attractive and our exports less competitive. We let inflation and profit and salary and wage rates get out of hand in the 1960's and 1970's and lost competitiveness. Our business management styles are not always as good as the Japanese in dealing with workers. We got careless and sloppy and the quality of our products has not always been what it should. Even our Tax Code is not as good as the Japanese code (which we gave them and which they kept pure) and our laws have encouraged questionable investments.

Having said this, much of the trade deficit—perhaps a third of it—is not our fault but is the fault of legal and extra-legal, unspoken Japanese protectionism. Raw and processed foods, lumber, cigarettes (as long as the Japanese want to smoke, why not our cigarettes?), chemicals, some hi-tech items, military aircraft—in all these areas there have been denied sales and lost jobs for Americans. In hi-tech industries particularly, the Japanese are endlessly creative at blunting our competitive advantage. They are, to put it midly, screwing us on the industries of the future.

But more important than the trading relationship, is the political relationship. Japan is a democratic success story. She is a nation of incredibly hard-working, talented people who can bring progress to all of Asia. She is an important military ally. For example, we keep urging Japan to spend more on military, but she is one of the top 10 military powers in the world in terms of spending and talent.

But the trade wars—and that is a phrase one Senator used last week—are damaging the political relationship. It does sound like war; the Finance Committee Chairman has said, "an eye for an eye."

The United States-Japan Wisemen's Group offered many ideas for improving the relations between our two countries, and the most important recommendation for the American side was to start treating Japan as an equal nation.

We don't. To listen to many of my colleagues in the Congress in recent days, you would think that Japan is the same as Grenada.

Japan is not Grenada. Japan is a major world power. General MacArthur did not fade away. He is dead. The General Headquarters—to respond to one Japanese comment—has not been reopened in downtown Tokyo.

Can you imagine the reaction of Americans if a foreign nation wanted us to translate our telephone regulations—say Judge Green's opinions—into Japanese at our expense? Can you imagine if the Japanese insisted as a negotiating point that a foreigner or a foreign company sit on one of our Government Advisory Commissions? Can you imagine the reaction of American cattlemen or American dairymen if a foreign country insisted that we repeal the meat import quota and cheese quota acts? Can you imagine our reaction if Japanese politicians scorned meeting with top level American delegations? Can you imagine the reaction if the Diet passed a resolution 500 to zip threatening the United States with trade retaliation?

We'd go nuts.

Yet that is what we are demanding of the Japanese. As one of our chief negotiators said recently. "No American effort since the Occupation has dug into the guts of the Japanese system as we have done in the past year."

Let's stop it.

Let's stop tearing apart the gut of an ally.

Let's preserve the political and cultural relationship.

Let's admit that the Japanese are lousy importers and we can't make them buy from us. Let's admit that they make a good product and that our consumers want to buy from them. Let's admit that under any economic theory, it would be natural and normal for Japan—as a small, resource poor nation—to be running an export surplus with the world in capital and consumer goods.

Let's admit all that, and set a limit to it.

The bill I am proposing was inspired by MIT economics professor Lester Thurow and is the same as House Joint Resolution 195 of the 98th Congress. It would cap Japan's balance-of-trade surplus with the United States at $15 billion per year. The more Japan buys from us, the more she can sell. She just can't run a overdraft of more than $15 billion a year.

Under this approach, there will be no hassles or frustrating negotiations on specific products, on the interpretation of regulations, on goodwill and the keeping of one's commitments. The cap is substantially below today's Japanese trade surplus but does not require a balance. This recognizes the fact that with truly free trade, the deficit might be about one-third less; and Americans do want to buy a substantial number of Japanese products. Once the cap is reached, that is it for the year. No hassles. No pressure for negotiations. No bullying. No more screaming speeches from Congressmen.

When I first proposed this Thurow idea in legislative form, it was ridiculed as unwise protectionism. Two years have passed. I ask the critics: "Will you now admit that the economic tension is seriously threatening the political relationship? Will you admit that we have just been drifting in the bilateral trade area with no solutions in sight? Will you admit that Japan is different and that maybe—to save the political and friendship relations—we should apply new approaches to a unique problem?"

Anyone who gives thoughtful response to these questions will see the need for new approaches. Maybe my approach is not the right one. But current policy is a disaster that threatens much more than our pocketbooks.

I am trying to save the United States-Japan relationship. If you have a better idea, offer it now. Increasing the tension on

our bilateral relationship will only create contention.

TRIBUTE TO GLEN BROWDER

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to rise today to salute our newest Member of Congress, the Honorable GLEN BROWDER of Alabama's Third Congressional District.

I am very pleased to offer for the RECORD, the following resolution by the trustees of Jacksonville State University in honor of GLEN BROWDER.

The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas Professor Glen Browder distinguished himself during the sixteen years he taught political science on the graduate and undergraduate levels at Jacksonville State University, staying current with his research interests in scientific polling and other aspects of the discipline, and

Whereas Professor Browder was elected to the Alabama House of Representatives in 1982 and served Northeast Alabama well as an advocate of the state public school system, higher education, and the law enforcement profession, and

Whereas Professor Browder brought a new era of professionalism to the Office of Secretary of State when he took office in January, 1987, working diligently to assist local governments throughout Alabama in their efforts to update voter registration lists and modernize the election system, receiving major credit for the passage of the Fair Campaign Practices Act, and

Whereas a void was created by the untimely death of Congressman William F. "Bill" Nichols, leaving Northeast Alabama without a senior Congressman, and

Whereas Professor Browder was given a mandate by the voters with overwhelming victories in the primary and general elections, and

Whereas Professor Browder will begin representing the people of the Third Congressional District on April 18, 1989: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Trustees of Jacksonville State University hereby salute and congratulate Professor Browder on his recent success and offer best wishes for continued success as he serves his district, state, and country.

FEDERAL FUNDING FOR CRITICAL PENINSULA TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, significant improvement of local transportation is the issue of greatest concern to residents of the San Francisco Peninsula. I am delighted to report to my colleagues here in the Congress that significant progress is being made in dealing with these urgent transportation needs.

Local officials in the bay area have put together a comprehensive rail extension program that addresses our urgent transportation needs. It is a model program that involves the close cooperation of local government and local transportation officials, and it has the strong support of the entire bay area congressional delegation.

I commend the local officials—board members of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission [MTC] and the Bay Area Rapid Transit District [BART]—for their hard work and dedicated efforts in reaching agreement on this most important initiative, which will substantially improve transportation throughout the entire bay area.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call special attention to the efforts of officials of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority [SamTrans] and the leaders of San Mateo County, and particularly San Mateo County Supervisor Tom Nolan, who made a major effort to reach agreement and cooperate with other bay area jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, the financing of this program is significant because it involves a substantial local contribution. The people of the bay area, and particularly the San Francisco Peninsula, have indicated their serious interest in dealing with their transportation problems by making a substantial local financial commitment. Of the total $2.4 billion cost of these transportation improvements, the Federal Government is being asked to assume only 29 percent of the cost. State funds will cover about 9 percent of the total, and the rest will be paid by local government units.

I want to call the particular attention of my colleagues to the fact that San Mateo County, the area I represent in the Congress, is making a $600 million contribution to the mass transit project from new sales taxes that the citizens of the peninsula agreed to pay for better transportation. That contribution, Mr. Speaker, represents one-quarter of the total costs of this project.

As my fellow colleagues in the Congress can see, we are requesting Federal funding as only one element in this overall package. I would like to emphasize, however, that this is a critical portion. The funding for the entire package is complex and all pieces of the puzzle must be in place for it to proceed, and Federal funding must be committed in order to trigger the various local and State contributions. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, the Members of the bay area congressional delegation—both Democrats and Republicans—are asking that Federal funds be specifically earmarked for this package of projects. The entire bay area congressional delegation has endorsed the proposal.

Since the Congress will shortly consider the transportation appropriations legislation that will include earmarked funds for this project, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the testimony of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission of the San Francisco Bay Area be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my colleagues can better understand the importance and background of this funding request.

TESTIMONY OF THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

Chairman Lehman and members of the Committee, I am Rod Diridon, Chairperson of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors. My fellow MTC Commissioner with me today is Tom Nolan, a member of the San Mateo Board of Supervisors and Chairman of SamTrans, the transit operator for the County. Together, we are joined by Keith Bernard, General Manager of the Bay Area Rapid Transit District—BART.

Thank you for providing the opportunity to present a status report on the development of our rail extension program in the San Francisco Bay Area.

MTC sponsors the overall rail improvement program which includes extensions for four separate but interconnected systems. The four systems run the gamut of rail service ranging from the Guadalupe light rail system in Santa Clara County to San Francisco's metro-rail, the CalTrain commuter rail and the BART heavy rail system. The MTC program, adopted in March, 1988, embodies improvements and extensions of all four systems.

The Santa Clara Guadalupe light rail line will be extended in the Tasman corridor to the east to Milpitas and to the west to Sunnyvale and Mountain View. The Muni Metro in San Francisco envisions short extensions that will link existing lines. CalTrain extensions to the north and south will improve service into downtown San Francisco and in San Jose. BART's extensions are planned from Daly City to the San Francisco International Airport with other extensions planned to West Pittsburg, Dublin, and Warm Springs in the East Bay.

The Muni Metro extension and CalTrain southern extension are financed by commitments predating MTC's current extension program. The remaining CalTrain, BART and Santa Clara extensions total 35 miles which are estimated to cost $2.4 billion in current dollars. The sources of funds proposed to finance the $2.4 billion are as summarized at the easel (Attachment 2). We are proud to report that over 60% of the total cost comes from local taxes, 10% from State grants and less than 30% from proposed federal grants. Secretary Skinner needs look no further than the Bay Area to find very strong local commitment.

Our FY 1990 request is for the BART Colma Station, which is the first of four new stations to be built on the way to the San Francisco Airport, and the Tasman Corridor extension of the Santa Clara light rail system. We seek $30 million for Colma Station construction and $4 million for Tasman preliminary engineering.

We seek also a Congressional push in support of planning for the next round of extensions in the form of report language which would encourage UMTA to permit an alternative analysis for a BART extension to San Jose. Given the long time needed to perform such work, it is not too soon to begin the next round of planning.

In a moment Tom and Keith will briefly discuss the BART extensions. The Tasman project is in my county, Santa Clara, where it will link the soon to be completed Guadalupe light rail line with the CalTrain service in the west and a future BART extension on the east. Your support made the Guadalupe project possible—the northern segment runs impressively now—and the planned extensions will fill out the network. Thanks so much for your help.

Permit me to return for a minute to the very strong local commitment that supports the MTC program. The program was first adopted in March, 1988, partly in response to admonition from our Congressional delegation and your Committee. We have made

surprising progress since then. First there was a historic agreement between BART and SamTrans which provides for a $200 million transfer of local funds from SamTrans to BART. Next there were two successful local elections which together with previously voted-on funds, provide $1.3 billion in local sales tax support. In further reaffirmation, the voters in 7 counties gave a 70 percent approval of a bridge toll increase which provides another $150 million. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) has pledged $200 million plus $48 million inflation allowance to the plan. And finally, UMTA Administrator, Al DelliBovi awarded a $10 million grant for environmental studies and preliminary engineering to get the ball rolling.

Despite our best efforts and the support of your committee, the federal share of our proposed rail extension program will be in jeopardy if the Administration's transit budget proposals prevail. The overall transit budget must be sustained in order for there to be a sufficient UMTA Section 3 new starts program to draw upon. We recognize we must work with our colleagues in the transit industry to help you preserve the larger transit program.

Now let me ask my colleagues here today to outline briefly the historic BART/SamTrans agreement which is central to the substantial local funding found in our proposal.

TESTIMONY OF TOM NOLAN, MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF THE MTC OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA, MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY, AND CHAIRMAN OF SAMTRANS

I would like to emphasize the major local commitment made by this region as a whole and by my county in particular.

San Mateo County voters have passed a series of elections that are relevant to our claim to be a partner in this program. The first ½¢ sales tax for transit passed in 1974. Elections to authorize use of these revenues for BART were approved in 1985 and 1987. And finally, another ½¢ sales tax for improving CalTrain as part of a larger transportation package was adopted in June, 1988. Altogether, SamTrans pledges almost $600 million to the $2.4 billion rail extension program.

The June, 1988 vote came close on the heels of our agreement with BART regarding the terms and conditions associated with extending BART into our county and to the airport. The payment by San Mateo to BART in increments which will total $200 million, tied to development of the airport line, makes it possible for East Bay counties to realize longstanding rail extensions there. It also provides the key to East Bay support for federal funding of an extension in our county. The message is clear: all pieces of this puzzle, including federal funding, must fit in order for progress to be made.

TESTIMONY OF KEITH BERNARD, GENERAL MANAGER OF THE BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT (BART)

I would like to briefly describe to you the Colma Station Project which is the subject of our request for funding.

The Colma Station will be located 1.5 miles south of the existing Daly City Station in unincorporated San Mateo County, adjacent to the town of Colma and next to our new yard facility. The Colma Station is the first of our stations planned for an extension of BART to the San Francisco International Airport. This extension is the key element in the Bay Area regional rail agreement which will deliver three BART extensions in the East Bay—from Concord to West Pittsburg in Contra Costa County, and San Leandro to Dublin and from Fremont to Warm Springs in Alameda County.

The Colma Station is expected to attract 15,000 trips a day and to cost ninety million dollars; 25% to be funded by SamTrans and 75% by the Federal Government. The station will be ideally located. It will be directly accessible from both an interstate freeway and a major arterial serving several San Mateo County cities. Plenty of parking is planned; approximately 2,200 spaces.

The station will serve two primary purposes. It will 1. relieve the heavily utilized and congested Daly City Station and 2. provide improved access to BART for Mateo County residents.

Over 80% of the current Daly City Station patrons reside in San Mateo County. Daly City is our most heavily utilized station outside of downtown San Francisco. It is expected that San Mateo County's demand for BART will continue to expand because of anticipated employment and population growth in Northern San Mateo County over the next decade.

The Colma Station project has also been the subject of a federally sponsored alternative analysis and environmental study completed last fall. In December, the BART Colma Station was selected as the locally preferred alternative.

The Colma project has a total cost per new rider which is below the federal cost effectiveness threshold. We expect to be ready to begin construction in the FY 1990.

Please support the program including Colma Station funding this year so we will all be able to get around the region in the future.

PAUL COVERDELL FOR DIRECTOR OF PEACE CORPS

HON. RICHARD RAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD my testimony to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on behalf of the nomination of Georgia State Senator Paul Coverdell to be Director of the Peace Corps.

The testimony follows:

It is my pleasure to testify on behalf of Senator Paul Coverdell. Senator Coverdell has long been an influential Georgian. He has represented Georgia and his constituents in an admirable manner and I want to commend the administration for recognizing his qualifications and ability.

Senator Coverdell was first elected to the Georgia General Assembly in 1970, at the age of 31. In 4 short years he rose to his current rank of Republican leader of the Georgia State Senate, a position he has held since 1974. Although the Republicans control less than 20 percent of the State legislature, he has often been recognized as one of the most effective legislators in the general assembly. He was co-founder and president of the National Republican Legislators Association from 1979-1981, and chairman of the Georgia Republican Party from 1985-1987. He was chairman of the National State Legislators for Reagan/Bush in 1980 and 1984, and chairman of the National Legislators for Bush in 1988.

Senator Coverdell has been an active participant in bipartisan efforts to improve ethics laws, reform the State pension system, and rewrite senate rules to allow greater openness in government. He has also supported legislation which raised the drinking age, reformed drunk driving laws, and required seat belt use.

Senator Coverdell founded the Urban Studies Institute, which focuses on urban issues. His efforts in this area have helped to establish an increase in funding to Grady Hospital, the public hospital for the indigent. He is recognized for his successful effort to eliminate the double taxation of city residents.

Senator Coverdell has been a life-long conservationist and active supporter of urban neighborhoods. He has been an opponent of highways that threatened to destroy in-town parks and neighborhoods. In this regard, he has been a strong supporter of MARTA, Atlanta's rapid transit system.

Senator Coverdell is an excellent choice to head the Peace Corps. He has spent his life involved in humanitarian service and community activities. He has repeatedly shown his commitment and dedication to public service.

Senator Coverdell is a loyal and dedicated member of his political party, but he is known for his strong support as a nonpartisan when it comes down to supporting the best interest of our Nation and its citizens. As a Democrat, I have the highest respect for his integrity, credibility, and dependability.

The Peace Corps is an international development program which is respected throughout the world. Senator Coverdell would continue this fine tradition, and work to fulfill President Kennedy's belief that America has a crucial role to play in the betterment of humanity.

CONGRESSIONAL CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL FOR SOVIET JEWS—"POOR RELATIVES"

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take the opportunity today to join with my colleagues in support of the Conscience Vigil for Soviet Jews, sponsored by the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews.

It seems that almost daily there are new and surprising changes taking place in the Soviet Union under the leadership of President Mikhail Gorbachev. Certainly we in the West welcome any and all overtures from the Soviet Union which lead us toward a stronger sense of global peace and cooperation, and which contribute to greater economic and political security for the citizens of that vast nation. It remains, however, ever important that we continue to be vigilant in demanding that true freedom is achieved for all people of the Soviet Union. A prisoner who is taken from behind bars but who is prevented from practicing freedom of religion or freedom to return to the land of his or her people is still a prisoner.

To that end, I should like to appeal to my colleagues here in Congress to join with me in

calling on the Soviet Union to address an extremely important problem which has come to be described as that of the "poor relative." Poor relatives are people who are prevented from even applying to emigrate from the Soviet Union because they cannot obtain the necessary notarized waivers from their families.

Article 24 of the Soviet "Regulations on Entering and Leaving the U.S.S.R."—effective January 1, 1987—states:

Applications to travel abroad from the U.S.S.R. for family reunification shall be examined on presentation of . . . substantively certified statements from the family members remaining in the U.S.S.R. and from the former spouse (if there are children under the age of majority from this marriage) showing that the traveler has no outstanding obligations toward them under U.S.S.R. law.

That article has created a significant barrier to emigration. Jewish activists in the U.S.S.R. estimate that there are hundreds of poor relatives and thousands of Jews who have not even attempted to apply for emigration because of article 24. While the Soviets allege that article 24 is designed to protect the family, in effect, the law works to do just the opposite—it destroys families by coercing applicants' relatives to veto their applications. Many times relatives refuse to sign a waiver because they fear retribution from Soviet authorities, demand a ransom, or simply take revenge on the applicant. The requirement established by article 24 is unreasonable in the Soviet system where elderly parents receive pensions and divorced parents of minor children routinely tender child support payments. And since no effective appeals process currently exists, a would-be emigre can not apply to waive the requirement or ask the State to examine the grounds for the relatives' veto. Thus, the applicants' relative has unreasonable and complete control over the person's desire to emigrate.

While Soviet officials have promised to establish a legal process by which poor relatives can appeal the financial claims brought against them, to date they have not done so.

The Union of Councils for Soviet Jews has recommended a cessation of all family-related restrictions whatsoever. I should like to join them in support of that goal. Permission from a relative is not a legitimate cause for denying emigration.

THE CASE OF ALLA PRILUTSKAYA

Alla Prilutskaya is a poor relative who has twin daughters. Although her former husband left Alla when the twins were 5 years old, he will not give her the required affidavit. The girls, Masha and Vika, are now 14 years old and have had no contact with their father during all the years of his absence. He has been vindictive toward Alla and has tried to blackmail her. He is currently demanding 40,000 rubles in exchange for his signature on the required affidavit.

Alla goes to her place of work and talks to her colleagues, and the twins have written letters to their father and his boss, trying to persuade him to give them the required papers. Alla took part in the women's hunger strike March 8–10, as did the girls. Beginning on March 27, Alla and the girls have been demonstrating in front of their father's institute on Mondays and Thursdays from 5:44 p.m. until 6:25 p.m.—Moscow time. Alla was arrested and detained for several hours by the militia on two separate occasions since she and her daughters began this most recent protest.

Alla's case is compelling and I appeal to my colleagues to support her efforts to receive permission to emigrate. She is asking that telegrams be sent to her husband's place of work. His name is Edward Prilutskaya, and his work address is Znipi Energoprom, Semenoroskaya Nab. 2–1, Moscow (Attention: Vadim Semionovic, Director).

Tragically, the case of Alla and her daugthers is not unique, and we must continue to work with the Soviet Union to reverse this harmful practice. The poor relatives have organized an extremely active group, and had held weekly demonstrations for several months in front of the Lenin Library in Moscow which were often broken up even before they were started. They publish a poor relatives bulletin which is widely disseminated in the U.S.S.R. But they need our support. In the spirit of glasnost and in the spirit of peace, I appeal to the U.S.S.R. to repeal all family-related emigration restrictions, so that the plight of the poor relatives of the Soviet Union can be finally resolved.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST WINNER

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that Troy James Nelson of Rugby, ND, received eighth place honors in the Voice of Democracy broadcast scriptwriting contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary. The following speech, "Preparing for America's Future," was one of nine national winners selected from more than 250,000 entries.

PREPARING FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By Troy James Nelson)

Ever since the beginning of this great nation by our founding forefathers, American leaders and citizens alike have been steadily planning for this country's future. The first President of the United States, George Washington, strongly believed we could become a great and powerful nation. He followed through with his belief for the future by becoming chairman of the Constitutional Committee and by ratifying what was to be this country's first big step toward democratic freedom, prosperity, and justice for all with the signing of the Constitution of the United States of America.

Echos of future prosperity and peace rang out as well with another great American legend and leader, Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln's resounding call for peace and loyalty between all men, no matter their religion, race, or color, was finally heard through the words of the Emancipation Proclamation.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy had another dream for America's future. His dream was to land an American on the surface of the moon and to explore that wide world of open darkness known as space. Although the dream finally came true in 1969, it was too late for one of America's greatest and most respected leaders ever. J.F.K., who was brutally assassinated in Dallas in 1963, had a dream for America's future—a dream that became a reality six years after his death.

Martin Luther King, Jr. had a dream for the future as well. His dream was one that involved that of public participation. Martin Luther King, Jr. dreamed that in the future, blacks could accept whites and whites could accept blacks as to who they were, men created equally. King's dream was stopped short as he became another fallen leader and part of America's past and history.

These days as we look toward the future, we can see many different goals, dreams, and ideas which need to be met and emphasized. I believe that blacks and whites should become of one, and realize who we really are—men and women created equally. I believe we should further our space explorations by reaching out into the unknown and learning what we can learn. I believe we should continue to work on world peace, not just between ourselves and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, but rather between ourselves and every other country on this planet. I believe that we can make our nation, the United States, strong again. We as citizens can out run crime, rid our cities and schools of drugs, and keep our country clean of all that is unjust and unright.

I finally believe that we can only make our future what we want it to be through today's young people. By continuing education in good public and private schools, we can educate today's young people to become the strong leaders we will need in the future. Leaders who will see that all of our dreams, goals, and ambitions as a country and as individuals come true. In preparing for America's future, it only makes sense that we enhance, extend, and encourage education to young and old alike. We need today's young people to become the leaders of tomorrow. Leaders who will lead in technical advances such as a cure for AIDS and leaders in political office to preserve and make peace in our country. Leaders who will reach beyond the limits of reality, and reach into tomorrow, the future. To make this nation great, we must begin now, to prepare for America's future?

FEDERAL ANTIDRUG HOUSING INITIATIVES GATHER SUPPORT

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, only recently, National Drug Policy Director William J. Bennett announced an emergency plan to tackle the escalating drug and violence problems plaguing the metropolitan Washington area.

In addition to measures to create more jail space, reinvigorate law enforcement activities and promote education and prevention programs, the Federal plan includes new initiatives to clean up the public housing system in the District.

Housing and Urban Development Secretary Jack Kemp, a former colleague, is spearheading this effort to ferret our drug criminals from public housing units, heighten security throughout the projects and physically improve

the system. Secretary Kemp has indicated his desire to take this agenda of action nationwide.

As vice chairman of the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control and a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee with jurisdiction over HUD, I applaud these efforts to make our public housing neighborhoods safe again for their residents.

The Kemp plan has also caught the attention of the Washington Post. I commend this commentary to my colleagues and ask that it be reprinted in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 18, 1989]

MR. KEMP'S PLANS FOR D.C.

Like the plans of national drug policy director William J. Bennett for the District of Columbia, the measures announced by Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Jack Kemp will no doubt encounter their share of bureaucratic objections from city hall's corps of gift-horse diagnosticians. There's always the we're-doing-the-best-we-can faction and the only-with-federal-zillions-more school of apologists. But neither this city nor the new administration in the White House should squander a good shot at making a difference in housing conditions here. Secretary Kemp's proposals may well include some actions already being taken by the local government, but they represent more than just a commitment to a quick-fix plan for evicting drug pushers.

The federal plan for housing would repair public areas, restore and rent vacant apartments and beef up security. HUD officials have said the department will use federal modernization funds to help the District pay for changes. HUD will ease lease grievance procedures to hasten evictions of drug offenders from federally funded projects, try to evict drug users who receive rent subsidies, help set up antidrug hot lines and see to it that vacant apartments are inaccessible to drug users. Other changes may include improved tenant management systems, identification cards for residents and even organized sports and other recreational activities for children in public housing units.

The point is not to create even more repressive conditions than those that exist. D.C. housing director Roland Turpin is understandably cautious about embracing everything in the federal package but does say he welcomes the "technical and financial assistance from HUD" that is needed to restore order to the 57 projects in the system. Mr. Turpin says he hopes this is not an attempt by HUD "to make unilateral decisions about what should happen in this city . . . . We need to work with the residents in making those changes."

Fair enough. Public housing residents share the same hopes as others in the District of Columbia for safe and secure neighbors. Secretary Kemp, who comes to this subject with experience and understanding, surely shares these hopes too. If they can be realized, there will be more than enough credit for all who helped make it happen.

GENTLEMAN FARMER

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I grew up in the heart of a rural Maryland farm community, where it was said that a gentleman farmer was the one who had enough spare time to read all the material the Federal Government prints about farming. I can testify that no one, gentleman farmer or not, has anywhere near enough time to read through the morass of technical reports, program regulations, and agency guidelines that surround our farm programs.

Mr. Speaker, as I stand before you today, farmers across our Nation are making financial management decisions which will have a direct impact on the survival of our family farms. In today's modern economy, a family farmer is required to make many of the same financial decisions that a large corporation does. He has to purchase supplies, make capital investments, obtain business loans, and market his product. The one decision the farmer has avoided making, however, is the purchase of crop insurance.

Unfortunately, in these times of climatic changes, fluctuating export levels and higher input costs, farmers cannot afford to play Russian roulette with their financial security. Therefore, it is imperative that farmers purchase crop insurance.

I know from speaking to my own farmers in the First Congressional District of Maryland there are many problems with crop insurance which serve as a disincentive to farmer participation. Fortunately, Congress has historically demonstrated a commitment to making the crop insurance system work. I share this commitment.

When Congress last attempted to reform the FCIC in 1980, three very important goals were established:

First, farm acreage participation should be increased from 11 to 50 percent.

Second, Federal disaster payments should be eliminated.

Third, Federal crop insurance should become an integral aspect of farm management practices.

Unfortunately, as we review the results of crop insurance over the last 8 years, the progress on these three objectives has been dismal. Only 26 percent of eligible farm acreage is now insured under the current crop insurance system. And while the 100th Congress passed the largest farm disaster bill in the history of the United States, totaling $3.6 billion in aid to farmers, crop insurance has not become an integral part of farm management. The 1987 acreage participation rates for the mid-Atlantic region reflect the failure of this goal. New Jersey and Pennsylvania have farm acreage participation rates of 2.1 and 1.6 percent respectively. And in my own State of Maryland only 2.9 percent of eligible farmland is insured against crop loss.

After a review of these numbers, it is obvious that we have a long way to go before crop insurance is the core of a farmer's financial management.

Congress reaffirmed a commitment to crop insurance in the 1988 Disaster Assistance Act. A provision in this bill established a Federal Crop Insurance Commission to review the current system and make recommendations on how to improve the program. This Commission will submit an interim report next week and make a final report on July 1, 1989.

In Maryland, a State task force recently completed a review of crop insurance to assist congressional efforts to reform the FCIC. These efforts, in conjunction with comments from Mr. Bob Wilson, president of the Maryland Farm Bureau; Mr. Wayne Cawley, Maryland Secretary of Agriculture; and First District farmers, enabled me to formulate a legislative proposal, H.R. 1388, to reform the crop insurance system. H.R. 1388 will improve farmer access to information, reduce Government bureaucracy, create a more equitable price election system, and eliminate unnecessary barriers to farmer participation.

A 1988 General Accounting Office [GAO] crop insurance study of 10 States, including my home State of Maryland, stated that one of the major reasons for low-farmer participation was that "many agents do not have the knowledge or training to explain the program accurately."

My bill addresses this problem by offering agents an incentive to improve their knowledge of crop insurance. The FCIC will be required to offer regular crop insurance training classes and tests to individual agents which upon successful completion will provide the agent with a certificate of competence. This certificate, which will be similar to a bank's FDIC label, will provide the agent with a 2-percent bonus on each sale. I believe these changes will assist in increasing the number and improving the quality of agents who elect to sell crop insurance.

Another critical area of concern addressed in my bill is the lack of detailed information currently available to farmers. H.R. 1388 addresses this problem by designating the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service [ASCS] as the Federal Crop Insurance Information Center. This center will maintain current policy information and agent lists to assist farmers in the important decision of purchasing crop insurance.

Currently, the FCIC requires a farmer to provide actual production history records when establishing a yield to purchase crop insurance. For farmers who have kept complete records over the years, establishing their yield is not a problem. However, for many farmers this provision is a hindrance to program participation. My bill gives the farmer the option of choosing to use his ASCS records when establishing his yield, or, if he has them, his actual production records. By eliminating this potential barrier to participation, we are opening crop insurance up to many farmers who would otherwise not participate in the program.

In the area of the Price Election System, I think it's important that we establish a rate system based on projected State and local prices instead of a projected national average. A national projection distorts the premium charged to farmers and the insurable rates for a particular commodity. Two examples involving the soybean crop for the State of Maryland illustrate this point well.

In 1985, a farmer could purchase a maximum coverage of $6.50 on a bushel of soybeans. In the State of Maryland, however, the price of a bushel of soybeans was $5.01. Since premiums are based on the amount of coverage purchased, Maryland farmers paid a

higher premium for unnecessary additional insurance.

The opposite situation occurred in 1987, when the average price of soybeans in Maryland was $5.90 per bushel, whereas the maximum coverage that could be purchased was $5. Therefore, farmers choosing the maximum coverage of 75 percent—25 percent deductible—also had to accept an additional 18-percent deductible because of the price election/price discrepancy. This is not acceptable. Moving to a State/county projection system would establish an overall parity in determining the price of coverage for a commodity, thus making the program more sensible for farmers to invest in coverage.

H.R. 1388 also seeks to eliminate the 10-percent penalty charged by the FCIC to farmers wishing to insure their various county farms as separate units. Both the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Maryland Farm Bureau support this change.

Finally, the bill addresses the coverage of full season and double crop soybeans. Currently, the FCIC insures full season and double crop soybeans as a single policy, even though both have different risks. Any farmer will tell you that these are two different crops and should be insured separately. Therefore, it would make sense that FCIC offer two separate policies. I believe this change, along with the other provisions in my bill, will make crop insurance a better management tool for farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced H.R. 1388 to reduce the Government bureaucracy, restrictive regulations, and high premiums which discourage farmers from purchasing crop insurance. By making the program more appealing to farmers, participation rates can be increased, premiums can be lowered and Government expenditures reduced. Farmers in Maryland's First District don't want a new Government program; they want a program that works. The American farmer deserves this protection. I want to urge my colleagues to support this bill.

RADIOVISION RECOGNIZES ITS VOLUNTEERS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues a fine organization that performs an outstanding service throughout southeastern New York.

RADIOVISION was founded 9 years ago to provide closed-circuit programming for the blind and the sight impaired. In many ways, RADIOVISION is a "window on the world" for the sightless and the sight impaired throughout the Hudson River Valley. News items, feature articles, and good literature are just a few of the programming services that RADIOVISION offers its subscribers.

Incredibly, this fantastic, 7-day-a-week service is provided solely through volunteers. This weekend, RADIOVISION is conducting its ninth annual Volunteer Recognition Day, paying tribute to the 106 volunteers who have contributed their time and talents in 1988–1989 to make this the most successful year ever for RADIOVISION.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join with us in congratulating the fine volunteers, and the excellent staff, that have maintained the excellent service that RADIOVISION subscribers have come to expect.

THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION

HON. RON MARLENEE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, I stand with the minority leader as he testifies before the House Rules Committee today to roll back the excessive spending in the dire emergency supplemental appropriations bill.

President Bush requested a $2.1 billion supplemental appropriation to honor previous obligations mandated by law. The bulk of the President's request was targeted on veterans benefits, adequate funding for the Guaranteed Student Loan Program, and payments to States for foster care and adoption assistance.

Now, some have treated this supplemental as political football, to see how much the President will tolerate in lard and pork. Every Member in this body has talked about the need to control the Federal deficit. Yet, this supplemental is double the President's request! Where is all of the high-sounding rhetoric on the other side of the aisle to control the spending appetite of Congress?

It is simply outrageous to blackmail veterans health care funding by attaching $250 million for Japanese-American reparations to this supplemental bill. Last year, I promised my constituents that I would not support funding for reparations, especially when veterans have to beg and grovel to receive the Federal benefits they have earned with their blood and sacrifice.

I also will not stand for increasing the firefighting budget of the Forest Service by 140 percent over the President's request—until I receive some assurance that the let burn policy will be abolished and some of this money will be directed to private property owners who lost their livelihood because of this policy. These private landowners should receive priority in payment for damages from the Government rather than pay the bureaucrats who propagated this fallacious policy.

Mr. Speaker, let's put action behind our words and defeat attempts to add nonemergency spending to the supplemental appropriations bill.

THE SECRET CAMERA OF ANGELO SPINELLI

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention to the bravery of Mr. Angelo Spinelli, a constituent from Hallandale, FL. While serving as an Army Signal Corps war photographer in World War II, he became a prisoner of war and was kept prisoner for 27 months. For 20 of those months, he was kept at Stalag III-B in Furstenburg, Germany.

Mr. Spinelli was able to use what little resources he had to barter for a camera and film. During the 27 months that he was a POW, he bravely cataloged POW life without ever being caught.

These photographs comprise the largest collection of its kind. Consequently, they have been used in many different magazines, books, and television series in an attempt to provide an accurate and comprehensive portrayal of the difficult life of an American POW during World War II.

At the end of my remarks, I am inserting an article from the April 1989 issue of Soldiers magazine, which used eight of Mr. Spinelli's photographs, entitled "Stalag III-B." The article also contains the story of "The Secret Camera of Angelo Spinelli."

As his Congressman, I ask you to join me in a long overdue salute to Angelo Spinelli, a man whose courage and dedication to his country deserves the admiration of us all.

[From Soldiers magazine, Apr. 1989]

THE SECRET CAMERA OF ANGELO SPINELLI

(By SFC Frank Cox)

TUNISIA, Nov. 19, 1943.—General Order No. 139 is published by Headquarters, North African Theater of Operations. It's an award, the Legion of Merit, for a young combat photographer reported missing in action. Unknown to Sgt. Angelo M. Spinelli, captured nine months earlier during a tank battle near Faid Pass, he'd been honored for reconnaissance work that helped the advancing allies.

Spinelli was one of 21,363 U.S. service members reported missing after the Tunisian phase of the Northwest Africa Campaign.

"My luck and film ran out," Spinelli's account of his capture reads in Yankee Kriegies, a YMCA publication printed after World War II. "Kriegies" is short for the German term "Kriegsgefangenen," or prisoners of war.

Loaded into a boat, he and other captives were shipped to Italy. There they were crammed into excrement- and urine-fouled railroad box cars and transported to Stalag III-B in Furstenburg, Germany. Spinelli was confined there for 20 months.

Hour by hour, day after day he and more than 25,000 U.S. and Allied soldiers were warehoused in camps separated by barbed wire. It didn't take him long to learn to barter with the guards. Soldiers traded cigarettes, chocolate and other small luxuries in Red Cross food parcels for German food, soap and other essentials in short supply. For months he worked on one guard, an older man who claimed he wasn't a Nazi.

Eight packs of cigarettes got the captive photographer a compact Voigtlander Besser 120mm folding-bellows camera. Later, two packs got him a folding tripod which opened to about 5 feet and collapsed to 8 inches. "One pack would buy a roll of film," Spinelli recalled in his Hallendale, Fla., condominium last December. "At one time I had as many as 30 rolls. I used to ask other prisoners to try to buy film from guards. If they could get it, I would pay them a couple of packs of cigarettes"—a pack each for the

POW and guard. He even bribed one guard for some cement, which he used to construct a hiding place for his new gear.

Because he couldn't read the German writing on the film, Spinelli had to guess lens settings and shutter speeds. When a roll was exposed, he'd bribe a guard to get the film developed.

When moving about, Spinelli hid the camera and tripod under a pair of baggy pants he'd gotten in a trade with a paratrooper. "If I had stopped to think about what I was doing in that POW camp—taking pictures of guards being bribed and other things—I wouldn't have done it," he said, referring to the routine shakedowns prisoners feared.

"There wasn't a day that went by that we didn't think we might die," he said. "Some of the 'goons' and camp officers used to tell us we'd never get out alive. I wanted to take the pictures so there'd be something left if I didn't make it out."

He did get out of Stalag III-B, only to end up in another camp where he remained—with his film—for another seven months. As he entered the new camp, Spinelli bribed a guard to avoid being searched. When liberated in May 1945 by Russian troops marching on Berlin, he had more than 1,200 negatives.

Spinelli secretly documented POW sporting events and musical productions. Through his illicit camera, he also captured day-to-day realities and grim reminders of how dire a situation the POWs were in. One photo shows men sleeping outdoors to avoid ticks, lice and other pests infesting the barracks. Another shows two men carrying an inadequate tub of potato soup rationed to feed 150 to 200 hungry prisoners. He even snapped a candid photo of a Russian prisoner in the adjacent compound who'd been shot dead for picking up a cigarette tossed to him by an American.

Spinelli wants people to see the photographs and understand how prisoners survived their ordeal. Fourteen of his pictures were published in the Time-Life book Prisoners of World War II, in magazines and newspapers. He exhibits his work, some 200 of the best photos, whenever possible. His next scheduled showing will be at an ex-POW convention in Niagara Falls, N.Y., in October.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., FEDERAL HOLIDAY COMMISSION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1989

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Martin Luther King, Jr., Federal Holiday Commission Act. I would like to thank and commend the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Census and Population, Congressman THOMAS SAWYER, and Congressman JOHN CONYERS for their dedication and commitment to making the Commission permanent.

In 1984, the Martin Luther King, Jr., Holiday Commission was established to inspire nationwide activities in recognition of the first Federal legal holiday honoring Dr. King. At that time, 29 States observed the birthday of Reverend King. This year, 43 States and over 100 foreign countries recognize and celebrate his birthday. Clearly, a diversity of cultures, races, and nationalities embrace the legacy and ideology of Martin Luther King, Jr., expressed most significantly by his philosophy of nonviolence in the civil rights movement.

If legislation is not enacted to make the Commission permanent, the Commission's authorization is scheduled to expire this month. As a result of the dedication and commitment of the Commission, the dream of Martin Luther King, Jr., is being realized by a new generation of young people. The Commission provides a broad variety of services to almost every segment of our society including, but not limited to, voter registration, educational youth conferences, community hunger programs, and drug abuse assistance. In addition, the Commission provides assistance to various State, municipal, and international organizations promoting peace and goodwill throughout our Nation and across international boundaries.

I am convinced that the Martin Luther King, Jr., Federal Holiday Commission will ensure that the legacy of Dr. King will be respectfully remembered and that his dream for all Americans to be treated equally regardless of race, creed, color, gender or socioeconomic status will come to pass. Therefore, I urge all of my colleagues to support the Martin Luther King, Jr., Federal Holiday Commission Act.

THE VALDEZ CONNECTION

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, "fierce storms, treacherous winds, fog, icebergs—and an ill-placed rock—make Alaska's oilport hazardous beyond belief. * * *"

If I asked you who first made that statement, you would probably guess any one of the officials looking at the recent Prince William Sound disaster. You would be wrong. That statement was made by Philip Fradkin, an author, in an article he wrote on "The Valdez Connection" for Audubon Magazine * * * in 1977.

There is a great deal of food for thought in the article. I urge you to read it carefully in light of the present events in Prince William Sound.

Let me highlight some of the problems Mr. Fradkin predicted—with great clarity and accuracy—in 1977. It is a tragic story of political manipulation, incompetence, and arrogant overconfidence.

The environmental impact statement for the Trans-Alaska pipeline glossed over the sea leg portion of the oil transportation system.

The close bonds between the Coast Guard and oil companies that had formed—and the combined technical expertise of these two groups—made it difficult, if not impossible, for the States and environmental groups to effectively challenge tanker safety requirements and regulations.

Despite repeated assurances from Interior Secretary Rogers C.B. Morton to the Congress during the debate on the pipeline that the tankers would have double bottoms, no such requirement was forthcoming.

The 1975 Coast Guard regulations for tankers were protested by the Interior Department and the Environmental Protection Agency because they did not include a double bottom requirement for tankers used in Alaska oil trade. Environmental groups protested, as well, alleging that the regulations were written behind closed doors with the help of study group put together by the American Petroleum Institute.

Senator Warren Magnuson also vigorously objected to the regulations and the manner in which they were developed in a letter to the Secretary of Transportation. Magnuson stated, "I am also concerned that the rules were developed in a manner that relied too heavily on the input of special interests * * *." Magnuson further expressed concern that the Coast Guard "strained to stay within the letter of a treaty—concerning tanker requirements—which had not been sent to the Senate for advice and consent, which is not intended to be exclusive, and which does not cover completely the problem of accidental pollution for ships."

Little was said or done about training or licensing of the tanker crews, even though 50 percent of collision and grounding areas are due to human error. A 1975 OTA report looked at the difference between training for airline and ship's officers and found that the "* * * contrast with aviation in the area of licensing is striking. Marine license in themselves do not assure competency."

The list of concerns goes on and on. As it turns out, the issues raised some 12 years ago are all part of the backdrop of this massive oilspill in Prince William Sound. They include: lack of appreciation and understanding of the hazards of tanker travel through the sound; inadequate standards for tanker safety and pilot training; an unwillingness or inability of anyone to play the "tough cop" with the industry; and, the unwillingness of industry and the Coast Guard to recognize the potential magnitude of the damage that might be inflicted upon the environment should an accident occur.

I urge you to take the time to read this article. It is about warnings we should have heeded, but did not. As we proceed with our inquiries into the Prince William Sound tragedy, we should remember Mr. Fradkin's warnings and, this time, pay attention.

THE VALDEZ CONNECTION

(By Philip L. Fradkin)

("Fierce storms, treacherous winds, fog, icebergs—and an ill-placed rock—make Alaska's oilport hazardous beyond belief; incredibly, no tanker has ever sailed into Valdez, and simulated tests predict calamitous results.")

I have ridden on enough commercial airliners so that the thrill, if not the fear, of flight has worn off. But on occasion, if the flight is to be in clear weather over scenic landscapes, I will disregard my cardinal rule to sit in an aisle seat and have the computer select a window seat. If I am lucky, it will be a window seat with something more than a view of the wing. Under these conditions the loss of easy access to the bathroom, legroom, freedom from claustrophobia, and the chance to be early out of the airplane on

landing is more than a fair trade. From 30,000 feet, what the land is and its uses by man become an exercise is visual rationality, if not altogether reasonable.

This flight from Anchorage on a January morning was one of the best of such experiences for me. The ticket agent had given me a view of half a wing, but the seat was on the side of the plane facing the land, rather than the empty Gulf of Alaska. Up in the late-morning winter sunrise, ascending over Turnagain Arm, across the Kenai Peninsula, east over Prince William Sound, and then that massive corrugated sheet of ice—the Columbia Glacier—came into view, ending abruptly in Columbia Bay, an arm of the sound.

Because I had been studying charts and maps of the area for the previous week, I strained to make out additional landmarks. Yes, there was Valdez Arm funneling into Valdez Narrows, surrounded by snow-covered peaks rising abruptly from the rocky shoreline—a typical glacier-carved fjord. My seat companion, an oil tanker consultant to the State of Alaska, jabbed at the view with his finger. "There, you can see it. A black dot in the middle of the channel." I was tempted to pretend to see what I knew I should be seeing. I tried to imagine seeing it. Then, I believe I saw it—the potentially deadly black dot of Middle Rock in the center of Valdez Narrows.

I am not the only one who has had difficulty seeing Middle Rock, nor am I likely to be the last. Seven years after selection of Valdez as the port from where the trans-Alaska pipeline oil will be shipped, it is just dawning on a lot of government and oil industry experts that there may be serious problems in getting supermarkets in and out of Valdez. There is a chance the supermarkets will go aground on Middle Rock or, more likely, wind up on the opposite shoreline while attempting to avoid it. That is, if they can first miss the icebergs floating in Valdez Arm. Fog or a whiteout from one of the frequent blinding snowstorms (average snowfall is 245 inches a year) would not particularly help matters on the approach. Winds up to 120 miles per hour gusting from different points of the compass also can stir things up.

No pilot has yet been trained to bring supertankers into Valdez. Moreover, if such a vessel strayed from the narrow tanker lanes in Prince William Sound, it would find itself in waters last charted in 1860. This interchange took place last year between a federal official and a veteran barge captain. Official: "On the published chart there is no difference between the 1860 survey of Prince William Sound and what we did in 1973, 1974, and 1975. So if you're outside those traffic lanes, you're on old survey ground." Captain: "We've surveyed a lot of those waters with our keels, you know."

The waters of the sound and, outside, the Gulf of Alaska are the stormiest in the Northern Hemisphere. One hundred-foot-high waves were once recorded on an oil platform in the Gulf. This is what the environmental impact statement records: "Adverse navigational factors are thick fogs, sudden wind and rain squalls and snowstorms, as well as the uncommon occurrence of floating glacial ice, 'bergy bits,' and extreme waves . . . During the winter months the Gulf has the highest frequency of extratropical cyclones in the Northern Hemisphere."

Those are the dry statements contained in a tedious document. Here is what one barge captain said of the winds in and around Valdez: "There's actually no way of getting any idea of how or why or where that wind is going to come from. And it funnels there at the Narrows. You'll get 60- or 70-knot winds right outside the Narrows, and inside Valdez Harbor you'll get 20 or 30 knots."

Add to all this the fact that the supertankers are going to be considerably less safe than what the Nixon Administration promised at the time of the passage of the trans-Alaska pipeline act, and the possibility of oil spills along the southern coast of Alaska, already rated high, is guaranteed to increase.

The real dimensions of the problems are not known since no vessel larger than 28,000 deadweight tons (DWT) has ever entered the port of Valdez. The ships that will haul the oil vary in size from 70,000 DWT to 225,000 DWT. "The difference is like piloting a Cessna 150 and a 747," said one tanker expert. The oil industry did not think trial runs were needed, and it sees its recent acquiescence to demands by the state and Coast Guard to one month of trials with a 120,000 DWT tanker as a public relations gesture.

In fact, no one has taken anything near a comprehensive look at the problems involved in getting the vessels in and out of Valdez and to other West Coast ports. Already there are 6,000 vessel movements a year through the Santa Barbara Channel in southern California. With the additional tanker traffic, new offshore drilling in the channel where the massive 1969 spill took place, and the possibility of explosive-prone liquefied natural gas tankers using a nearby port, the congestion will become acute. The Coast Guard plans no vessel traffic system for the area and has kept the designated traffic lanes within the channel although oil companies have said they prefer the safer outside route for one lane of traffic. Vessels do stay from designated lanes. A collision was narrowly averted recently in the Santa Barbara Channel when two large vessels found themselves traveling straight at each other in the same lane on a clear day.

The environmental impact statement for the trans-Alaska pipeline glosses over the sea leg portion of the oil transportation system, and since its issuance in 1972, all energies have been focused on building the pipeline and terminal in Valdez. The fault is one omission. For the oil industry, it has been due to overconfidence. The industry's maritime experts cite similar narrow harbor entrances elsewhere, but neglect to add all the factors together. The federal regulatory agency—the Coast Guard—has lacked aggressiveness and has been extremely cozy with the industry it is supposed to regulate. The record of the Nixon and Ford administrations is one of broken promises. The only entity that is due credit is the State of Alaska, which has issued a host of warnings, along with Washington and Oregon, that have largely been ignored.

Granted the issues of sea transportation of Alaska oil are immense, as they have been for the entire $10 billion pipeline project. At no time have domestic shipping and oil firms been called upon to furnish such a large fleet for transportation of oil from an area about which so little is known. Nor has the Coast Guard ever regulated the movement of such large vessels in such a hostile environment. However, the tremendously rich waters of southern Alaska, through which a variety of whales and millions of birds pass, are a poor place to experiment on such a large scale.

But I am getting ahead of myself. The destination of the flight out of Anchorage was unknown. Nominally, it was headed for Juneau, but for the second day the airport at Alaska's capital city was closed. It took us three days to make it into Juneau, and while I was flying around at 30,000 feet above Washington, Alaska, and British Columbia, I learned something about the nature of a regulator and those regulated since Coast Guard brass, Alaska bureaucrats, and oil company executives were on the same Seattle, Ketchikan, Yakutat, Cordova, Anchorage, Ketchikan, Seattle, Ketchikan, Juneau merry-go round. At the end of it we felt like Yo-Yos on a 30,000-foot cord and shared a sense of camaraderie.

There was, for example, the five-hour wait starting at 4 a.m. for the departure of the flight from Anchorage. (The next day a Japan Air Lines cargo jet was to crash at this airport, forcing its closure. It was not a good week for commercial flying in Alaska.) The wait was at a time when the Senate Commerce Committee was holding hearings in Washington, D.C., on oil tanker safety and the Coast Guard was taking its lumps on the East Coast. A Coast Guard officer came back from a rack holding a newspaper whose front-page headline proclaimed, "State Raps Coast Guard." It was silently passed around the ranks of gold-braided dark-blue uniforms until one officer remarked with some vehemence, "We have got to establish that we have the same goal."

Another high-ranking officer, a former master of a commercial vessel, commented, "What problem? You have to establish there is a problem. Why I was down in Texas, and they have these bumper stickers, 'Let the bastards freeze in the dark.' " Not all the Coast Guard brass fit the same mold. There was a younger officer who sat mostly by himself. He had taken his chances and widely circulated a controversial proposal that pilots be certified according to vessel size, instead of the present blanket certification for all tankers over 20,000 tons. He was later to take his lumps from industry and pilot representatives.

It struck me later than there was little difference in outlook between Coast Guard officers and oil company shipping experts, most of whom have been ship's masters at one time. Both groups are essentially conservative. They are not trained to take chances or quantum leaps. They revere authority and have developed elaborate systems within the ranks and on board to perpetuate it. Along with airline pilots, ship's captains and the military are the most self-assured professional groups I have met. All these factors add up to a commonality of style, which can form the strongest of bonds. At the Juneau meeting on pipeline tanker traffic to which we were all headed, the Coast Guard officers addressed the oil men as "captain," and the civilians replied with the appropriate rank of the given officer.

Against these bonds and the combined expertise of the two groups it has been impossible for other federal agencies, coastal states, and environmental groups to assert themselves with any effect in the highly technical field of oil tanker safety. But if ever this time has come, it is now in the wake of all the groundings, explosions, and sinkings of oil tankers in recent months.

Indeed, the Coast Guard's record of decision-making on tanker regulations raises the question of whether a military organization should oversee such a civilian activity. Inherent in such an organization are specific tours of duty, then a change just when

knowledge is acquired. An officer who has developed expertise working on vessel traffic systems the last few years remarked, "I will spend three or four years on this and become an authority. Then I will go back to sea duty. Someone will come into this position with no knowledge and have to learn all over again. That is the gap. We just do not have within our ranks the people with expertise in supertankers, so we have to go outside for it."

A former Coast Guard officer who worked in Washington headquarters and retains close ties with his ex-comrades took this longer view: "The Coast Guard has always had the job to protect men and ships from the sea. The ocean has always been the enemy. Now the Ports and Waterways Safety Act comes along and they have to protect the sea from dumb crews and antiquated vessels. In the first instance you have the industry and unions on your side. In the second it is the state governments and environmentalists versus the others." And the Coast Guard has had difficulty in adjusting to the new realities.

The Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972 was signed by President Nixon with this statement: "Under this act the Coast Guard gains much needed new authority to protect against oil spills by controlling vessel traffic in our inland waters and territorial seas . . . and by setting standards for design, construction, maintenance, and operation of tank vessels . . . The legislation provides a firm basis for the safeguards we will need to handle increased tanker traffic with minimum environmental risk." Thus the Coast Guard, whose primary mission had been search and rescue, found itself squarely in the business of setting standards for design and operation of oil tankers for the first time.

The next ringing promise came from Interior Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton who testified at a hearing of the Joint Economic Committee in 1972, "I am convinced that we must seize this opportunity to set new and exacting standards to govern the marine transport of American oil. This goal is worth accomplishing by itself; but, if our standards can set an example for solving the broader problems of international oil movements, we will have accomplished a task of long-range significance for mankind." Referring specifically to transport of Alaska oil, Morton said, "Newly constructed American flag vessels carrying oil from Port Valdez to United States ports will be required to have segregated ballast systems, incorporating double bottoms." Morton repeated these assurances during the debate in Congress on the trans-Alaska pipeline act during the summer of 1973. Few noticed that the Coast Guard, the agency actually charged with making the decision, was saying very little.

In January 1973 the Coast Guard published in the Federal Register an advance notice of rule-making, asking public comment on proposed regulations for segregated ballast and double bottoms on supertankers. The notice stated that final action would be delayed until after the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) conference in London later that year. The position the U.S. delegation took to the IMCO conference was formulated by the Coast Guard. It called for segregated ballast in vessels over 20,000 DWT and double bottoms.

Some words of explanation about this complicated field. Segregated ballast consists of separate tanks for ballast water only. This eliminates the chance of discharge of oil ballast waters in the seas. Double bottoms are two separate watertight shells along the bottom of a ship which protect against grounding accidents. A double hull is the same type of construction, only carried on up the sides of a vessel. Such construction on the sides helps prevent a spill if a tanker collides with another vessel or rams an above-the-waterline object. To complete the definitions, a gas inerting system is a method of filling empty spaces in oil cargo tanks with an inert gas. Such a chemically inactive gas eliminates the potential for an explosion created by petroleum fumes mixing with air. The oil tanker *Sansinena*, which blew up in Los Angeles Harbor on December 17th killing eight and injuring scores of others, had no such system.

At the London conference the U.S. position was overwhelmingly defeated. One participant said, "We were defeated on just plain economics. Nobody wanted to go for double bottoms except the United States." Another member of the U.S. delegation had a different interpretation. An Exxon executive told him the oil firm lobbied 22 countries before the vote. One U.S. delegate felt the Coast Guard did not advance its position forcefully enough. "The speed with which they retreated indicates there may have been some lack of resolve in the first place that easily could have been communicated to their colleagues in other delegations."

Be that as it may, the Coast Guard position was to weaken considerably from this point on. What has maddened critics both inside and outside government is the Coast Guard's insistence it cannot impose tanker requirements for segregated ballasts and double hulls stricter than those agreed to at the IMCO conference, nor can tougher regulations be applied to domestic vessels than foreign tankers. (The Jones Act requires that only vessels constructed in the United States be used in the domestic trade. If it is decided to ship Alaska oil to a foreign country, namely Japan, foreign vessels could be used.)

The position agreed to at London is binding on no one since neither the U.S. Senate nor the IMCO member nations have ratified the treaty. It calls for segregated ballast on tankers of 70,000 DWT, but it is not retroactive for vessels whose construction was contracted prior to January 1, 1976, and that requirement subsequently was adopted by the Coast Guard in late 1975. It will have little effect on the tankers to be used in the Alaskan trade, however. The construction of most of these vessels was contracted before the effective date of the regulations, and with the current glut of oil tankers it is unlikely that many new tankers will be contracted for in the near future. Because the oil may be hauled farther than originally thought—through the Panama Canal to Gulf of Mexico ports or to Japan—a second fleet of older tankers is taking shape. They include the *Manhattan*, built 16 years ago and later converted to test the feasibility of an Arctic Ocean route east for Alaskan oil, and last leased to haul grain to India and Bangla Desh. In 1975 the Coast Guard adopted requirements for gas inerting systems, but they were not made retroactive and only apply to vessels larger than 100,000 DWT. These regulations also will have little effect on the Alaskan trade. No regulations have yet been adopted for double bottoms.

Of the 31 vessels now scheduled to haul Alaskan oil, 13 will not have segregated ballast, 17 will have no gas inerting system, and 20 will not have double bottoms or double hulls. The reason so many were fitted out with safety devices that were not required was because at the time they were ordered in the early 1970s, it was thought the tougher regulations would be adopted. Additionally, what makes a mockery out of the Coast Guard's timidity is that chemical tankers and liquefied flammable gas carriers are required by IMCO codes and Coast Guard regulations to have double bottoms. Double bottoms are found on passenger liners, Navy ships, Coast Guard vessels, container ships, and dry bulk carriers. The supervisor of salvage for the Navy has stated, "I view the probability of a major salvage or pollution incident growing out of the grounding of a large, single-bottom tanker on an order of magnitude greater than for a double-bottom tanker."

Not everyone within the administration was happy with the Coast Guard's position. In August 1974, Interior Secretary Morton wrote the Coast Guard, "The proposed regulations do not, however, require new tank carriers to be constructed with double bottoms, regardless of whether or not the vessels are constructed for, or employed in, the Alaska oil trade . . . The Department of Interior must strongly take issue with this position as it relates to oil transported from Alaska." The Environmental Protection Agency wrote, "We feel, however, that no valid case was made for not including double bottoms in the regulations." But the opposing view was not pushed hard because, as one official said, "The bureaucratic tendency is to accept the views of your sister agency, particularly when they have some kind of expertise."

Environmentalists as a minimum requirement favored double bottoms but preferred double hulls. They did not like the proposed regulations, and eight organizations, including the National Audubon Society, fired off a letter to the Coast Guard pointing out that the regulations had been put together with the help of a "study group" organized by the American Petroleum Institute. It consisted of six representatives from major oil companies, one from a shipping industry trade association, one an independent tanker operator, and three government officials. The group, formed without public notice, met behind closed doors after the public comment period on the regulations had ended. The chairman was a vocal opponent of double bottoms.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee which has jurisdiction over oil tanker safety, wrote Transportation Secretary William Coleman, "I am also concerned that the rules were developed in a manner that relied too heavily on the input of special interests . . . Heavy reliance on special interest input in a public rulemaking process can only erode public confidence in our government." In the letter the Washington senator added, "Instead, the Coast Guard has accepted—on a political rather than a technical basis—the provisions of the 1973 IMCO conference as the basis of its regulatory actions. The Coast Guard strained to stay within the letter of a treaty which had not been sent to the Senate for advice and consent, which is not intended to be exclusive, and which does not cover completely the problem of accidental pollution from ships." Despite these protests, the regulations were finalized.

While most of the debate has focused on construction of vessels and there have been limited gains in this field, little has been

said or done about training and licensing. Over 50 percent of collision and grounding incidents are attributable to human error. The Congressional Office of Technology Assessment pointed out the differences in training and licensing of airline pilots and ship's officers in a 1975 report. Candidates for commercial pilot jobs average four years of college and 1,500 hours of flying time. On this base the airlines pile on their own training schools. After graduation, there are annual retraining sessions. Maritime academies graduate ship's officers, and from there it is mostly on-the-job training. "Relatively few shipowners have any formalized in-house training programs," the report goes on to state. "The contrast with aviation in the area of licensing is striking. Marine licenses in themselves do not assure competency. Licenses of airline flight crewmen come much closer to doing so in light of the extensive formal training and proficiency testing required, coupled with the tough hiring practices of the airlines."

Back to the Juneau meeting. Its genesis was a study conducted by the state's Office of the Pipeline Coordinator on a supertanker simulator at the Netherlands Ship Model Basin. The 160 runs on the simulator did not result in any firm conclusions, but they pointed for the first time in some interesting directions. Although some runs were made under extreme conditions when shipping would normally be closed, certain predictable difficulties were excluded. For example, reduced visibility was not factored into the simulated runs, and it was assumed that all the captains and pilots had previous experience on large tankers. No tugs with barges or fishing boats were placed in the channel, as might be the case under real conditions. Using a 165,000 DWT tanker, the vessel was run in and out of Valdez Narrows under a variety of conditions. The variables were wind, placement and availability of tugs, ballast or loaded condition, and power and rudder failure. Few of the runs followed the specific track down the center of the channel. Most wobbled from side to side, and some wound up on the rocks. One tentative conclusion was that Middle Rock was more a psychological barrier than a physical hazard, because in trying to avoid the rock, and in trying to veer on a dogleg turn at the northern end of the track, most captains overcompensated the ungainly supertankers and wound up on the east side of the channel or on the rocks.

The next set of runs on the simulator probably will be with the rock taken out, the dogleg straightened, and under conditions of poor visibility. The official Coast Guard position is that the rock has not yet been proven to be a hazard to navigation. The Corps of Engineers has estimated it will cost between $12 and $18 million to remove the rock with conventional explosives. The lower figure is to remove it to a 60-foot depth, the higher to 75 feet. The job would take about two years. With the rock out, the channel would be widened from 900 to 1,200 yards.

When the State of Alaska released the report on the simulator tests, the results shook up a few people. The Coast Guard called a first meeting for December 14th in Juneau, and the Alyeska Marine Advisory Committee told those attending that they did not plan to bring a tanker to Valdez for trials prior to the start-up of the pipeline. Alyeska Pipeline Service Company is the consortium of oil companies building the pipeline, but, despite the existence of the marine advisory committee, when asked to comment spokesmen for the company say its jurisdiction ends when a tanker casts off its moorings at the Valdez terminal. From that point on, Alyeska officials say it is a matter for the individual oil companies.

The Coast Guard minutes of the December meeting note, "With regard to maneuverability and other operational data on the TAPS tankers operating specifically in Valdez, industry expressed their intention to rely on existing data from other vessels in other port areas, contending that such data was sufficient and adaptable to the Valdez area." The minutes don't mention it, but tempers began to boil at this point. Charles A. Champion, the hulking state pipeline coordinator, recalled, "In the hall afterward I frankly threatened to punch a few oil people out. I had one by the tie and six backed up in a corner. I was using basic oilfield language. I went back with the admiral [John B. Hayes, commander of the Coast Guard in Alaska] to the hotel room of Exxon. The result of that meeting was that they came out basically to pacify me and decided to bring up a 120,000 DWT tanker for the trials." The Coast Guard minutes end with a note, "The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m." Then there is this addendum, in all capital letters: "At an informal meeting later in the day, the Alyeska Marine Committee advised the Coast Guard and State that, after reconsideration, actual tanker trials and further simulation studies would be conducted."

The program for the tanker trials was worked out at the January 13-14 meetings. In addition to assessing the danger of Middle Rock for the first time with a real, live supertanker, the *ARCO Fairbanks* will be used to determine wake damage, train pilots and masters, test the Coast Guard's new vessel traffic system, docking, anchorages, maneuvering in port, and positioning of tugs. Maximum publicity will be sought for the trials. And all this for only $20,000 a day in operating costs.

While a start has been made in dealing with the problem of Middle Rock, little has been done about the icebergs disgorged by the Columbia Glacier. A report by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) in 1974 noted that although the glacier was presently in a stable condition, it showed signs of being on the verge of a massive retreat. Under stable conditions, the report stated, "icebergs occasionally drift into the shipping lanes in northern Prince William Sound and the approaches to Valdez. Drastic retreat of the glacier would vastly increase iceberg hazards to shipping, especially to large, unwieldy vessels such as oil tankers." One estimate is that the amount of floating ice would increase tenfold; another cites up to 50 cubic miles of ice over the next 30 to 50 years.

A Coast Guard officer read an account of the report in a West Coast newspaper, and a meeting was called in Washington, D.C. There was talk, but nothing happened. The problem is bureaucratic. Nobody can figure where the jurisdiction of the USGS ends and Coast Guard begins in the case of a tidewater glacier. Subsequent funding requests for studies to confirm whether the glacier is about to retreat have been turned down within USGS. The Coast Guard has done nothing but consider air and ship iceberg patrols and a wild scheme to stretch a three-mile cable between Glacier Island and the mainland to keep icebergs out of the shipping lanes. This has never been tried before. There are doubts whether the cable could withstand the massive pressures of wind-driven icebergs.

Records kept by a Valdez cruise boat and the state ferry show the number of icebergs have increased in the last two years. USGS scientists, after two days on the glacier last summer, felt they had found additional evidence to support the theory that the glacier is on the verge of drastic retreat. Of 27 tidewater glaciers in Alaska, 26 have gone through such periods of retreats in historic times. Columbia Glacier is the only one not to do so. "Glaciers just sit and look pretty most of the time. It is hard for people to envision periods of rapid change," said one scientist.

The heads of the maritime divisions of the oil companies tend to downplay the danger of icebergs, but recorded testimony reveals that they have closely questioned Coast Guard officers about the availability of iceberg patrols. What worries ship operators are not the massive, obvious icebergs but the smaller pieces, nicknamed "bergy bits" and "growlers." Along with those larger icebergs which have a high rock content, bergy bits and growlers float low in the water and are difficult to spot. With moderate to high waves in storm-tossed waters, radar can be rendered useless as an aid in iceberg detection.

Disregarding these new factors, by some calculations the number of ship accidents and the volume of oil spilled could be two to three times higher for Valdez than for the Los Angeles area. Moreover, the consequences of a spill at Valdez would be more severe. The draft environmental impact-statement for the proposed pipeline project to take Alaskan oil from the port of Long Beach and ship it east states, "It should be reemphasized that Port Valdez supports very rich and diverse intertidal and subtidal communities . . . Port Valdez waters have not been severely degraded biologically as have Long Beach port waters. The low temperatures result in much longer oil-degradation times than for Long Beach. The probability of a major spill in Port Valdez Harbor is considerably greater than Long Beach. One may reasonably assume that the biological impacts at Port Valdez would be significant, but these are beyond the scope of this statement." The same could be applied to the waters of Prince William Sound, which a University of Alaska publication has termed "a resource of unique dimension . . . as yet unassailed by unmanaged human use."

Under adverse weather conditions the Coast Guard says it has the authority to shut down Port Valdez. But the question arises, how long can it remain shut down, and under what adverse weather conditions would the Coast Guard act? There is a maximum of eight days of tank storage capacity at the Valdez terminal. A slowdown or stoppage in the flow of oil through the 800-mile-long pipeline from the North Slope could congeal the hot crude oil. At one time the Coast Guard estimated the port could be closed for two weeks. An officer who has studied the problem said. "Any conditions we lay on them could have an adverse economic impact. We cannot have unnecessary delays. The government could affect the private economy. We are going to make sure the operation is safe enough, but not too safe."

Outside the port, the vessels are on their own. One report states, "Prolonged periods of fog . . . play havoc with the economics and logistics of the entire tanker transport system for Alaskan crude. There may be strong motivation for a ship's master to proceed through the fog: such pressures might

well work to increase the risk of collision or grounding.

As Champion predicted on the flight into Juneau, the day and half meeting was conducted in an atmosphere of "sweetness and light." In the wood-paneled courtroom on the ninth floor of the Federal Building, Admiral Hayes summed up the results: "Out of each workshop we have gotten specific areas of agreement. We have gotten further than I thought we would. I am just delighted with the input of industry." Champion, representing the state, commended the Coast Guard and the oil industry but cautioned it was only "a temporary commendation." The chairman of the Alyeska Marine Advisory Committee declined to comment at the open session.

And the flight out of Juneau was made on the first attempt.

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO OUTSTANDING LABOR LEADER SAMUEL F. KINSORA, OF WAYNE, NJ, ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to salute a truly great man from my home State of New Jersey who, for more than four decades, has been one of our Nation's preeminent labor leaders fighting for the rights of working men and women everywhere.

I am speaking of Samuel F. Kinsora of Wayne, NJ, who, for the last 23 years has served as the president and guiding force of United Food & Commercial Workers Local 1262 [UFCW] of Clifton, NJ's largest local labor union, and who is now retiring. To celebrate his many outstanding achievements on behalf of all workers, Samuel F. Kinsora will be honored with a retirement dinner on Saturday, April 29, 1989, at the Aspen Hotel-Manor in Parsippany, NJ.

Mr. Speaker, it is expected that an overflow crowd of more than 700 people will attend this noteworthy event, a number which includes numerous family members, friends, colleagues, and distinguished government officials. Most certainly, this will be a proud evening for Sam Kinsora, as it will be for his loving family; his wife, Kathy; his son, Michael, executive assistant to the president at UFCW Local 1262; his daughter, Peggy; his grandchildren, Brittany and Amesio Kinsora and Andrea and Jeremy Joseph, and his brothers, John and Robert Kinsora.

Sam Kinsora came to New Jersey from Michigan, where he matriculated at the University of Michigan, earning a degree in labor economics, and where he graduated Detroit College of Law. A veteran of the U.S. Marine Corps, where he attained the rank of major, he learned about the U.S. labor movement at a young age. His father served for many years as president of the Movie Projectionists Union in Detroit. Sam Kinsora became directly involved in the labor movement in 1948, first as a union business agent in Michigan and later in the service of the Retail Clerks International Association in southern California.

Mr. Speaker, Samuel F. Kinsora has been a dedicated trade unionist with UFCW Local 1262 for more than 40 years, having served as its president since 1967, a period during which this outstanding union has, indeed, flourished, thanks to his foresight, guidance, and strong leadership. Today, UFCW Local 1262 represents nearly 30,000 supermarket and retail store employees in the New Jersey-New York-Connecticut metropolitan area. Along with being the largest local union in New Jersey, thanks to Sam Kinsora's guidance, it is also the nerve center of the 1.3-million member United Food & Commercial Workers International Union, AFL-CIO.

Mr. Speaker, it is widely recognized that under Sam Kinsora's bold and innovative leadership, local 1262 has consistently negotiated labor contracts in the retail store industry that have continuously provided the finest in wages, health, welfare, pension, and other pacesetting benefits programs for employees.

Because of his many professional achievements, Sam Kinsora's aid has been enlisted on numerous occasions by the State of New Jersey. Among his many assignments on behalf of the State, he has served as a member of the Governor's Task Force on Unemployment, and as a member of a special energy crisis committee that dealt with the many problems faced by New Jersey and the Nation during the energy and gas shortage. Most recently, he has developed a plan of action that not only met New Jersey's energy conservation needs, but also provided ways of preserving the jobs of thousands of UFCW local 1262 members, as well as the jobs of many other workers throughout the State of New Jersey.

On a national level, Sam Kinsora's education in law and his expertise in labor-management relations have earned him special assignments from the UFCW International Union, including serving as chairman of the union's constitution committee. In addition, as a frequent member of the UFCW Overseas Study Program, he has gained worldwide experience, having traveled extensively to countries such as Israel, Austria, Japan, Iceland, and Portugal, among others.

Mr. Speaker, along with his myriad of accomplishments, Samuel F. Kinsora has always maintained a strong interest in promoting a wide range of educational opportunities for the young people of New Jersey. Under his direction, local 1262 has developed its own Scholarship Awards Program which, in the past 19 years, has awarded more than $300,000 in college scholarships to more than 400 outstanding students who have either been members of his union or dependents of union members.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that through his efforts as a labor leader, a civic activist, an innovator, a strong supporter of education, a family man and a human being, he has truly made his State and our Nation, a better place to live. Mr. Speaker, I invite you and our colleagues to join me in saluting a truly outstanding human being, Samuel F. Kinsora, president of United Food and Commercial Workers local 1262 of Clifton, NJ.

DANNEMEYER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I have heard from over 1,300 seniors from my district about the Catastrophic Protection Act, twice as many as wrote concerning the congressional pay raise. This issue has also been raised at every townhall I have held since the first of the year. Of all this outcry, I can count on one hand those that have favored the Catastrophic Protection Act. This is not a few displeased constituents, this is the public yelling its outrage.

When President Reagan and Secretary Bowen started the ball rolling on catastrophic protection they had some pretty sound ideas. They wanted to reduce the out-of-pocket expenses incurred by Medicare beneficiaries suffering from acute illnesses. This would have been paid for by an across-the-board Medicare Part B increase.

The final product that emerged was a completely different animal indeed. We ended up with a mandatory package of tax increases for middle income seniors, expensive benefits that only a few seniors would be able to take advantage of, and no mention of the true catastrophic costs to seniors—long-term care. When I showed this legislation to the Arizona Association of Retired Persons and other senior advocacy groups they all told me not to support this legislation because it would hurt seniors more than it would help them. I am glad I took them up on this advice.

We have before us a chance to correct a big mistake. By supporting the Dannemeyer motion, we can at the very least reopen this debate. I know there are many in this body who support outright repeal or modifications to the Catastrophic Act. Supporting the Dannemeyer motion will give us the chance to review the facts surrounding this new law, and the public outcry demands that we do so. We listened to the people when they demanded a vote on the congressional pay raise, we must listen again and vote for this motion.

THE SANDINISTA ELECTION LAWS ARE UNFAIR

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, at the heart of the bipartisan accord on Central America, which was the basis of legislation providing humanitarian aid to the Nicaraguan resistance, there was a call for free and fair elections in Nicaragua.

The Sandinista government shows no signs of wanting to provide such elections.

I signed the bipartisan agreement with the belief that the United States would not stand by idly when the Sandinistas dragged their feet in the process of democratization. A news article in the Washington Times quotes a

State Department official as being critical about the so-called election reforms. I'm glad to hear this, but the big question is: what are the cosigners of the bipartisan accord going to do about this most recent example of Sandinista intransigence? We cannot simply say all the right words about free elections and then not do anything when—as has become evident in recent days—the Sandinistas are making an open mockery of the process.

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD, U.S. Calls Sandinista Election Laws Unfair, from the Washington Times, April 21, 1989.

[From the Washington Times, Apr. 21, 1989]

U.S. CALLS SANDINISTA ELECTION LAWS UNFAIR

(By Peter LaBarbera)

A State Department spokesman criticized Nicaragua's democratic reforms yesterday, saying the new laws won't lead to fair elections next February.

"The structure that has been passed in this legislation is not one that can lead then to further steps that would ensure the legitimacy of the elections," said State Department spokesman Richard Boucher.

Criticism of the Sandinista election laws was echoed yesterday by a bipartisan panel of eight U.S. election specialists and from anti-Sandinista opposition parties who said the proposals "guaranteed electoral fraud."

"We believe the new law will not provide an adequate foundation for a free and fair election in Nicaragua on February 25, 1990," said Penn Kemble, an election expert with the Nicaraguan Election Project.

The project—sponsored by the human rights group Freedom House—is composed of five Democrats and three Republicans who will monitor the election campaign.

In Nicaragua, meanwhile, a coalition of 14 opposition parties publicly expressed its "total rejection" of the Sandinista election law, which was approved by the Marxist Sandinistas' national assembly Tuesday.

"The Civic Opposition . . . denounces, before the Nicaraguan people and international community, the farce being promoted by the Sandinista regime," read the statement.

The critics chiefly object to a portion of the Sandinista law guaranteeing the regime's domination of the Supreme Electoral Council, which will oversee the voting process.

The Sandinistas have awarded themselves three of the five seats on the national council, as well as majorities on all its district branches.

Two other members on the supreme body will be picked from nominations by "opposition" parties in the assembly, but the regime is free to pick a candidate from the several "collaborationist" parties favorable to the state.

"That council, in order to achieve legitimacy, has to fairly represent the people of Nicaragua," Mr. Boucher said.

The reforms also ease restrictions on foreign funding of political parties, grant opposition parties access to state-run television and set a formula for the distribution of state campaign funds.

The Sandinistas rejected the advice of Venezuelan and Costa Rican governments, which sent teams to Managua that produced reports on the needed reforms. Both have called for electoral councils with two members each from the Sandinistas and genuine opposition parties, plus a fifth independent member.

Danny Lee McDonald, chairman of the Federal Election Commission and a member of the Nicaraguan Election Project, said yesterday that "without a balanced Supreme Election Council, we are not going to have a free and fair election."

Mr. McDonald, Mr. Kemble, a senior associate at Freedom House, and other members of the project visited Nicaragua on a fact-finding trip April 9-13. The group issued a report yesterday detailing other recommendations for a fair election.

Roberto Ferrey, a director for the armed Nicaraguan Resistance, said in an interview that Managua is "lying, cheating and playing tricks," but the international community isn't paying attention.

"If this were [Chile's outgoing leader Gen. Augusto] Pinochet, the international media would be crying out by now," he said.

Rodrigo Madrigal Nieto, Costa Rica's foreign minister, said that he was distressed by the Sandinista proposals.

"I cannot be left unconcerned because we can see that [Nicaraguan leader] Daniel Ortega is not complying with promises of giving guarantees to the opposition," Mr. Madrigal said.

Mr. Boucher said Washington hoped that differences between the Sandinistas and the opposition could be worked out.

"If they [the Nicaraguan government] are willing to sit down and work on this with the opposition, there's always opportunity to amend that or pass new legislation," Mr. Boucher said.

NUCLEAR POWERPLANT STANDARDIZATION ACT OF 1989

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to encourage the development and use of standardized plant designs and to improve the nuclear licensing and regulatory process.

Standardization, accompanied by licensing reform, is the most important step that can be taken to ensure the continued growth of U.S. nuclear energy. Nuclear energy already supplies the Nation with nearly 20 percent of its electricity, replacing 680 million barrels of imported oil a year. It can, and should, play an even greater role in energy generation in the future.

The electric utility industry is expected to turn sharply toward greater dependence on oil electric generation. In fact, oil imports for electric generation could rise by 1 million barrels per day by 1990 and 3 million barrels per day by 1995. I feel that it is detrimental to our Nation to increase our dependence on imported oil from unstable and volatile regions of the world. But, unfortunately, current regulatory and legal constraints have discouraged the construction of additional nuclear powerplants, forcing utilities to turn back to oil and natural gas in order to meet our insatiable appetite for low-cost electricity.

I believe that we must once again look to nuclear energy as an alternative to oil. And, in particular, I believe that standardization would sharply improve the economics of nuclear powerplants. Standardization could reduce the capital cost of a nuclear plant by 55 percent, making nuclear energy competitive with oil facilities at oil prices as low as $9 per barrel.

Standardized nuclear powerplants will operate more safely and efficiently than current plants. Standardized plants are safer because of the rapid improvements in training, plant operation and maintenance made possible by sharing common experience with similar plants. That would be a big change from the current situation, where virtually each nuclear plant is significantly different from all other plants. One of the problems associated with the Tennessee Valley Authority's Nuclear Program was that many of the plants were custom built thus exacerbating the complexity associated with training, maintenance, and operation. As a former member of the TVA Board of Directors, I feel that if standardized plants were available 20 years ago, some of TVA's problems with its Nuclear Program could have been prevented.

Continued growth of nuclear energy is vital to U.S. energy independence and economic stability. By offsetting oil imports, nuclear power contributes directly to lower inflation and an improved U.S. trade balance. In fact, oil imports account for the largest item in our bloated trade deficit: $50 billion per year. Standardization would enable the United States to cut oil imports and cut our trade deficit.

The current licensing process prevents the early resolution of critical siting and safety issues, leading to cost overruns and construction delays. The end result is that nuclear plant costs have skyrocketed and construction schedules have risen from 5 to 12 years. In fact, the current two-stage process in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 was drawn almost verbatim from the Federal Communications Act of 1934, which was the basis for the licensing of radio stations. I believe that it is high time that the United States had a licensing process for nuclear plants that was designed for nuclear plants, not radio stations. There is no reason why nuclear energy technology, which was developed in the United States, must fail in the United States. The French have used our technology and build the same powerplants in less than half the time it takes us to build and begin operating a plant.

The legislation I introduced would require a final determination by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that construction and operation of a preapproved standardized design provides reasonable assurance of adequate public health and safety. Utilities proposing a standardized plant would receive a combined construction and operating license. This new licensing process would ensure rigorous commitments to quality assurance programs, adherence to construction schedules, and avoidance of custom plants.

This new licensing process would also boost public participation, since hearings would be held on complete designs before construction. Currently, public hearings are held before plant design is complete and after the plant is already constructed. Clearly, hearings at either of these stages are ineffective, since plant designs are unknown prior to con-

struction and unchangeable once the plant is completed. In order to improve public participation, hearings should be held after design is complete, but before construction. In that way, design changes can be made, if necessary.

The United States must reexamine its policies on nuclear power. Now is the time. The severe drought last summer forced us to consider ways to prevent further ozone depletion, global warming, and to address the greenhouse effect. I have already read predictions that this summer may be just as hot as it was during the severe drought that we experienced last summer. Significantly, even opponents of nuclear power have acknowledged a linkage, stating that we need to invest in research and development of new nuclear energy technologies. There is an emerging consensus that there is no way to separate energy policy from global climatic change and the greenhouse effect. Clean and safe nuclear power is a step in the right direction.

Although the NRC recently issued a final rule improving the licensing process, there is still a need for legislation. The NRC rule allows for a second hearing after plant construction and before operation. The NRC rule does not force the resolution of issues before plant construction, and we may end up exactly where we are today. I therefore urge my colleagues to cosponsor my legislation and push for its quick passage so that our Nation will once again be able to look to nuclear energy as an economically viable option to meet our future energy needs.

THE ASBESTOS HAZARD EMERGENCY RESPONSE AMENDMENTS

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to carry forward our efforts to eliminate the health threat posed by asbestos in the buildings where we live and work. This legislation, the "asbestos hazard emergency response amendments," builds on the model Congress enacted in 1986 for cleaning up asbestos in our Nation's schools.

Scientists have linked inhalation of microscopic asbestos fibers to cancer and asbestosis. An estimated 10,000 people will die each year for the rest of the century from these diseases due to past exposures; 60,000 claims for asbestos-related diseases are now on file in courts across the country.

Studies indicate that even very slight exposures to asbestos can be life-threatening. Not only do asbestos workers have a significantly higher than average incidence of cancer and asbestosis, their families do also—even children born after their parents have ceased working with absestos. Some of the experts most familiar with absestos-related disease say there may be no safe level of exposure.

Unfortunately, because its fire-resistant charasteristics were known before its dangers to human health were publicly understood, it was used extensively in insulating schools and other buildings, where ten of millions of Americans are now subject to exposure to it on a daily basis. The Environmental Protection Agency estimates that asbestos is present in 30 percent of our Nation's 110,000 schools and in 20 percent of all commercial and Federal Government buildings.

As we have learned of the dangers of asbestos, it has become increasingly clear that we must deal with the asbestos in these buildings. Schools have been the first focus of concern because children are especially sensitive to exposure and because, due to their youth, disease has more time to develop.

But the same dangers are also present in Federal, State, and local Government buildings, and in commercial buildings. In its February 1988 report to Congress, the Environmental Protestion Agency estimated that friable asbestos-containing materials—materials which are brittle and danger of releasing asbestos dust—are present in 20 percent of the Nation's 3.6 million Government and commercial buildings. This estimate includes 39 percent of the 14,000 Federal buildings, 59 percent of the 350,000 apartments of 10 or more units, and 16 percent of the 3.2 million private nonresidential buildings. Half a million of these buildings are estimated to contain asbestos that is already damaged.

In its report, EPA recommended against taking action now to require cleanup of asbestos in public or commercial buildings, although it did recommend applying certain AHERA standards to clean up work now taking place, such as requiring that the work be performed by accredited personnel.

EPA's reluctance to go further is reminiscent of one of its first acts under the new Reagan administration in 1981, which was to shelve a pending school cleanup proposal. EPA's history with regard to asbestos has been to recommend inaction, forcing the Congress to require action.

Before 1986, Federal law required only that schools survey their premises for asbestos and post notices if they found it. When parents, teachers, and school employees saw these notices and became justifiably concerned, schools were left to fend for themselves. If they instituted asbestos abatement work, it was often performed by people who did not understand the dangers of asbestos or the proper manner of handling it.

The result was increased threat of asbestos exposure. A 1985 EPA survey estimated that as much as 75 percent of all school cleanup work was being done improperly, dangerously releasing asbestos into the air. I was particularly alarmed by a photograph showing teenage boys in cutoff jeans ripping asbestos off walls and pipes in a New Jersey school, releasing clouds of asbestos dust with nothing to protect them from breathing it or keep it from contaminating the entire building.

The 1986 law—AHERA—was a direct response to these concerns. It set a timetable for schools to inspect for asbestos and formulate an effective plan for dealing with any asbestos found. And it required that people performing inspections or clean up and prevention actions be State-certified after EPA-approved training. Work remains to be done in assuring that schools are informed as to their responsibilities and options. But AHERA is our best hope to see that the threat of asbestos in our Nation's schools is removed with the maximum efficiency, speed, and safety and the minimum confusion and cost.

Meanwhile, exposure to asbestos poses the same threat in public and commercial buildings. Cleanup is already underway in many commercial buildings, spurred not by Government prompting but by market forces which are sharply devaluing properties known to contain asbestos. These cleanup activities are often proceeding with virtually no regulatory guidance to assure that the work is done safely and effectively by competent, trained personnel. Many States have no requirement that workers be accredited, that a cleanup plan be developed in advance, or that asbestos be safely removed and disposed of. And States which do have such requirements vary widely in the standards they impose.

As in past years with the unregulated school clean up, there are reports of untrained workers ripping asbestos from buildings with primitive tools and improper ventilation, with no notice to building occupants. The homeless have reportedly been hired off the street to perform this work. Bags containing asbestos waste have been found abandoned in warehouses, dumped in the Lincoln Tunnel, left in a hangar at the Newark Airport. Effective standards are needed to prevent asbestos abatement in these buildings from becoming a health and environment nightmare.

The Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act of 1986 responded to concerns about asbestos cleanup work being conducted in our Nation's schools by untrained people who did not appreciate asbestos' dangers or its proper handling. Similarly, my new legislation extends Federal standards to asbestos cleanup in Government and commercial buildings.

The bill places Government buildings on an inspection and cleanup schedule, with Federal buildings taking the lead; the standards would apply to private commercial buildings as building owners elected to undertake activities affecting asbestos. The bill establishes strong accreditation requirements for consultants, laboratories, and contractors to assure that the people to whom we entrust this sensitive task are highly competent and conscientious; it also establishes safeguards to assure integrity to the entire abatement process.

The accreditation requirements cover prior academic training and experience for both those who teach accreditation courses and their students; student-teacher ratios; classroom and hands-on instruction; the standardized exam; postcourse supervised work experience; and continuing education and annual work experience. Only the new continuing education and annual work experience requirements will affect people already accredited under AHERA.

EPA would establish standards and procedures for terminating accreditation in cases of incompetence, gross negligence, and intentional violations—something not provided for under AHERA.

The bill requires that building owners who use the same asbestos abatement firm for all phases of a project get an independent assessment of the plan developed under which the project will be conducted. Independent review is essential to ensure integrity, as the

General Accounting Office has found in its audit of Superfund projects.

The bill also requires EPA to develop a secure system for tracking transportation and disposal of asbestos waste, in order to assure that it is safely and properly disposed of.

The bill would establish an Asbestos Abatement Scientific Commission, to bring our country's best scientific minds to the task of determining the safety and effectiveness of the various asbestos abatement methods. EPA noted in its February 1988 report that it lacked such information. The Commissioners would be selected on the basis of special scientific education, training, and experience, nominated by the National Academies of Science and Engineering and appointed by Congress and the President.

Cleaning up the asbestos in our Nation's buildings will be a major undertaking, and an expensive one. But an increase of asbestos-related disease because of inaction or incompetent cleanup now will mean greater suffering and higher costs in the future. We must once again take the lead to see that the cleanup proceeds promptly and properly.

HONORING JULENE MOHR

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Julene Mohr of Hillsdale on her election as the president for the Michigan Association of the Future Farmers of America.

Julene is a constituent of my congressional district and I would like to enter into the RECORD an article about her which appeared in the March 30 edition of the Hillsdale Daily News:

MOHR IS ELECTED STATE FFA LEADER

(By Jim Lyons)

CAMDEN.—The Michigan Association of the FFA elected Julene Mohr, Camden-Frontier junior to be its president for the coming year.

Mohr, who will be leading 120 chapters and 5,000 to 6,000 members of the state FFA into 1990, hopes to eliminate some of the stereotypes associated with the organization and bring in more students interested in the future of agriculture.

"One of the goals is eliminating the stereotypes," she said, noting that the FFA is not just farming anymore. With wide-ranging education programs, the organization is preparing FFA members for a job in the huge industry of agriculture.

While farmers make up a small percent of the population, food industries employ one in six Americans, Mohr said. To project the new image of the organization, group members at the national level changed the name from Future Farmers of America to its shorter moniker and are currently revamping other aspects to the agricultural education group.

"A lot of the ideas are staying the same," she said, but the appeal is being changed. Instead of vocational agriculture program, she noted, the national FFA changed the name to agricultural education to make the title more appealing, an improvement that may wipe away some stereotypes and bring more members into the group.

"In the past 10 years, our membership has dropped from 10,000," Mohr noted, adding that she hopes to gain some of those members back. But, Mohr noted, students don't know what they're missing if they don't get involved in FFA.

"Agriculture is something that can't really be ignored," she said. "When you look at your future, when you say no to the FFA . . . you're closing doors."

Beside membership problems, FFA members are eyeing their future and, like Mohr, exploring some of the complexities of agriculture. With federal farm program cuts a possibility and other legal and international issues threatening to have a larger impact on the local farmer, FFA can help develop the skills needed to face agricultural issues.

For Mohr, who someday hopes to work in agricultural law, possibly on the international level, FFA has given her a wider range of experience to meet coming challenges.

"I'd like to think that the FFA has made me more well-rounded," she said. "There are a lot of positive advantages."

Mohr has also helped break down another kind of agriculture stereotype, becoming the third woman to lead the state organization in its 61 years of existence. Having grown up on a farm, she said her agricultural experience hasn't been any different than that of a young man.

"Today, anyways, if you're willing to get out there and work . . . whether you're male or female shouldn't make a difference," she said. "We can do the job just as well and come off just as strong."

The FFA is an important part of Mohr's high school years, but not the only part by a far shot. Her involvement includes being class secretary since junior high school, participating in as many sports as possible, staying active on the year-book staff, Students Against Drunk Driving, 4-H and band, plus serving as the president of the National Honor Society.

"I keep myself really busy," she said.

Beside state problems Mohr has to be concerned with, local concerns will keep her and her organization busy, she said.

"Camden-Frontier is having a lot of problems . . . with their millage," she said. "The FFA is one of the programs that could be dropped."

For the future, Mohr plans to attend one of the larger universities in the state and study pre-law, with an emphasis on agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in wishing Julene the very best as she serves in this important position of leadership.

WILL CONGRESS SUPPORT A NEW KIND OF STATEHOOD FOR PUERTO RICO?

HON. JAIME B. FUSTER

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. FUSTER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, Senator J. BENNETT JOHNSTON, chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and the ranking minority member, Senator JAMES A. MCCLURE, jointly introduced legislation providing for a congressionally authorized plebiscite in Puerto Rico that would enable voters to decide on the island's future relationship with the United States.

The choices in the plebiscite are among federated statehood, full independence, or an enhancement of the existing commonwealth status.

President Bush and some congressional leaders are already supporting statehood for Puerto Rico. I hope we will soon have the opportunity to find out just how strong their statehood support really is. Because what they seem to support, perhaps innocently so at the encouragement of some statehooders in Puerto Rico itself, is a new kind of statehood which the other 50 States do not enjoy. Is the Congress really prepared to offer this new kind of statehood? My constituents in Puerto Rico have a right to know.

A few years ago, Puerto Rico's principal leader of the statehood movement addressed mainland audiences to propose an intriguing statehood-for-Puerto Rico scenario. His proposal has become the mind-set for most statehooders in Puerto Rico. Since this proposal has never been rejected or qualified by mainland leaders such as President Bush and Congressmen who support statehood for Puerto Rico, statehood sympathizers in Puerto Rico have been led to believe that such a new kind of statehood is possible and that in due time Congress will offer it.

Thus, statehood leaders in Puerto Rico need not necessarily be blamed for their rhetorical flourishes and pie-in-the-sky prophecies, but such proselityzing by their colleagues on the national level is another matter entirely. Would Congress and President Bush really be prepared to accept, as statehooders in Puerto Rico argue, that Puerto Rico be admitted to the Union with Spanish as our official language, with our own limited international personality preserved, paying no Federal income taxes during the first 20 or 30 years of Puerto Rican statehood while at the same time the Federal Government assumes Puerto Rico's current external debt of over $12 billion? Would they accept statehood to be portrayed as the panacea for the many complex and intractable social and economic problems that Puerto Rico has suffered for centuries?

I think this new kind of statehood is an illusion, but statehood leaders in Puerto Rico operate in this Alice-in-Wonderland milieu in part because their sympathizers on the national level, who should know better, not only do not contradict them but actually offer strong support to their efforts.

These questionable contentions by statehooders in Puerto Rico should be subject to close scrutiny by Congress. The people of Puerto Rico have a right to know in advance of the plebiscite whether statehood will in fact be granted with such unusual conditions.

I ask my colleagues to reflect upon this matter as they hear more and more about a referendum on Puerto Rico's political status options. And I particularly ask those who are sympathetic to statehood not to ratify by silence the more preposterous assertions about a new kind of statehood for Puerto Rico that bears little resemblance to that of the other 50 States, unless they believe that such statehood is possible.

WASTE TRANSFER

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would prohibit the transfer of solid waste from one State to another without prior consent from the State in which the waste is to be disposed.

The Nation is faced with ever increasing amounts of solid waste while available landfill space is rapidly decreasing. Since 1978 an estimated 14,000 solid waste landfills, or 70 percent of those operating at the time have closed. The Environmental Protection Agency predicts that of the 6,500 landfills operating today, more than 2,000 will close within 5 years. Without question a solid waste management crisis exists in the United States.

The acute shortage of landfill capacity in regions throughout the country has forced some States to search for alternatives outside their own borders. Obvious sites are those States with vast amounts of open terrain. Unless these States have strict regulations governing waste disposal they are attractive targets for those States wishing to transport waste across the borders.

New Mexico, with its weak waste management regulations, vast open space and sparse population, is a classic example. Private waste management firms from across the country are attempting to open new landfill sites in the State because they have to comply with few environmental regulations. As a result, fears are mounting within the State that New Mexico will soon become the Nation's dumping ground.

The New Mexico State Legislature attempted to address this problem by tightening the State's waste-management laws. Legislation was introduced and passed that would have established a comprehensive statewide waste-management program and required an increase in recycling, safer handling of hazardous wastes and careful monitoring and protection of groundwater. The regulation system was worked out by representatives of local governments, the environmental community and various industries. Despite 2 months of negotiation, the effort was blocked by the Governor's veto, leaving the State unprotected.

I am introducing legislation that would give New Mexico, and other States in a similar position, the right to refuse the interstate transfer of solid waste. Specifically, the legislation would prohibit the transfer of solid waste in excess of 100 pounds from one State to another State for disposal, unless the State in which the waste is to be disposed of has given prior consent. Any person who knowingly violates the prohibition will be subject to a fine of not more than $25,000.

I am very concerned by the prospect of New Mexico and similarly situated States receiving large quantities of solid waste from States that can no longer dispose of the waste they produce themselves. Huge new landfill sites could have a very damaging effect on New Mexico.

First, New Mexico, the "Land of Enchantment," is known for its inherent beauty and healthy living. New Mexicans should have every right to maintain this high quality of life. I want to make sure these standards are not diminished.

Second, the State does not have sufficient waste-management regulations to dispose of solid waste safely. The State has only two rules: First, a landfill must be at least 20 feet above the groundwater level; second, it must be located and operated so that it does not cause a public nuisance or create a hazard to public health or welfare. A mere 20 feet above the groundwater level will not prevent landfill seepage from contaminating the water. Furthermore, the State has no regulations to protect against emissions of methane and volatile organic compounds released from landfills. In order to assure public safety, comprehensive waste-management regulations must be put in place before New Mexico considers new landfill sites.

Finally, the business community is concerned that imports of solid waste will discourage new businesses from locating in New Mexico. Much of New Mexico's economy is based on tourism because of the State's natural attractions. This sector could be hampered by the site of huge new landfills across the State. While the waste-management firms argue that they will bring new jobs to New Mexico, many people are concerned that these are not the type of jobs New Mexico wants to attract.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation as we consider the Resource Conservation Recovery Act in Congress.

A TRIBUTE TO COL. LINDA K. SINDT

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Col. Linda K. Sindt who is retiring from the U.S. Air Force on May 31, 1989. Colonel Sindt serves as the director of personnel for McClellan Air Force Base in Sacramento, CA. McClellan AFB is the largest employer in northern California. For almost 24 years, Colonel Sindt has served her country with dedication and enthusiasm.

Supervising 220 employees and providing support for 14,000 civilian and 3,800 military requires commitment, intelligence, and great understanding. She has provided trained personnel to support the Sacramento Air Logistics Center's mission of keeping combat ready such aircraft as the F/EF/FB-111, A-10, F-4, and C-12 as well as surveillance and warning systems, radar sites, space systems—for example, the space shuttle—missile tracking stations, and airborne and ground generators. This mission reaches far beyond the confines of the base, with its geographical responsibilities encompassing the Western States and dozens of countries in the free world.

Colonel Sindt is a recognized authority on all aspects of military and civilian personnel management. She developed strategies to deal with the most drastic reductions in civilian personnel in this command in the past 10 years. Internally, she managed a severe cutback in assigned strength with minimum impact on morale and efficiency. She handled enlisted reductions, selective reenlistment bonus cuts, civilian personnel turmoil, and plans for the new Officer Professional Development Program and enlisted evaluation system with characteristic aplomb and efficiency. Under her direction, the consolidated base personnel office earned two unprecedented excellent ratings during the Air Force Logistics Command mobility capability inspection, and the civilian personnel office was selected as the best in the Air Force.

Colonel Sindt has received many awards and decorations during her tenure with the U.S. Air Force. She has been awarded the Defense Superior Service Medal, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal—fourth Oak Leaf Cluster; Air Force Commendation Medal—second Oak Leaf Cluster; National Defense Service Medal, Vietnam Service Medal—third Bronze Star devices; Air Force Overseas Short Tour Ribbon, Air Force Overseas Long Tour Ribbon—second Oak Leaf Cluster; Air Force Longevity Service Award—fourth Oak Leaf Cluster; Small Arms Expert Marksmanship Ribbon, Air Force Training Ribbon, Republic of Vietnam Gallantry Cross with Palm, and the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal.

Colonel Sindt's achievements go beyond her work at the base. She was highly praised for her work in representing the Sacramento Air Logistics Center Commander in coordinating military support for the Sacramento Camellia Festival. She was an active supporter of the Air Force Association, McClellan Management Society, and served as chairman of the Chapel Protestant Fund Council. In the face of a tremendous workload this talented leader made her mark at Sacramento and McClellan Air Force Base.

I would also like to mention the special relationship Colonel Sindt shares with my Sacramento office. She is always available, helpful, professional, and friendly. On behalf of my constituents, my staff and myself, I would like to thank her for the assistance and direction she has given to us all over the years.

I know my colleagues join me today in the sincere best wishes in Colonel Sindt's future endeavors. Colonel Sindt's devotion, skill and extraordinary contributions to the public sector and the military community are a shining example to individuals committed to a quality work force. I would like to extend my best to Colonel Sindt and her husband Duane.

RECOGNIZING WORLD POPULATION AWARENESS WEEK

HON. JIM MOODY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, we have a population crisis. Too many people live in places without the resources—economic, social, or natural—to support them while the rest of the world recklessly consumes more than its

share. This has devastating consequences. Witness the environmental problems covering our cities with smog, exacerbating killer droughts and floods across the globe, and making our water unsafe to drink or even swim in. Look at the diseases without known cures which quietly kill millions of people, and look at preventable and curable ills such as dehydration and diarrhea that kill millions more.

We need to take action on all these fronts now, and we can have visible success on some in the short term. For instance, about 50 percent of the 10 million infant deaths and 25 percent of the 500,000 maternal deaths each year could be prevented if voluntary means of child spacing and maternal health programs were expanded to meet minimal needs in developoing nations. It's an inexpensive, safe, and direct way of saving lives.

Last year the House passed House Joint Resolution 48 to designate the week of April 17, 1988, as World Population Awareness Week. Forty Governors proclaimed the week and every State held events urging citizens to consider the implications of rapid population growth throughout the developing world.

Today Representative JOHN PORTER and I, along with 53 of our colleagues, are introducing a similar resolution designating the week of October 22, 1989, as World Population Awareness Week. Congress can show its commitment to bettering the quality of life for people world wide by again passing this resolution.

Rapid population growth in countries unable to provide even basic services to their constituents has global implications. World population is now more than 5.1 billion, and it grew by an unprecedented 92 million last year. At current rates, our human numbers will reach 6 billion within 10 years and 10 billion in 40 years. Ninety Third World nations are expected to double their populations within 30 years, and with 50 percent of their citizens younger than 16 years old, it is obvious why. There is a clear link between rapid population growth, illness, resource depletion, and environmental deterioration.

This grave outlook calls for a renewed leadership by the United States and other industrialized countries. About 500 million women in the developing world want and need family planning but lack access to it. They only want to exercise their right to have the number of children they can support. Increasing access to voluntary family planning saves lives and improves the quality of life, and it is essential for those countries struggling with social, economic, and environmental problems.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

BRING BACK THE ANTISMOKING ADS

HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution which calls upon the Nation's radio and television broadcasters to renew the antismoking campaign of 1967–1971 during which government and private health organizations were provided free air time for public service announcements depicting the health hazards of smoking.

In 1967, the Federal Communications Commission ordered radio and television stations to allow time for antismoking advertisements to counter cigarette ads. The decision was based on the fairness doctrine which requires that broadcasters give time for conflicting points of view on public issues.

Those ads were enormously successful in educating the public about the dangers of cigarette smoking. Memorable slogans such as "Like father, like son," and "Next time someone you love wants a cigarette, give them a kiss instead," encouraged millions of people to quit smoking, and essentially served to deglamorize the habit for a whole generation of young people. There is no doubt that tens of thousands of smoking-related deaths were prevented because of this counteradvertising campaign.

However, when Congress, at the urging of the tobacco companies, banned cigarette advertisements from radio and television in 1971, the antismoking messages were also dropped. As a result, in the years immediately after Congress instituted the ban on cigarette advertising in the electronic media, overall cigarette consumption went up, not down.

The reasons for devoting modest amounts of TV and radio air time to an effective antismoking campaign could not be stronger. Cigarette smoking caused more than 390,000 American deaths last year. It is, far and away, the single most preventable cause of death in the United States.

Cigarettes cause more deaths than heroin, cocaine, alcohol, fires, automobile accidents, murder, suicide, and AIDS combined. Surgeon General C. Everett Koop estimates that smoking is responsible for 30 percent of all heart disease, 30 percent of all cancer deaths, and 80 to 90 percent of all chronic lung disease. And smoking by pregnant women is a major cause of premature birth, fetal injury, and low birth weight.

Indeed, as the Surgeon General asserts, "There is no single more effective action a person can take to reduce the risk of cancer—and of dying from it—than to quit smoking, especially cigarette smoking."

Most disturbing is that while smoking among adults has decreased over the past two decades, smoking among young people is again on the rise. Studies done in 1985 show that one-third of high school seniors still believe that smoking a pack of cigarettes every day poses no serious health risk.

According to the Surgeon General's 1989 report, a majority of smokers pick up the habit during childhood and adolescence, and the average age of initiation is falling steadily. Studies show that smokers who begin in their teens are more likely to be heavier smokers as adults, and are less able to quit. To reverse this trend, the Surgeon General warns, smoking prevention education needs to begin in elementary school.

Clearly this trend can and should be reversed through an effective media-sponsored antismoking campaign, The best, most effective way to discourage cigarette smoking is to better inform the public, and especially young people, about the known dangers of smoking.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation's broadcasters, as users of scarce public airwaves, are required by law to serve the needs and interests of the community. They once played an extremely effective role in educating the public about the known and avoidable dangers of cigarette smoking. Bringing back those antismoking ads is an effective, positive, and noncontroversial way to discourage smoking, and it will help ensure that ignorance does not continue to play a role in the epidemic of disability, disease, and death caused by cigarette smoking.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important resolution.

KENNETH R. KELLER: NOMINEE FOR THE AFLC DISTINGUISHED CIVILIAN SERVICE AWARD

HON. JAMES V. HANSEN

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, everyone involved at Hill Air Force Base knows Kenneth R. Keller, my constituent, and a nominee for the AFLC Distinguished Civilian Service Award, was involved in everything.

Mr. Keller has been more than a devoted public servant. For the past 25 years, his exceptional management of personnel and resources has placed him in the forefront of contracting at the Ogden Air Logistics Center. His dedication to improving and developing contract actions led to successful program execution initiatives and advances in automation. Mr. Keller has unique and special leadership abilities, but beyond that, I would say that he has shown he cares in a very special way for Government, its people and its future.

Mr. Keller's professional skills has helped shaped the Air Force financially. Millions of dollars have been saved by his early intervention in the ICBM motor refurbishment and maintenance program for the Minuteman and Peacekeeper missiles. He directed acquisition methodologies and maximized the positive impact of multiple year contracting while still achieving one of the major contracting goals—competition.

There are givers in this world and there are takers. Mr. Keller is a giver. Whenever the need would arise, Mr. Keller answered the call. He has never hesitated to change direction or to focus to meet mission demands. When someone had a problem in contracting, the first person they would call was Kenneth Keller. When the Air Force issued the Program Management Directive in 1985 phasing out an entire enlisted career field for simulator maintenance, Mr. Keller stepped right in and made certain there would be a smooth transition to contractor logistical support.

Mr. Speaker, many owe him much, but he is doing what comes naturally. What gives him joy is giving back. He is one of a kind, and his legacy of achievements will benefit the community and the Air Force well into the future. Mr. Keller will be retiring from the Air Force on April 28, 1989, after 37 years of distinguished

service. Truly, he is deserving of this most prestigious award. I am honored to mention his name inside the walls of this institution, which reflects the same values and qualities admired so much by Kenneth Keller.

A TRIBUTE TO BROADCASTERS CHARLOTTE PETERS AND BOB OSBORNE

HON. JACK BUECHNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, broadcasters from around the State of Missouri gathered this past weekend in Columbia for a regional meeting cosponsored by the Missouri Broadcasters Association and the Missouri Radio-Television News Directors Association.

When the conversation turned to those who have made great contributions to the industry but have now passed on, I'm certain that two venerable St. Louis area names surfaced—Charlotte Peters and Bob Osborne.

These are people who, by virtue of their personal strength, determination and dedication to the highest principles, created a standard by which future generations of broadcast professionals, whether in news or entertainment, will be judged. I'd like to take this opportunity to recall their careers and highlight their accomplishments.

Charlotte Peters, a pioneer who broke into television when the industry was in its infancy, began her career with a show titled "To the Ladies." It quickly became apparent, however, that the appeal of this flamboyant, energetic personality should not, and could not, fall within the sole province of only one segment of the viewing population. The show was soon retitled "The Charlotte Peters Show" and she was off on a 23-year love affair with the public marked by dashes of slapstick comedy, doses of pantomime, splashes of Ethel Merman-type songs and truckloads of opinion.

Over the years, Charlotte and a host of guests entertained St. Louis residents by zeroing in on the funny bone. More times than I can count, I found myself moving from smile, to chuckle, to loud laughter watching this one-woman tour de force.

Charlotte's roster of guests read like a Who's Who of the entertainment industry. I'm thinking of such people as Bob Hope, George Raft, Don Ameche, Robert Goulet, Guy Lombardo, Danny Thomas and, yes, even the Three Stooges. I'd also like to point out that in its last 2 years of existence, this was one of the few locally produced daytime shows anywhere in the country.

Given all this, I suppose it shouldn't surprise anyone to hear that even during a memorial service last December, Charlotte Peters managed to blaze a new trail.

A video tape of her old shows featuring some of her more outrageous bits was played in Memorial Hall and, true to form, Charlotte "left 'em laughin'." No one watching these treasures could resist a giggle or two, despite the surroundings. As her daughter, Patricia Schwarz said in an interview, "This is the way mom would've wanted it."

As much as Charlotte Peters made television her life, KMOX program director Bob Osborne was a fixture to St. Louis radio and his death, also in December, leaves a void that will be difficult to fill.

Bob, or "Ozzie" as he was known to his colleagues, first came to the attention of St. Louis listeners in 1960, after scoring professional successes in Hartford, CT.

Bob first took to the Missouri ether with station KWIL-FM, starting as an on-air talent, but eventually serving as both program director and station manager. He oversaw the transition from rock 'n' roll to a middle-of-the-road format.

In November 1968, he moved to station KMOX-FM—now KLOU—displaying the same front-office versatility, the same on-air capability that made him invaluable elsewhere.

The people of St. Louis will long remember Bob's comfortable style with the Saturday morning buy and swap show, the "Trading Station." And then there was his Friday evening popular music offering, "Compact Corner." Most recently, he was the familiar voice associated with the KMOX daily morning show featuring a combination of music, interviews, and feature reports.

For sheer depth of knowledge about music, few could rival Bob. As his longtime friend and fellow jazz lover Charlie Menees said, "He knew all types of music, and he was one of the first radio people to realize the value of the compact disc." He was also an early advocate of stereo sound for AM radio.

If you ask his coworkers for a description, there are two words that crop up repeatedly—kind and patient. He was a man who took time to talk and, perhaps more important, listen. Maybe that's why he was so well respected and, yes, loved.

There are some who say that he was responsible for making his station the "Voice of St. Louis." For many of us, however, Bob Osborne was the voice of St. Louis.

A BILL TO SUPPORT THE PRIBILOF ISLANDS

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will ensure that the Congress keeps a promise made to a group of Alaskans.

For those Members not familiar with the history of the Pribilof Islands, let me explain that they are the center of one of the darker parts of U.S. history. The two islands—St. Paul and St. George—are home to approximately 750 individuals, as well as millions of seabirds and marine mammals. These two volcanic rocks were settled in the 18th century when Russian fur traders forced a number of Alaskan Aleuts out of their homes and carried them to the islands so that they could supply seal pelts for the Russian fur market. The Aleuts were kept in slavery until Alaska was sold to the United States in 1867. Unfortunately, the term "land of the free" was not applied to the Aleuts; in fact, they continued to be kept in salvery by American merchants and later the U.S. Government until the 1960's. By this time, the Aleuts had become virtual wards of the U.S. Government, with their only livelihood being the harvest of fur seals, whose pelts were sold under a treaty between the United States, the U.S.S.R., Japan, and Canada.

In 1983 and 1984, the U.S. Government dealt the residents of the Pribilofs another near-fatal blow. First, the Congress passed the Fur Seal Act Amendments of 1983 (Public Law 98-129), which ended Federal support of the islands in exchange for a lump sum of money. Although this legislation did not ban the commercial seal harvest, it did seek to establish on the Pribilof Islands "a stable and diversified economy not dependent on commercial fur sealing." The Congress dropped the other shoe in 1984 when the Senate refused to extend the North Pacific Fur Seal Treaty, thus ending commercial sealing. Thus, in a 2-year period, Congress radically altered a way of life that had existed—for better or worse—for over 200 years and left a group of American citizens to fend for themselves in the middle of the Bering Sea.

Since that time, the people of St. Paul and St. George have made every effort to continue their lives and comply with the law. Since the Pribilofs are located in the middle of the rich commercial fishing grounds in the Bering Sea, they have worked hard to develop boat harbors and a commercial fishery. Unfortunately, that avenue may also be denied to them.

Recently, the North Pacific Fishery Management Council has begun considering a plan to limit fishing in the Bering Sea in order to conserve fish stocks and prevent what some view as a potential economic collapse of the fishery. If the Council adopts—and the Secretary of Commerce approves—a limited entry plan, then it is very likely that the Pribilof Islands will be excluded, as they have only a limited history in the fishery. Thus, further hopes of economic self-sufficiency may be crushed.

The bill I am introducing today will help to alleviate that problem by granting the Pribilofs a portion of that fishery if a limited entry program goes into effect. This special allocation will be made in recognition of the unique relationship between the Pribilofs and the U.S. Government. In order to allow the Aleuts time to become full partners in the fishery, it permits them to transfer the allocation, with certain restrictions, for the first 5 years that it is in effect. Subsequently, they will have to use the allocation themselves or it will go back into the common pool to be available to all fishermen in the Bering Sea. Again, the bill only applies if a limited entry program goes into effect.

The Government of the United States has treated these people cruelly, and they deserve our help. I hope that the Members of this body will join with me in correcting a great injustice.

29-059 O-90-13 (Pt. 6)

A NATIONAL AWARD FOR SONORA UNION HIGH SCHOOL

HON. RICHARD H. LEHMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise before my colleagues today to commend Sonora Union High School for receiving a national award given by Reader's Digest, and four of the largest education associations in America—the National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Education Association, National Association of Elementary School Principals, and the American Federation of Principals. The award recognizes principal Ed Duggan, student activities director Steve Southard, counselor Tod Prouty, physical education teacher Barbara Smith, drafting teacher Charlie Clyde, and music teacher Pat Sieben for their dedication, enthusiasm, and commitment to Sonora Union High School.

Mr. Speaker, it was only 2 years ago that Sonora Union High School was in serious trouble. The dropout rate was 30 percent, test scores averaged in the 30's on a 1 to 100 scale, students were selling drugs on school grounds, there were gang fights in the halls, and in 1 year, five students had committed suicide. However, with the leadership of Ed Duggan, the new principal, and with the support and commitment of the entire staff, Sonora Union High School has effectively combatted these problems through innovative and creative programs.

They have implemented many programs designed to challenge, encourage, and motivate the students in all facets of their lives. They have instituted a peer counseling program, suicide prevention and awareness classes, a drug diversion program that operates with the city, a community service club to encourage students to volunteer, and a weekly award that recognizes students who challenge their limits. Mr. Duggan, with the help of the entire staff, has involved all aspects of the community and has encouraged the participation of parents in their children's education. Not only does the curriculum include classes for students who wish to pursue a postsecondary education but it also offers elective vocational classes. These classes encourage students to obtain the technical training skills necessary to prepare them for entering the job market after graduation.

In this time of huge budget deficits, with not nearly enough money going to education programs, it is extremely gratifying for me to have a school in my district that has developed such innovative and effective programs to combat major social and academic problems. Their success is well documented; the dropout rate is 1 percent, the average test scores are up to 80 percent, and the school spirit has never been higher. Mr. Speaker, today I commend and congratulate Sonora Union High School. They are truly a model school for the entire Nation.

FOR THE RELIEF OF CATHERINE ANN BARDOLE

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduce a bill for the private relief of Catherine Ann Bardole, also known as Kathleen Bardole. Mrs. Bardole is originally from Ireland, where she legally separated from her husband in 1976, and obtained custody of her two daughters. Several years later, she married Dr. Frank Bardole, an American citizen, and subsequently obtained permanent resident status in the United States.

After her remarriage, Mrs. Bardole's former husband in Ireland retained a Utah attorney in an attempt to regain custody of his children. This attorney was successful in securing a protective service pickup order from the court, which is normally issued in cases where one parent fears the other will flee with the children. While there was no indication whatsoever that Mrs. Bardole intended to flee, her children were nevertheless taken into protective custody. Shortly after this, Dr. Bardole died tragically in his office, leaving her a widow.

To compound Mrs. Bardole's misfortune, the immigration agency which was responsible for filing her papers with the Immigration and Naturalization Services failed, out of sheer negligence, to submit her forms by the specified deadline. As a result, the Bardole family faced immediate deportation.

Mrs. Bardole is an excellent teacher and has made a new life in the United States, where she planned to live and work with her husband. The injustice of this situation has made her case the focus of a great deal of concern in Utah. She has been the subject of numerous newspaper articles and television reports, and my office has received countless letters and petitions on her behalf. Mrs. Bardole and her children are productive members of our society, who ask nothing more than to remain in their home. Her deportation would result in a grave injustice, and would deprive our community of a fine, productive family.

I urge my colleagues to join me in an effort to provide special relief to Kathleen Bardole. The bill I introduce today will allow her to attain permanent resident status and to continue her life without further disruption.

A TRIBUTE TO HON. DONNA T. MORRIS

HON. BILL SCHUETTE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Honorable Donna T. Morris, judge of probate in Midland, MI, on the occasion of her name being added to the Book of Golden Deeds.

Each year, the Exchange Club of Midland, MI, honors an outstanding citizen of the community by adding their name to its Book of Golden Deeds. This year, on April 25, 1989, the Exchange Club is honoring the Honorable Donna T. Morris for her many contributions to the Midland community.

Donna's first husband, Mr. John C. Morris, served as the Midland County probate judge. Together, Donna and John were very active with the troubled youth of the area. With their support and leadership, the Morris' former house was converted into a home for abandoned, neglected, and abused children called Harbour House.

Despite many adverse circumstances in her personal life, Donna managed to go back to school and obtain her juris doctor in 1977. She then returned home and in 1979, was elected Midland County probate judge. In that office, she has earned an impeccable reputation for fairness and is widely admired throughout the Midland area.

Donna has managed to overcome the obstacles in her life and accomplish what few people are capable of. Donna is responsible for securing funding sources for community agencies to establish much needed programs and facilities. Results of her efforts include the following: Jefferson House and Mode House, which are residential and independent living programs for mentally ill persons; the Sexual Offenders Program, which is a program that offers in-depth counseling for sexual offenders; Northwood Drug Counseling, a program that provides confidential and affordable counseling to students; and the Children's In Home Intervention Program, which offers professional training and counseling in the family home of certain high risk cases.

Donna's youngest child, Patricia, spent 8 months at Sloan Kettering Hospital in New York fighting a life-threatening battle with a rare form of leukemia. This traumatic experience coupled with her love for the disadvantaged drove Donna to work tirelessly toward her present goal of having a local juvenile diagnostic treatment and detention center.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring Judge Donna T. Morris on the day of her much deserved recognition for her contributions to the community of Midland, MI. Her commitment to the people she serves knows no limits. She has touched so many lives and treats every individual with dignity and genuine concern. Her reputation is of fairness and honesty. I treasure Donna's advice and concern, but most of all, I treasure her friendship.

SIFTING FACT FROM BALONEY

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the noted philosopher, Archie the Cockroach, once observed, "Did you ever notice that when a politician does get an idea, he gets it all wrong?" That tendency has certainly been exhibited lately by those who suggest that the legislative branch of Government does not have a better record in dealing with wrongdoing than does the executive branch of Government.

Certainly, corruption or ethical failings are serious matters wherever they are found. The record demonstrates that, painful though the process may be, the House of Representatives has done a better job reviewing the conduct of the people who run it than has the executive branch of Government.

A column written by Pulitzer Prize winner David Broder brings a welcome sense of balance to that question. I commend it to my colleagues.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1989]

MALARKEY FROM NEWT GINGRICH

(By David S. Broder)

Having succeeded in bringing House Speaker Jim Wright (D-Tex.) to the bar of justice before the House Ethics Committee, Rep. Newt Gingrich (R-Ga), the voluble new House minority whip, is trying for bigger game. He now wants to indict the entire House for what he is pleased to call "institutional corruption." He is overreaching to a degree that calls his own judgment into question.

When Gingrich filed the ethics charges against Wright last year, based on newspaper accounts of the speaker's financial dealings, it appeared to be a bit of partisan mischief-making. No one is laughing now, least of all Wright.

The unanimous report of the House Ethics Committee that there is reason to believe Wright may have violated House rules with his book sales and business affairs would seem to be all the vindication Gingrich would need—or want.

But the fast-talking former history professor is not satisfied by the prospect of nailing Wright's hide to the wall. In a succession of press sessions, he has been arguing that the scandal that has enveloped the highest elected Democrat in the land is just the tip of the iceberg. It's merely a symbol, Gingrich argues, of the "institutional corruption" that is endemic wherever Democrats have been in control for years—whether in the House of Representatives or in city halls from New York City to East St. Louis, from Chicago to Jersey City.

It is all, says Gingrich, part of the "corrupt liberal welfare state," a phrase he pronounces like one word, as folks in his adopted state of Georgia once talked about "damn-yankees."

Like all conspiracy theories, this one works better as an outlet for frustration than it does as a tool of analysis. The same man who sees the Congress in which he serves as a cesspool of "institutional corruption and abuse of power" can find nothing "systemic" about the instances of illegality in the executive branch, whether it's the Pentagon procurement scandals or the Iran-contra affair.

But Gingrich has a problem in elementary logic. If the House has been as thoroughly debauched after 35 years of control by the same party as he asserts, it's hard to figure why the boss man of this corrupt institution is in such trouble. When Gingrich is asked how a complaint by a minority-party backbencher (as he was when he filed charges against Wright) could put the speaker in such jeopardy, he answers, a bit lamely, "The system works."

If you're examining the record without the partisan, ideological blinders that Gingrich wears, the evidence suggests that the House has done a far better job of dealing with its bad actors than the White House and the executive branch have done in cleaning up their breaches of conduct.

In the past 10 years, the House has moved to expel four members for misconduct. Three of them resigned to avoid that humiliation, and the fourth was, in fact, expelled.

It has formally censured four members. One resigned, two were defeated by the voters and one—Rep. Gerry Studds (D-Mass.)—remains in office, having been judged more leniently by his constituents than by his colleagues.

Reprimands or other forms of mild fault-finding were voted on another dozen members, most of whom have subsequently resigned from the House, been defeated or have removed themselves to less exacting and more permissible surroundings.

That is hardly a pattern suggesting a calculated, callous indifference to the rules of conduct. And of the 15 or more members who have felt the sting of ethics investigations, only three have been Republicans. If the Democrats in control of that "corrupt institution" are trying to punish their adversaries and protect their own, they need glasses.

While Wright is the most important figure to face this kind of peer review, he is far from the first congressional power broker to learn that he is not above the law. One committee chairman was censured and two others were facing that threat when the voters removed them from office.

At the height of the 1984 campaign, the House Ethics Committee announced it was beginning an investigation of possible financial disclosure violations by the Democratic vice presidential nominee, Rep. Geraldine A. Ferraro (D-N.Y.). Ultimately, the "technical violations" that were found were of no political significance, but her fellow partisans in the House did not spare her the burden of facing that inquiry even as she was seeking the second-highest office in the land.

Contrast that record, if you will, with the repeated instances of cover-ups, conflicts of interest and plain old-fashioned corruption that have come to light in the executive branch in the past decade. And think about the number of times that a president has rushed out to defend, rather than denounce, the culprit—to pronounce that, in his eyes, Charley the Chiseler is still a national hero or a good friend.

It's politically tempting to say, based on the charges facing Jim Wright, that the House is corrupt from top to bottom. But the record shows that the House has done a whole lot more to cleanse itself than the executive branch can claim. So spare us, please, this "institutional corruption" malarkey.

HONORING FRANKLIN K. LANE HIGH SCHOOL AND ITS GALA CELEBRATION

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Franklin K. Lane High School located in the seventh district of New York. On April 29, 1989, the Franklin K. Lane High School Choir, along the Queensborough College Community Chorus and the Queens Symphonic Band, will be performing the Inauguration Cantata 1789.

These groups will be performing in honor of the 200th anniversary of the inauguration of George Washington as the first President of the United States. After participating in the Queenswide musicfest, the Franklin K. Lane High School Concert Choir was selected by the New York State Bicentennial Commission to perform the Inauguration Cantata 1789. This performance is one of only 20 authorized by the commission, a tribute to the choir's ability and reputation.

Acknowledgment goes to everyone involved in making this event a huge success. In particular I would like to recognize the following people: Mr. Morton Damesek, principal of Franklin K. Lane High School; Mr. Stanley Nussbaum, assistant principal, Franklin K. Lane High School; Mr. James Gedge, director of the 80 member Franklin Lane Concert Choir; Mr. Raoul S. Camus, conductor of the Queens Symphonic Band; and Mr. R. John Specht, director of the Queensborough Chorus.

Mr. Speaker, I would like all of my colleagues to pay tribute to the Franklin K. Lane High School Choir for all of its hard work in honor of one of this Nation's greatest moments—the inauguration of the first President.

TRIBUTE TO CLAIRE WETHERELL

HON. RICHARD H. STALLINGS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I take this opportunity to recognize one of Idaho's outstanding citizens, State Senator Claire Wetherell, who will be honored on Friday, April 28, 1989, as Idaho Catholic Woman of the Year. This most prestigious award will be presented to her during the Idaho Council of Catholic Women's Conference to be held in Boise.

Since 1951, when Bishop Kelly of the Boise Diocese first started this award, a number of deserving Idaho women have been honored for their outstanding service to the church and to the community. Every 2 years a woman is chosen who represents distinguished qualities of leadership in spiritual and community activities.

Idaho President Virginia Almquist has said:

Senator Wetherell is a marvelous choice. She exemplifies Catholic womanhood at its best—with concern for spiritual as well as secular interests.

On Sunday, April 30, 1989, Senator Wetherell will receive a papal blessing and a medal at Mass celebrated by Bishop Todd Brown at Sacred Heart Church in Boise.

I can think of no one who better exemplifies leadership and service to her church and her community than my very good friend, Claire, and I commend the Idaho Council of Catholic Women and Bishop Brown for making this excellent choice.

I have known Claire for nearly 15 years. As a candidate for office and as a Congressman, I have been welcomed in her home and the homes of her family. I have admired Claire and her willingness to serve her fellow Idahoans in so many different ways. She is a selfless and bright woman whose smile can

light up the room and whose wit can put anyone at ease.

Some time ago, the Idaho Statesman honored Claire as a distinguished citizen. In reviewing her many accomplishments, the newspaper noted that there was a time, before Mountain Home, ID, had a doctor, that the next best thing was Claire Wetherell. Claire really became the doctor of Mountain Home herself—going at any time of the day or night to minister to everyone. There are doctors in Mountain Home now—but she is still serving the community.

Claire was born and raised in Flandreau, SD. She attended the University of California at Berkeley and Mercy Hospital of Nursing in Council Bluffs, IA. She worked as a nurse and served as a nurse in the U.S. Navy during World War II.

She was supervisor of base supply at Mountain Home Air Force Base, assistant director of the USO, worked part time at Elmore Memorial Hospital and has been president of Guaranty Title, Inc., since the death of her husband in 1966.

Her service to Mountain Home and Idaho has ranged from political to voluntary. She served two terms on the Mountain Home City Council, including 2 years as president. She is currently serving her third term as State senator from District 12, which includes Elmore and Owyhee Counties. She is a member of the judiciary and rules, education and agriculture committees.

Claire has served as president of the American Legion Auxiliary, the Mountain Home Civic Club, Business and Professional Women, Catholic Ladies' Alter Society, Mountain Home Chamber of Commerce and the Mountain Home PTA.

She was the first president and one of the organizers of the Elmore Memorial Hospital Auxiliary and has been active in many community fundraising drives. In 1977, she was selected First Lady of the Year by the Elmore County chapters of Beta Sigma Phi and chosen Woman of Progress by the southwestern district of business and professional women. In 1988, she was honored as Outstanding Volunteer by the Easter Seal Society at their White Rose Luncheon.

Claire was vice chairman of the Idaho Democratic Central Committee for 10 years and also served as a State Democratic committeewoman and was a delegate to the 1980 Democratic Convention.

She serves on the Veterans' Affairs Commission and the district IV State department of health and welfare advisory board. She also served on the county board of health and board of education.

I congratulate Claire on this most distinguished award and I congratulate the Idaho Council of Catholic Women for its choice.

A TRIBUTE TO JANE RILEY

HON. GEORGE (BUDDY) DARDEN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity today to recognize and honor Ms. Jane Riley, who is retiring as principal of Hickory Hills Elementary School after 15 years of dedicated service. Ms. Riley has touched the lives of so many children, including mine, and I know many parents throughout the community share my appreciation for her dedication to our children.

Prior to serving as principal of Hickory Hills, Ms. Riley worked in the Marietta Board of Education central office for 7 years. She also served 4 years as a first grade teacher at Hickory Hills Elementary School. During her career, Ms. Riley made many contributions to our school system, and any of our children's successes are in part due to her dedicated leadership.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great admiration and appreciation that I share with you the contributions and accomplishments of Ms. Riley. I invite you and our colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Ms. Riley, and in wishing her the best in her retirement.

HOOSAC VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL CHORUS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, an estimated 10,000 to 15,000 young people across the United States will gather on the Mall here in Washington to perform the largest open-air concert ever staged. I am proud that at least 50 of those students will be coming from my district in western Massachusetts.

The students from Hoosac Valley High School in Adams, MA, not only will participate, but they will serve as a host school for this historic event. As some of my colleagues may know, this event will be the largest open-air concert ever staged.

More than 300 choral groups will join together in performing a series of continuous 30-minute concerts around the Washington Monument. At the conclusion of the day's events, the students will gather near the Lincoln Memorial for a group performance of music and dance, including the premiere of an original song composed especially for this event.

Mr. Speaker, events like this are truly no-lose propositions. Each of the choirs, which pay their own way to Washington, wins by seeing our Nation's Capitol, by meeting some of their peers from across the country, and by feeling the joy and the warmth of such a magnificent event. Those of us in Washington get to enjoy the vigor and enthusiasm of thousands of our young constituents. And, of course, the country is able to see the optimism and the boundless energy of its most recent generation, to renew a faith in our young.

Those of us who will be in town this Saturday will be in for a real treat, Mr. Speaker. At a time when we look out and see the problems of our young people strewn across the headlines of our local papers, a time when we see drug use and abuse run rampant through our streets, sometimes there is a sense of despair about the future of America and her young. Seeing a unified call of action, seeing the bright, shining faces of young people who truly care about their fellow man, puts a great deal into perspective.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have our problems. But we also have our bright spots. And Saturday, April 29, will be a bright spot that we all can share in.

Congratulations go out to the Hoosac Valley choral director, Mrs. Marianne Caproni. Although she wouldn't tell you herself, she initiated this program. That was the first step, and the kids took over from there. Hearing the enthusiasm of these young folks, and their efforts to raise money for the trip, really gives you a feel for the importance of the event.

My young constituents held bake sales, car washes, sold candy, did anything they could to raise their own funds for this trip. I understand that groups from nearly every State held fundraisers for this trip, and that a group from Mississippi even held a pig-kissing contest.

This should be a proud day for all of us, Mr. Speaker. And if any of you get a chance to visit Stage J, near the Ellipse, you will have the rare opportunity to see the best show of them all—the Hoosac Valley High School Chorus.

RENEWABLE ENERGY TRADE EQUITY AND PROMOTION ACT OF 1989

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Renewable Energy Trade Equity and Promotion Act of 1989. This legislation, based on legislation Senator HATFIELD and I introduced last Congress, will use existing Federal programs to promote American exports to the potentially multibillion dollar renewable energy market.

Over 65 percent of renewable energy equipment is exported to Third World countries. The United States once had the lion's share of this market. But that share has declined due to aggressive export promotion programs by our international competitors. For example, Denmark is using concessionary financing to promote wind energy projects and the European Economic Community has offered $30 million in tied aid to promote European photovoltaic products in drought-stricken Saharan Africa.

In the 98th Congress, I introduced and we passed a bill (P.L. 98-370) creating an interagency board, the Committee on Renewable Energy Commerce and Trade [CORECT], to coordinate Federal export programs and establish a unified approach on renewable energy exports. CORECT has developed industry promotional materials, supported trade missions and market surveys, and is supporting a Caribbean Basin Trade Show and Conference in Miami next month. Yet with all this good work, the effort is dwarfed by our international competitors.

The bill I introduce today is designed to encourage the Government to work further in

concert with U.S. industry to boost exports of American renewable energy products. In brief, it does the following:

First, it requires the U.S. Trade Representative to report to Congress on the extent other countries impose protective tariffs or other restrictions on U.S. energy products or services.

Second, it reestablishes the feasibility program of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation allowing incentives, grants, and studies for small renewable energy businesses to help them market overseas.

Third, it directs both the Export/Import Bank and the Small Business Administration to set goals of awarding at least 5 percent of their energy industry export funding to renewable energy projects, and asks the agencies to report annually on their renewable expenditures.

Fourth, it calls for information exchanges and training to help link U.S. producers with assistance programs and potential foreign customers.

Fifth, it broadens the mission of the CORECT board and authorizes $2.5 million for fiscal year 1990 to encourage renewable energy marketing overseas.

Sixth, it has us to instruct international financing agencies receiving U.S. support, such as the World Bank, to promote renewable energy projects.

Seventh, it allows the Department of Defense to use renewable energy equipment in its overseas military assistance programs.

Solar, wind, geothermal, ocean thermal, biomass, hydropower, and other renewable energy sources will grow in importance as the world comes to appreciate the pollution, climate change, and economic costs associated with fossil fuels. The United States must be prepared to maintain its lead in these technologies, both as innovator and as producer for the world.

The Renewable Energy Trade Equity and Promotion Act of 1989 is an important legislative step toward maintaining our edge in the world renewable energy market. I am proud of the accomplishments of CORECT. We must now build upon the success of this initial effort.

The bill I introduce today will not add significantly to the Federal budget, yet it provides the tools American industry needs to respond to the international challenge. It could well be a model for export assistance for other high-technology industries composed primarily of small businesses. It urge my colleagues to support it.

IT'S TIME TO CONDUCT HEARINGS

HON. CLAUDE HARRIS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the committees of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives to conduct hearings on the Catastrophic Health Care Act, Public Law 100-360. I have written both Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI and Chairman BENTSEN to answer questions about this complicated public law. Like many of you present today, I have heard many complaints from constituents about the financing mechanisms for this bill. Although I applaud the efforts of the Congress to improve Medicare, I am concerned about the cost of these new benefits.

Last week, on April 18, 1989, I was unavoidably detained by a group of constituents in my office. As a result of this meeting, I was unable to vote on rollcall 31. If I had been present, I most certainly would have voted "aye" to ask the Congress to reexamine the financing of this act.

I am pleased that both Houses of Congress have now voted to have these hearings. It is important that all interested parties be given a forum to express their views.

MICHAEL JAY SOLOMON HONORED

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an extraordinary individual and outstanding member of the community, Mr. Michael Jay Solomon. He is this years recipient of Shaare Zedek's highest honor, the Jerusalem Award, and will be saluted by the Los Angeles Friends of Shaare Zedek Center, Jerusalem, for his efforts to sustain and strengthen the medical center's crucial life-saving and life-giving work.

Michael has worked tirelessly to uphold Shaare Zedek's more than 100-year tradition of administering the finest medical care to the people of Israel regardless of race, religion, color, age or ability to pay. This humanitarian commitment is most recently demonstrated by his request that all funds raised by this event be used to support and expand the hospital's pediatric department.

A pioneer in the entertainment industry, Michael began his career in film distribution at age 18 hoisting film reels onto trucks at loading docks. In 1959 he joined United Artist's International Division and a year later was assigned to Central America, where he sold theatrical films out of Panama and Bogotá, Colombia. Within 2 years, at age of 24, he became the youngest field manager in the history of the motion picture business, heading up the United Artist office in Lima, Peru, for 2 years.

Michael was asked by MCA to start their Latin American Television Division and soon became MCA's youngest vice president at age 30. In 1977, after assignments in Central America, South America and Mexico, Michael launched his own international film company, Michael Jay Solomon Films International. He also published "The Solomon International Television Newsletter," a weekly consolidation of worldwide programming information. Now in its 12th year, his newsletter is considered one of the most highly regarded resources on this subject. A year later, Mr. Solomon teamed with Michael Garin to form Telepictures Corp. Telepictures flourished and in 1985 the company merged with Lorimar to become Lorimar Telepictures Corp.

Michael is a member of Board of Directors of Continuing Care Association, International Radio and Television Foundation, New York University College of Business and Public Administration, and vice chairman of International Council of National Association of TV Arts and Sciences. He most recently was named founding chairman of the newly established west coast office of the Jerusalem Foundation, Inc., and chairman of the National Association of Television Program Executives International Committee.

Presently, Michael Jay Solomon is a member of the three-men office of the president of Lorimar Telepictures. He is a member of the company's board of directors and oversees international operations. He is a native New Yorker and was educated at Emerson in Boston. He also attended NYU Evening School of Commerce. He is happily married to Luciana Paluzzi and is the proud father of Lee Jay.

It is my distinct honor and pleasure to ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Mr. Michael Jay Solomon, a lifetime leader of the Jewish community who has built a record of commitment and excellence that is an inspiration to us all.

FRANK FAT'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Frank Fat, the founder and host emeritus of Frank Fat's, a Sacramento landmark he established 50 years ago. Frank is the dean of Sacramento restaurants and I would like to extend my sincere congratulations to him on the occasion of Frank Fat's 50th anniversary.

Frank is a hardworking man with a wellspring of patience and indefatigable ambition. He has nurtured his business and relationships until they have blossomed into a leading restaurant frequented by those seeking both business and pleasure. Frank Fat's has been called the "third house" for it is said that there has been more legislation passed there than in the senate and assembly chambers of the capitol.

Frank Fat emulates integrity. He is a gentle, serene man who is said to prefer friends to money. While a millionaire in his own right, if wealth was based on friendships, Frank would be a multibillionaire.

Frank has given much back to the community. He has always promoted community service and has dedicated his life to improving the Chinese image, especially in the areas of politics and business. As the patriarch of the Fat family, he has lived by the philosophical principles of family, hard work, education, and kindness. "Honesty gets the reward" is said to be Frank Fat's proverb.

The Fat family is indeed a dynasty in our community. I offer my congratulations to Frank, his wife Mary, and the entire Fat family on the 50th anniversary of one of my favorite restaurants.

THE NAMING OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL 101 IN MEMORY OF OFFICER EDWARD R. BYRNE

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on April 27 a school in my district, Junior High School 101 in the Bronx, will be renamed. Schools are named every day, for Presidents, community leaders, and national heroes.

This school is being named for a different type of hero, Police Officer Edward R. Byrne, who was killed in cold blood at the orders of a drug lord while guarding a witness.

The full horror of the drug epidemic that is sweeping our Nation was brought home very clearly that day. If a police officer is not safe from the drug dealer, how safe is the average citizen?

We in New York took Officer Byrne's death not as a defeat in the war against drugs, but rather as a challenge. We decided that we would not abondon our streets, our neighborhoods, our city to the drug pushers. Mr. Speaker, we are in a war and we must dedicate all our resources and energy if we are to be victorious.

The main battlegbround in this war is the hearts and minds of our youth. By naming this school after this young police officer, killed in the line of duty, not only the children who attend this school, but all children will learn what a real hero is. The term "drugs kill" will be driven home. Officer Byrne will not have died in vain.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. MANUEL MALOOF

HON. BEN JONES

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. JONES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize a truly outstanding business and civic leader from De Kalb County, GA, Mr. Manuel Maloof. Mr. Maloof is currently serving his second term as chief executive officer of De Kalb County.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Manuel is being recognized for his civic achievements by being honored with the Mr. De Kalb award by the De Kalb County Unit of the American Heart Association.

I know Manuel to be a man of commitment, compassion, and candor. He is a business man, an admirable public servant, and above all, a family man.

He brings to his job an old fashioned concern about people and their problems. He possesses a tough minded sense of fiscal responsibility. Through his able leadership, Manuel has guided De Kalb County into an unprecedented period of growth and prosperity. Manuel Maloof is a man of keen intelligence, uncommon wit, and rare courage.

Manuel has a simple formula for success. He believes in fair play, common sense, and hard work. These virtues describe Manuel, and they reflect the spirit of the county which he has served so well.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor my friend, Manuel Maloof, as Mr. De Kalb.

WORKER'S MEMORIAL DAY

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor those American workers who have given their lives or suffered disabling illness and injury while in the workplace. April 28 has been declared Worker's Memorial Day by the unions of the AFL-CIO as a time to remember those who have sacrificed to make American industry strong.

Every year more than 10,000 American workers are killed on the job; tens of thousands more are permanently disabled; and millions are injured. Another 100,000 workers die from cancer, lung disease and other diseases related to toxic chemical exposure at work.

Mr. Speaker, Worker's Memorial Day will provide not only a forum to remember these victims of workplace injuries and disease, but act as an incentive to renew our efforts to strengthen safety and health protections. These workers deserve better standards of enforcement and just and fair compensation for their injuries. We in the Congress must rededicate ourselves to improving safety and health in every American workplace.

CHRISTOPHER JONES EARNS EAGLE SCOUT AWARD

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great admiration I call to the attention of my colleagues the achievement of Christopher Jones, a constituent of mine from Newport, PA. On Sunday, April 16, 1989, Christopher Jones received the Boy Scout's most coveted award—the Eagle Scout.

Christopher, the son of Dave and Cindy Jones, has demonstrated exemplary self-discipline as a member of Boy Scout Troop 222 and the Newport community. Under the guidance of Scoutmaster Dave Lenig, Christopher has honed his mental and physical skills to the form required for admittance into the ranks of the Eagle Scouts. This fine young man is also an active participant in his high school band and a member of St. Paul's Lutheran Church in Newport.

Mr. Speaker, I invite you and my colleagues in the U.S. Congress to join me in wishing congratulations to Eagle Scout Christopher Jones on this very special occasion. I wish him great success in his future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO ASBESTOS WORKERS LOCAL NO. 11

HON. HELEN DELICH BENTLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, this year Asbestos Workers Local No. 11—one of the most venerable union organizations in my district—is celebrating its 75th year of existence. Many of its members reside in my district—fine folks who have blessed me time and time again with their support. It is an honor to salute them here.

While Local 11 is a somewhat small organization, it has long been a big voice in Baltimore's building trade. Over the three-quarters of a century the union has existed its membership has been involved in projects involving ships and buildings throughout the Baltimore area. They labored on through times of war and depression, prosperity and peace. In addition, they also faced the health risks that accompany working so closely with asbestos and fought for the passage of legislation to make their jobs a bit safer. Despite all this, however, they endured.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you as well as all my colleagues to join me in saluting the past and present membership of Asbestos Local No. 11. Truly they represent all the great things that come to mind when we think of the American worker. Each of these special people has my best wishes upon this happy milestone.

REPRESENTATIVE WAYNE OWENS SPEAKING ON GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1989

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and good friend from Utah, Mr. OWENS, gave a speech on Saturday, April 15 in Salt Lake City to a Utah women's conference on the global environment. I am most impressed with Mr. OWENS' timely and provocative comments and would like to submit his speech for the RECORD so others can benefit from his insights. As more and more environmental issues take on a global aspect, I believe careful consideration of Mr. OWENS' comments will help us in Congress take prompt and appropriate actions to ensure the quality of the environment on our planet.

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE WAYNE OWENS AT THE CONFERENCE "TO SAVE THE WORLD," HELD SATURDAY, APRIL 15, 1989 IN SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Thank you for your kind invitation to discuss the global environment, an exceedingly important subject. I welcome this opportunity.

John Donne wrote:

"No man is an island, entire of itself. Every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main. If a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a manor of

thy friend's or of thine own were. Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind, and therefore, never send to know for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for thee."

The bells are tolling, pealing, for the first time on a global environmental scale—and even Congress, occasionally hard of hearing, is slowly awakening to the sound of alarm. The metaphysics of transendentalism and the preaching of wilderness apostles like John Muir and Henry David Thoreau of the interconnectness of nature, is becoming popular wisdom. For the first time, the average citizen understands that what happens in Brazil affects the United States—and vice versa. Fortress America exists no longer. No fence, no law, no patrol can prevent the invasion of polluted air and water from around the globe to our borders and our shores. The Earth knows no boundaries beyond its own biosphere, and every time a chlorofluorocarbon escapes into the atmosphere in West Germany, every time a hectare of rain forest disappears in Zaire, every time a factory in Ohio belches hydrocarbons into the air, every time a ghost ship wends its unwanted way across the world's oceans in search of a port for its toxic waste, the bell tolls for all of us. "No country is an island," Donne might well have written, for such is the truth in the late 20th century.

The growing global environmental crisis is full of ironies. We have too much ozone in the troposphere, the zone closest to the Earth; too little in the stratosphere. We dread a nuclear winter; but now we also worry about a global warming. We fear increased flooding in areas like Bangladesh; we fear drought in the heartland of America. The question is not so much whether climate has begun changing—it clearly has—but what direction that change will take and whether we can predict and maybe even prevent some of these changes.

Perhaps the most pressing issue is ozone depletion. The growing ozone hole in Antarctica has prodded the international community into taking measures to reduce the number of chloroflurocarbons, or CFC's, released into the atmosphere. The Montreal Protocol of 1987, an international agreement among several CFC producing nations, was a good first step, but it will not by itself be enough.

The problem with ozone, like most things, is simply a matter of distribution. While the ozone in the stratosphere disappears around the poles, the ozone around urban areas increases. There's plenty of ozone. It's just in the wrong places—in the eyes and lungs of irritated Los Angelenos and in the stunted crops of the Central Valley, instead of the clean frigid reaches of the Antarctic stratosphere.

Science has attributed the blame for ozone depletion to CFC's. We cannot afford to wait for more conclusive proof of this theory before we take action, for this proof would be a systematic pattern of skin cancer and other human suffering. Nor can we simply take Don Hodel's infamous advice during the last Administration and protect ourselves with passive measures. Hats, sunscreen, and sunglasses are no solution to the depletion of our planet's protective layer of ozone. Only active measures will work to prevent further destruction of the best sunscreen imaginable, stratospheric ozone. In my mind, that means legislation, and now. Several bills are before the House and Senate which would reduce the production of ozone-depleting CFC's to zero by the year 2000. I support this effort and I am working for prompt passage of this legislation. The atmosphere needs to heal.

We would prefer that this be a multilateral commitment among all CFC producing nations in order not to competitively disadvantage our own industry, but there is not enough time for bickering. What we do, we must do quickly, and we will encourage other nations to do the same. My assignment on the Foreign Affairs Committee gives me the opportunity and the jurisdiction to be involved in this and other worldwide efforts at environmental cooperation.

Probably the most complex problem of all, and yet at the same time the most critical, is how to slow down and eventually eliminate the seemingly inexorable warming of the earth caused by increasing levels of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere. Trying to stall the greenhouse effect goes right to the heart of industrial society and demands a rethinking of our priorities.

The world's climate clearly appears to be warming, despite one of the coldest winters in Utah I can remember. Four of the ten hottest years on our planet were recorded in the 1980's—and we're not done yet; 1989 seems likely to continue this drying, warming trend in our region and over most of the United States and the world. A few years ago, as we sandbagged State Street, then fished for trout in it, we could hardly imagine worrying about whether Salt Lake City would be able to maintain its supply of freshwater in the coming decade. But we are worried now, as are residents in California, the urban Northeast, Arizona, and elsewhere. My firm support for the completion of the Central Utah Project is tied, in part, to my suspicion that this warming, drying phase is not over. Changing weather patterns have an all-encompassing and cumulative effect. The devastating fires of Yellowstone are related, the experts say, the loss of billions of dollars of crops last year in the prairie States is related, the continued desertification of much of northern Africa and the resulting starvation are related.

The evidence is insistent. We must do something to alleviate the warming trend. It sounds like something out of an apocalyptic science fiction novel: fire, drought, flood, glacial melting—but the process may have already begun.

Ideally, all nations would cooperate to reduce carbon dioxide emissions significantly by the year 2000. Certainly, the United States must. The debate is heating up in Congress—but so is the weather. We can't filibuster on this one; we cannot wait for the rest of the world to agree before we begin our own reductions. We produce about 25 percent of the world's carbon dioxide emissions ourselves and we must mitigate the damage we are causing. Energy conservation is an integral part of that effort, as is technical innovation and I am confident our technology is equal to the challenge. I support the national goal, written into several pieces of proposed legislation, of reducing carbon dioxide and other global warming gasses by 20 percent by the year 2000.

The greenhouse effect aside, pollution is still a major problem in much of the world. We are responsible for the acid rain killing lakes and streams in the northeast and in eastern Canada. The Clean Air Act, incredibly, has become a major political fight, although our new environmentalist President has publicly supported the tough standards our country needs. Eastern Europe is in difficult straits, a victim of its own uncontrolled heavy industry and acid rain from both east and west. The U.S.S.R. has pollution problems that make our own pale by comparison. Since acid rain and polluted air, like most environmental scourges, transcend national boundaries, this is another forum for international efforts and multilateral agreements.

The most exciting development in the field of cool, clean energy, of course, is only a few blocks away. If fusion power actually does become feasible, we will have taken a great step towards ending global warming. I support the research being done at the University for many reasons, and one of them is my fervent hope that the elusive, nonpolluting source of energy we've been looking for since man lit his first fire, might conceivably arise from this experiment. Acid rain, global warming, even the strategic importance of the Middle East and Persian Gulf would be transformed by this development. Alchemy in the Middle Ages had nothing on this. Turning lead to gold pales beside turning a gallon of sea water into enough electricity to light a city.

The most disturbing element in global warming is the near-impossibility of predicting all its effects. No computer model is up to the task of accurately plotting the future of weather. The only experiment which would prove conclusive would entail using our own planet as the test tube. It seems likely that certain farming areas would heat to the point of being nonproductive. Other farming areas might arise in more northerly climes as the weather warms. Washington, DC might disappear beneath the rising waters of Chesapeake Bay as the world's glacial load melts—a side effect some day we could endure. But man has adapted himself to an essentially predictable climate. Significant variation from that model would require changes and expense like the world has never seen before.

The growing problem of deforestation is another reason global warming continues to escalate. "Any fool can kill a tree," wrote John Muir. "It cannot fight or run away." We've always had an emotional attachment to trees. Now we know why. Besides providing shade, beauty, and lumber, trees protect us from an imbalance of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. As any fourth-grade science student knows, they consume carbon dioxide and miraculously produce oxygen, the most precious gas in the solar system. As long as we have trees, plants, and algae, we will be able to breathe.

Obviously, the best solution to too much carbon dioxide in our atmosphere would simply be to plant more trees. Reforestation is what we need. Unfortunately, deforestation is what we are getting.

I want the United States to be more involved in preventing deforestation and promoting sustainable development in the developing world. Too often, programs in foreign lands run by our own Agency for International Development, or AID, have contributed to environmental degradation and exploitation. As we in the Foreign Affairs Committee rewrite and amend the Foriegn Assistance Act in the next few weeks, we will have the chance to emphasize sustainable development and environmental protection in our foreign assistance projects. Too often, the United States, within its own borders, in an effort to save money or prop up local economies, has given conflicting signals about the importance of environmental protection. I support a bill to trade off debt if debtor nations stop mining their forests. If we are going to encourage nations to reforest, not denude, we had better, for

our own credibility, end wasteful and destructive practices in our own forests, like the Tongass National Forest in Alaska. There, in the panhandle of southeast Alaska where I visited last summer, our last great rainforest is being ripped down at a prodigious, nonrenewable rate, and at the unbelievable cost to the American taxpayer of 97 cents of every dollar invested in the logging. Until we straighten out our own problems of overcutting and short-term exploitation, we are not credible in our efforts in Brazil and elsewhere.

Closely linked with endangered species and tropical forest preservation is the idea of biodiversity, since the great majority of the world's species live in the rainforests of our planet. Some scientists say we may only be familiar with less than 50 percent of the organisms which live in the rainforests. Every day, several new species are discovered. We are approaching tropical forests from a position of ignorance. We have an amazing amount to learn from them, if they will only be around long enough to teach us.

Obviously, we have some serious global environmental problems. But how can we solve them? Congress has proven itself gifted at expressing concern and forming committees for research, but sometimes less gifted at actually implementing effective programs. Even assuming we are successful in taking timely action within our own borders and in U.S. activities overseas, that will still not be enough.

The United States, to maintain its environmental leadership, must become a more active participant in multilateral efforts for the environment, particularly in the United Nations. The UN Environment Program was established in 1973, the first truly international attempt at environmental protection. It was designed to act as a catalyst, to encourage and teach nations how to properly care for their land and resources. We must strengthen UNEP and I am undertaking efforts to do just that, with an initial concentration on providing UNEP with more money and staff. With only 170 professional employees to cover the planet, UNEP is not exactly a bloated bureaucracy. The Administration's proposed budget for UNEP this year actually entails a decrease in funding. This seems counterproductive at a time when virtually all nations are beginning to understand that environmental protection is not nearly as important for aesthetics or recreation as it is for survival. I will fight in Congress not only to increase the funding and the power of this organization, but also to provide that a portion of our Peace Corps volunteers are offered to UNEP as an international conservation corps, for reforesting, for education, for sustainable, ecologically responsible development. I would like to see more opportunities for American professionals to work with UNEP through the UN Volunteers Program in order to truly catalyze the environmental consciousness of the Third World.

Bhopal. Chernoble, annual flooding off the deforested Himalaya into the Ganges plain, acid rain, the unconscionable spill at Valdez, the continuing deforestation of the tropics, starvation resulting from desertification—all these events have galvanized the feeling that environmental protection and the economics of development are not mutually exclusive. To the contrary, they are synergistic. Development will not properly occur without a healthy environment. Utah's major attraction for new business is the high quality of life we enjoy, our special ability to live and work with beauty and nature.

Along the same lines, we are reviewing the activities of multinational lenders like the World Bank and International Monetary Fund to determine how their policies affect the environment. Besides sponsoring numerous projects of questionable environmental value, the multilateral lenders are encouraging the developing world to pillage their land for short-term commodity extraction to pay interest on debt once intended for development, but now more likely to cause regression. Several bills, including those related to debt relief, are under discussion in Congress and address the issue of how to influence the multilateral lenders to be more responsive to environmental concerns.

As the traditional prime mover of environmental protection, the United States is in a unique position to lend a hand bilaterally, country to country, to nations who could use our experience. American foreign aid has been often primarily devoted to strategic military and geopolitical aims and has rarely been used as a tool to better environmental conditions. I am trying to help change that.

We have cooperative environmental agreements with many countries, including the Soviet Union. Secretary General Gorbachev's comments at the United Nations last December opened the door to cooperation and revealed, for the first time, a serious Soviet concern for the environment. As two of the world's greatest resource consumers and polluters, I believe we have a special responsibility to clean up not only our own nations, but to use our influence to promote environmentally sound practices in our spheres of influence around the world. I would like to see us extend our 1972 Agreement for Environmental Cooperation to encompass joint efforts in the developing world in reforestation and other environmental actions. I would also like to see AID's environmental budget greatly increased. Out of a Foreign Aid Assistance proposal of $14.7 billion, only $1.1 billion is actually available for country-to-country development aid. Only a tiny fraction of that will be used to encourage a sustainable environment. I find this approach inadequate.

By far the most controversial aspect of the international environmental effort is the apparent need to plan population growth, especially in the developing world. I am even hesitant to broach the topic in one of the most fertile congressional districts in America. May I simply say that all of the other efforts we make might be futile if we do not plan the growth on our planet—like Sisyphus pushing a stone uphill, for every step forward, we will roll back two and never reach the summit. There was, for many years, the assumption that population would stabilize as economic growth was achieved. After all, that had generally been the case in the Western World. The unfortunate reality, however, has been a Malthusian dilemma: High population growths have prevented the very economic development which would have controlled human increase. The poor get poorer and there are many more of them. Many nations will never reach an economic threshold which would create a leveling of population, unless they control their populations first.

In closing, I would like to ask one question: What has been our most meaningful export to the rest of the world?

Coca-Cola? Big Macs? Fords? F-16's?

I think we could make a good argument that environmentalism is our greatest export. I am sometimes surprised when I hear people speaking of environmentalism as though it were some foreign concept, somehow un-American. It is not. It is as American and homegrown as Mom, apple pie, free enterprise, the Bill of Rights. We invented it. We perfected it. We created the first national parks, national forests, and national regulatory systems for environmental protection. We even stopped completion of a major dam—for a time at least—to save a 2-inch fish we were afraid we could find nowhere else.

Environmentalism is quintessentially American. It is part of our heritage, a vestige of the frontier, a physical reminder of the kind of freedom embodied in our Constitution. The merit of the concept has been proven in practice and in the sincere flattery of imitation. Nations throughout the world have modeled their programs and agencies after our own. Even the Soviet Union has adopted the framework of our Clean Air and Clean Water Acts and recently embraced our concept of national parks for the people rather than nature reserves set aside strictly for science. We may have lost the edge in electronics, even perhaps in high-resolution TV, but we are still the leaders in environmental protection, and I hope we will use our unique position to encourage the world to solve the critical environmental problems I've mentioned tonight.

Sometime about 20 years ago, the world began to view itself as a coherent whole. We began to understand that national boundaries were nearly meaningless in the environmental context. I think we can trace that moment of epiphany to the day the world first saw the world, when one giant leap for mankind became one huge step in the world's environmental consciousness. No one could ever view our planet in the same sense again, having seen our bright, beautiful, blue orb drifting through the cold and charmless void of space. Our planet was our home, our unspeakably lovely home, and, like a college student leaving home for the first time, we began to appreciate our Mother. For a brief, timeless moment, looking through television cameras at the sterile sands of the moon, we earthlings were homesick and couldn't wait to get back.

Environmentalism is no longer a question of aesthetics; instead, our future hangs in the balance. Ecology is not the battle cry of impersonal science or impassioned romantics, but exactly what it means in Greek, the study of our home. We must be wise enough to meet the challenges of the global environment for we will surely never be clever enough to ignore them and survive. Voltaire once characterized humans as parasites on the body of the Earth. I would rather imagine a curious symbiosis, for, at this moment, our planet relies on us, just as much as we rely on it. And if we address the global environmental problems facing us and resolve them, perhaps we will have circumvented John Donne's tolling bell completely, simply by preventing it from ringing at all.