

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTRODUCTION FOR THE  
SCHOOL-BASED MEALS FOR  
OLDER INDIVIDUALS AND INTER-  
GENERATIONAL PROGRAMS ACT OF 1990

HON. MARILYN LLOYD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to expand the Congregate Meals Program authorized under the Older Americans Act [OAA]. My legislation, the School-Based Meals for Older Individuals and Intergenerational Programs Act of 1990 will create nutrition sites in elementary and secondary schools and couple them with intergenerational programs that will benefit both the elderly participants and the students of the schools. I am joined in introducing this bill by the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Aging's Subcommittee on Human Services, Representative TOM DOWNEY.

Senator BROCK ADAMS, who is the chairman of the Senate Labor and Human Resources' Subcommittee on Aging will also introduce this legislation today. I am particularly pleased that Senator ADAMS is sponsoring this measure because it is modeled on a program located in Seattle, WA, entitled [SPICE]—"School Programs Involving Our City's Elderly." The SPICE Program, which has been in operation for over 16 years, is known as one of the most successful intergenerational programs in the Nation. I want to thank the program's executive director, Ken Camper, for providing his expertise and firsthand knowledge during the development of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have two primary reasons for introducing this legislation. First, we simply must develop ways to provide more congregate and home-delivered meals to needy older Americans. There are millions of older individuals who could benefit from nutritious meals, but the meals are unavailable to them. The unmet need is growing as our population ages and as funding sources are reduced, and during the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act in 1991, we must confront this problem. Second, I believe that intergenerational programs are critical to our future. We must bring generations together to exchange ideas and to help one another to cope with the demands of our complex society.

Mr. Speaker, my vision is to reduce age segregation and intergenerational tension through the development of innovative programs involving individuals of all ages. My legislation will fund such programs in communities with severe needs. This legislation has been written with the experiences of numerous intergenerational programs in mind. It combines a low-cost lunch for older adults

with a variety of educational, health, recreational, and social activities that will benefit students and the elderly.

I will not discuss at length the School-Based Meals for Older Individuals and Intergenerational Programs Act, but I would like to explain some of the many benefits of this program, and insert in the RECORD a section by section description of the bill for my colleagues to consider.

Mr. Speaker, the bill creates a new subsection under the Nutrition Services Program in the OAA to provide nutrition providers with grants to establish new congregate meal sites in schools. The grants would be used to develop meals programs that are desperately needed and intergenerational programming that will offer the elderly's unique range of knowledge, talents, and experiences to the students of these schools. It is my hope that this interaction between generations will benefit older individuals by enhancing their self-esteem and providing them with worthwhile activities in roles as tutors, teachers aides, special speakers, playground supervisors, and in many other volunteer roles.

At the same time, I believe that the children and young adults of our Nation will benefit greatly from more interaction with older adults. Our young people face very difficult situations as they move through the educational process, and the intergenerational programs that this bill creates will assist students in schools with the greatest needs as evidenced by dropout rates, substance abuse, poverty, and other factors that indicate an at risk student population. Older Americans can and want to help their communities, including service as positive role models for students.

School districts will benefit from this program, as well. They need broad-based support in their communities for school initiatives, and the elderly, who will become more familiar with the school systems through this program, can help on such initiatives. Schools and teachers also benefit from the availability of volunteers to provide classroom assistance. This program will also put to good use underutilized space and equipment that school districts often have as a result of decreases in enrollment.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we are introducing the bill today to put it out on the table for comment and support prior to the 102d Congress when it will be reintroduced. It is our hope that we will have many cosponsors by January. I look forward to working with my distinguished colleague, Representative KILDEE, who serves as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor's Subcommittee on Human Resources, which has jurisdiction over the Older Americans Act. He has an outstanding record of service in behalf of the elderly and is a strong advocate for intergenerational programs.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following materials be inserted in the RECORD following my

statement on the School-Based Meals for Older Individuals and Intergenerational Programs Act of 1990:

SECTION-BY-SECTION DESCRIPTION

The legislation amends the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide nutrition services for older individuals and intergenerational activities in elementary and secondary school facilities.

SECTION 1: SHORT TITLE

"School-Based Meals for Older Individuals and Intergenerational Programs Act of 1990".

SECTION 2: FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

Findings:

1. There are millions of older individuals who could benefit from congregate nutrition services, but meals are unavailable or limited in the areas where they live.

2. There are millions of students who need positive role models, tutors, enhancement of their self-esteem, and assistance with the problems they face in our complex society.

3. Older individuals have a unique range of knowledge, talents, and experiences, which can be of immeasurable value for students as a part of their educational process, and intergenerational programs can provide older persons with the opportunity to contribute their skills and talents in our public schools.

4. Programs that create and foster communication between older individuals and youth are effective in improving awareness and understanding of the aging process; they can also promote more positive, balanced views of the realities of aging, and reduce negative stereotyping of older individuals.

5. Unused or underused space in school buildings can be shared for intergenerational programs serving older individuals in exchange for good faith commitments to provide volunteers to assist the schools.

6. School districts need broad-based support in their communities for school initiatives, and intergenerational programs can help to enrich that support.

Purposes:

1. To create and foster intergenerational opportunities for older individuals and students in the schools where meals and social activities are provided.

2. To assist students in schools with the greatest needs as evidenced by dropout rates, substance abuse, poverty, and low rates of English proficiency.

3. To provide older individuals with opportunities to improve their self-esteem and make a major contribution to the educational process of our youth by contributing their unique knowledge, talents, and sense of history through roles as tutors, teacher aides, living historians, special speakers, mentors, playground supervisors, lunchroom assistants, and in many other volunteer support roles.

4. To provide the potential for older individuals to have access to school facilities, such as libraries, gymnasiums, theaters, cafeterias, audio-visual resources, and transportation.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

5. To create other programs for interaction between students and older individuals, including class discussions, dramatic programs, sharing of school assemblies, mutual classes, field trips, and others.

#### SECTION 3: AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

There are funds authorized for nutrition services and intergenerational activities for fiscal years 1992-95 at the following amounts: FY92—\$50,000,000; FY93—\$52,500,000; FY94—\$55,125,000; and FY95—\$57,881,250—to carry out subpart 3 of part C of title III. This reflects increases for inflation of five percent each year.

#### SECTION 4: SCHOOL-BASED MEALS FOR OLDER INDIVIDUALS AND INTERGENERATIONAL PROGRAMS

The Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by adding a new subpart 3 under title III C.

The Commissioner will make grants to states under their state plans for the establishment and operation of projects that:

1. are carried out in elementary and secondary schools;
2. provide to older individuals hot meals, each of which assures a minimum of one-third of the dietary allowances as established by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council: (A) while schools are in session; (B) during the summer; and (C) on the weekdays in the school year when such schools are not in session;
3. provide intergenerational activities in which older individuals and students interact at such schools;
4. provide social and recreational activities for older individuals at such schools;
5. develop and maintain skill banks in which information on the skills and preferred activities of older individuals is maintained and available to school officials for providing such individuals with opportunities to serve as tutors, teacher aides, living historians, special speakers, playground supervisors, lunchroom cashiers, and assistants in such schools;
6. provide opportunities for older individuals to participate in school activities (such as classes, dramatic programs, and assemblies) and use school facilities (such as cafeterias, libraries, gymnasiums, and auditoriums);
7. applications will be submitted to the appropriate state units on aging with comments from the appropriate area agency on aging and local educational agency;
8. 15 percent of the cost of each project shall be paid in cash or in kind from non-Federal sources;
9. applicants must demonstrate the need for such projects, how the project will be coordinated with other nutrition services and other services currently provided;
10. each year priority for grants will be given to entities that carried out a nutrition project under this program the previous year and to entities that carried out a nutrition project under Title 3, Part C of the Older Americans Act;
11. priority will also be given to applicants that will serve schools with the greatest need as evidenced by such factors as dropout rates, substance abuse, and the number of limited English-speaking children;
12. the Commissioner will report to Congress on the effectiveness of this program;
13. administrative costs are limited for this program;
14. funds may not be transferred from this program.

#### SECTION 5: EFFECTIVE DATE

This legislation shall take effect on October 1, 1992.

#### NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF NUTRITION AND AGING SERVICES PROGRAMS,

Grand Rapids, MI, October 17, 1990.

HON. MARILYN LLOYD,

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN LLOYD: The National Association of Nutrition and Aging Services Programs wholeheartedly endorses the School Based Meals and Intergenerational Programs Act of 1990. This endorsement is based on the recognition of the critical need for intergenerational programs which are aimed at providing community assistance and support to confront the serious problems facing our schools today.

Seattle's SPICE program (School Programs Involving Community Elders) has proven that school based nutrition programs can make a critical contribution to the educational well-being of students and can enhance the school environment in a multitude of ways. We believe that the rich diversity of talents possessed by our older Americans can become a major resource to local schools, and that this bill will provide the vehicle to accomplish this objective.

At the same time, there is a serious unmet need for additional congregate nutrition sites which can serve our growing population of elderly—particularly the frail and vulnerable—who are not now receiving services.

This bill will meet each of these needs by creating school based meal sites which actively engage in the development and promotion of intergenerational programs and activities in order to help meet the pressing educational demands of our school system.

We hope that you can gain passage of this new and extremely promising measure.

Sincerely,

TOBY FELCHER,  
President.

#### SCHOOL BASED MEALS AND INTERGENERATIONAL PROGRAMS OF 1990

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

MR. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging's Subcommittee on Human Services, I rise today to join as an original cosponsor to legislation introduced by Mrs. LLOYD entitled "School based Meals and Intergenerational Programs of 1990," which would amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide nutrition services and intergenerational activities in elementary and secondary school facilities.

In my capacity as a member of the Select Committee on Aging as well as the acting chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources on the Ways and Means Committee, I find this legislation brings together two of our Nation's most precious resources in a very special way—our children and our aged.

Seniors have so much to offer to the youth of our Nation. Their knowledge and their experiences enable young people to understand the world better and, therefore, prepare them to be better adults. Likewise, young people

have much to share with seniors, giving them a fresh perspective on everyday life, and a renewed outlook to daily problems. Working together, they benefit each other.

Millions of seniors across the country could and do benefit from a nutritious meal. Estimates indicate that approximately 10 to 15 percent of our elderly citizens who are in nursing homes are there because they are unable to meet their nutritional needs in their own homes or community. In fiscal year 1988, 242 million meals were served to elderly individuals; of that total, 147 million, over 60 percent, were served in congregate settings and 95 million, about 40 percent, were home delivered. For many of these seniors, these meals are the only connection they have to their surroundings and the outside world, and for many, it is their only nutritious meal per day. The socialization opportunities offered by congregate meal settings is extremely significant and valuable to participants. The Older Americans Act has provided funding for meal programs for seniors since 1972, when Congress enacted the National Nutrition Program for the Elderly as a new title.

But, while the nutrition program has been highly successful, an essentially frozen funding level for the past 10 years has prevented many seniors from getting those meals in areas where they live. Just yesterday, the House passed the conference report to the labor/HHS/education fiscal year 1991 appropriations bill which provides for a 9-million increase over fiscal year 1990 for congregate meals, and 8.8 million increase in home delivered meals under the Older Americans Act. While we are glad to see these increases, in light of the 2.41 percent across-the-board cuts suffered by all discretionary programs, these figures do not do much to keep pace with the rapidly growing numbers of seniors in this country.

Mrs. LLOYD's legislation proposes that seniors be allowed to receive their meals at and participate in intergenerational activities in elementary and secondary school facilities. In exchange for this service, those seniors can serve as role models, tutors, and friends to young students. They can bring their valuable expertise to these students as well as assist the teachers and school districts in preparing the students for their futures. Programs would be designed to address the critical priority areas such as dropout rates, drug and alcohol abuse, poverty, teenage pregnancy, and low rates of English proficiency.

When Congress created the nutrition provision in the Older Americans Act, it envisioned the program to serve as an important vehicle for fostering social interaction among participants and facilitating social services delivery as well as providing nutritional services.

I commend the chairperson of the Subcommittee on Housing and Consumer Interests for introducing this legislation, which will clearly enhance those goals laid out by the Older Americans Act. As we prepare for the 1991 reauthorization of the Older Americans Act, I think this bill will provide an innovative intergenerational approach.



**LEXINGTONIAN BECOMES  
PRESIDENT OF AREA CHAPTER  
OF THE JANE AUSTEN SOCIETY  
OF NORTH AMERICA**

**HON. IKE SKELTON**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 25, 1990*

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to recognize Barbara Larkin, a former resident of Lexington, MO, who was recently chosen as president and regional coordinator of the Jane Austen Society of North America for the Columbia and Jefferson City area of Missouri.

Founded in 1979, the Jane Austen Society of North America has grown to over 2,000 members. Though members come from a variety of backgrounds, they are united by one thing—the fascination for Jane Austen and her works. The Society publishes an annual journal, "Persuasions," as well as a newsletter, "Jasna News." Each fall they attend a weekend conference devoted to one of her novels, or to an aspect of her life.

The daughter of a minister, Jane Austen was born in 1775 in Hampshire, England. One of eight children, she never married and instead, devoted her life to writing. Her most celebrated work, "Pride and Prejudice," is one of five novels she completed. Her lively, ironic wit and her appealing heroes and heroines are as fresh and unforgettable in 1990 as they were when they first appeared nearly 200 years ago.

I know that the Members of this body join me in congratulating Barbara Larkin on her being chosen president of this group.

**THE COAL PIPELINE ACT OF 1991**

**HON. MORRIS K. UDALL**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 25, 1990*

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate that events in the Persian Gulf are no worse than they are. Our troops have not been fired upon, other countries have made up for embargoed Iraqi and Kuwaiti oil, and there are no gas lines at home.

But this dangerous situation should serve to remind us of the perils of our dependence on foreign oil. We've had painful reminders before, in 1973 and 1979, but our resolve to do something about our energy problems passed with each crisis. We must not let that happen this time. We need to save energy, find alternative sources, and reduce our dependence on foreign oil. We need a sensible, workable, national energy policy.

When the 102d Congress convenes next January, I intend to introduce a bill that should play an important part in a national energy plan—the Coal Pipeline Act of 1991.

This is not a new idea. President Kennedy proposed the first coal pipeline bill nearly 30 years ago. Nor is it particularly complicated. The idea is simply to permit the construction of pipelines that can carry pulverized coal mixed with water or other liquids from the

mine to the powerplant. The bill would allow interstate coal pipelines that have obtained State authority for water use, have proud their environmental soundness, and have been found to be in the national interest to exercise the Federal power of eminent domain.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and I hope all my colleagues will support it.

It is good for coal miners, utilities, and electric ratepayers. By providing an alternative, less expensive way to transport coal, the bill will help keep American coal competitive and hold down electric bills.

It is good for the environment. Coal-water slurries are considered to be one of the most effective clean coal technologies available. By finely grinding the coal particles, one can reduce SO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 60 to 90 percent, thereby reducing acid rain.

It is good for labor. It takes millions of tons of steel pipe to build a coal pipeline. This bill has the potential for creating over 300,000 new jobs in construction, manufacturing, and service-related industries.

And it is good for the taxpayers. The bill does not call for new Federal spending, provide subsidies to any industry, or break the budget. Coal pipelines need no expensive research and development efforts; the technology is available and in use today. The Black Mesa Pipeline between Arizona and Nevada has been in service for 20 years, during which it has carried 75 million tons of coal.

In light of these benefits, in light of the proven record of the Black Mesa Pipeline, why aren't more coal pipelines built? The principal reason is that the railroads, which now transport most coal, don't want the competition. A case in point is Energy Transportation Systems, Inc. [ETSI] tried for over a decade to build a coal pipeline between coal fields in Wyoming and powerplants in Arkansas. But the railroads would not allow ETSI to cross railroad property and since ETSI did not have the power of eminent domain—the same power the railroads were given to lay their tracks through private property—ETSI had to give up.

The railroads acted improperly in obstructing ETSI's pipeline. In 1984, ETSI filed suit against the railroads under the antitrust laws. The railroads ultimately agreed to pay ETSI nearly \$700 million to settle the case.

The railroads also acted foolishly, in my judgment. Coal pipelines will not hurt the railroads; there is enough business to go around. The Energy Information Administration has concluded that even if all proposed coal pipelines were built and operated at full capacity, the railroads' share of the business will still grow because of increasing demand for coal.

The point is that without the power of eminent domain coal pipelines will never be built because the time and expense needed to fight the railroads in court will be prohibitive.

Mr. Speaker, coal pipelines are an idea whose time has come. The administration plans to send a national energy strategy early next year and I look forward to the 102d Congress giving our energy options a long hard look. The benefits offered by coal pipelines must not be overlooked. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring legislation to make them a reality.

**TRIBUTE TO LATE PAC LEADER  
ZEPH MOTHOPENG**

**HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY**

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 25, 1990*

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute, in memoriam, to the late Zephania Lekoane Mothopeng, who, until his death on Tuesday, October 23, was President of the Pan-Africanist Congress [PAC] of Azania. In so doing, I want to enter into the RECORD the following obituary from the New York Times. This obituary acknowledges tributes paid to him by the African National Congress [ANC] and the Azanian Peoples' Organization [AZAPO], and points up the need for those of us in the Congress who are concerned about events in South Africa to be aware of all of the important political actors in the post-apartheid transition that is unfolding in that country.

Zeph Mothopeng was a stalwart proponent of the PAC's Afrocentric brand of nonracialism which holds that all the peoples of South Africa must commit themselves to an authentic African identity linked to the return of the land to the indigenous people whose ancestors predate European settlement. This is a message that resonates strongly in the hearts of black South Africans. Hence, the ANC, in its statement, acknowledged that the death of Mothopeng "has left the people of South Africa, especially the oppressed, much poorer," while AZAPO urged that "blacks of rival political persuasions stop their factional fighting as a tribute to Mothopeng." In this vein, it is encouraging news that the ANC and the Inkatha Freedom Party will come together in the near future in a meeting that will include both its Deputy President, Nelson Mandela and Chief Gathsa Buthelezi. The need for a show of unity among the oppressed of South Africa in tribute to Mothopeng is also amplified by another item that I will introduce into the RECORD, Anglican Archbishop Desmond Tutu's recent announcement of his intention to convene a meeting of South Africa's black political leaders at his official residence, "Bishopscourt" in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the October 24 New York Times obituary on Zeph Mothopeng followed by the October 17 South African Press Association [SAPA] report of an interview with Archbishop Tutu on "National Concerns."

**ARCHBISHOP TUTU INTERVIEW ON NATIONAL CONCERNS**

[SAPA PR Wire Service; issued by Church of the Province]

CAPE TOWN—Archbishop Desmond Tutu today announced his intention to call a meeting of black political leaders at "Bishopscourt", his official residence in Cape Town soon.

He was delivering the charge at the opening of the synod of the Anglican diocese of Cape Town. He also called for the minister of defense, General Magnus Malan, to be "fired from the Cabinet." Archbishop Tutu called for the black "summit" while dealing with the recent violence in the country.

He said: "The political leaders of blacks need to meet urgently to plan a joint strategy on negotiations, to adopt a code of con-

duct in political dealings, and to decide on how to handle the factional violence and to promote unity and peace. Our church has a special responsibility to call these leaders together. Our commitment to the liberation of our people has been uncompromising but we also have made it clear that we have no party political alignments. In consequence, I propose to call a meeting of all black political leaders at Bishopscourt soon.

"My invitation will be to all leaders of substantial black political movements. The aim would be for a black political summit, the importance of which would be undisputed, so that our people would judge leaders who refuse to attend as enemies of unity, peace and liberation."

He told the synod that when he had asked the state president, Mr F W de Klerk at least to suspend General Malan, Mr de Klerk had said people should wait for the Harms Commission report.

"Now that the Harms Commission has reported, I want to call for General Malan to be fired from the Cabinet," Archbishop Tutu said. "It is difficult to imagine how the commission will be able to give him a clean bill of health after its failure to call him to give evidence. If we say General Malan must go we do not suggest that he is guilty. It would be obeying a convention observed in democratic countries that a Cabinet minister must resign when his underlings are found guilty of a serious misdemeanor. This convention is one that keeps politicians on their toes and is effective to curb abuse of power. The new South Africa cannot afford yesterday's men with dubious morals and yesterday's attitudes."

The text of that part of the Archbishop's address dealing with the above issues follows. The full text of his charge is available from the archbishop's office.

\*\*\* Talking about a willingness to forgive, no one in a high position has actually said they are sorry for all the hurt they have caused the victims of apartheid. No one in government has yet said, "Please forgive us". We blacks for our part are ready to forgive but the other party must contrite and ready to do reparation to demonstrate the seriousness of our contrition, and then reconciliation can happen. You cannot say you are sorry you stole my pen if you continue to retain possession of it. Your contrition will be demonstrated by your willingness to make amends. In this case, by returning my pen. We cannot just say, "Let bygones be bygones".

We have experienced a euphoria at the speed of events but we have also touched the nadir of despair at the mindless violence that has taken place in Natal and the Transvaal. We must condemn all violence from whatever quarter as evil. Why have the police allowed the AWB [Afrikaner Resistance Movement] to parade bearing arms? Can you imagine what would have happened if the military wings of black organisations did the same? We demand that the AWB be disarmed forthwith and they must be stopped from uttering such insulting, racist slurs and poisoning the minds of little children with horrible jingoistic slogans. The police must use the law that forbids inciting racial animosity and do so urgently if they do not want to see the whole thing disintegrating into bloody chaos.

Why, oh why, has it been misleadingly called black-on-black violence? Why don't the media describe the vicious blood-letting for instance in Northern Ireland as white-on-white violence? Or that in eastern Europe? It is also emphatically not tribal

for in Natal those involved are nearly all Zulus—it is not Zulu versus Xhosa for those who live in our black townships are people of all tribes who have continued to live together reasonably harmoniously even at the height of the carnage. In the Transvaal we have been reaping the whirlwind of many decades of migratory labour when married men, self-respecting husbands of wives and hard-working fathers of children have been cooped up in utterly disgraceful conditions in single sex hostels, alienating them from the township dwellers amongst whom the hostels have been built. The conditions must be condemned out of hand as totally dehumanising and we must quickly end the hostel system and turn these horrendous compounds into family-type accommodation so that the worker can bring his family with him.

The violence is also due to the socio-economic inequities of apartheid and its equally evil forerunner in the way our country has been run. The violence is also due to rivalry between political groups and ideologies. We urge their leaders and adherents to show the tolerance of maturity. They should have enough confidence in the rightness of their political view not to need violence and intimidation to get new recruits. We condemn political violence as the horrible delinquency it is and especially we cry out against necklacing, that gruesome way of killing. My father used to say, "Improve your argument—don't raise your voice!" Only those who know their position is untenable and unpersuasive use violence to get their way and that way lies totalitarianism and despotic rule.

The political leaders of blacks need to meet urgently to plan a joint strategy on negotiations, to adopt a code of conduct in political dealings, and to decide on how to handle the factional violence and to promote unity and peace. Our church has a special responsibility to call these leaders together: \*\*\* Why don't we have a permanent judicial commission to investigate allegations against members of the security forces? Why don't we have groups consisting of trusted lawyers, religious and authentic community leaders to monitor the activity of the security forces in sensitive areas—it would help to scotch allegations about police partiality and abuses of power and would do the world of good to improve the image and reputation of the police? I know Mr de Klerk will give these suggestions his earnest consideration for he is a man of considerable integrity and gives the impression of listening to others and taking them seriously. I wish I did not feel anxiety about the attitudes of Mr. Vlok and his commissioner of police.

Mr. de Klerk's initiatives deserve to succeed. We urge him, the ANC [African National Congress] and others to get on with the business of serious negotiations knowing that they have the good wishes and fervent prayers of all persons of goodwill and especially of Anglicans. They must look for encouragement at what took place in Namibia where the prospects of a settlement were bleak at first but once people got down to the nitty gritty of serious horse-trading and negotiation they discovered just how much they shared in common. After all the government and the ANC after their first talks themselves made startling, scientific discoveries—that their erstwhile adversaries were actually human. Let us have a constituent assembly quickly. Certainly we need to know as accurately as possible what support each contending group actually commands.

Part of the strife between ANC and Inkatha is because each side makes untested and unproven claims about the size of their constituencies and several thousand people have died as a result. The government does not need to abdicate administrative power with a constituent assembly in session. Look at what happened in Namibia. In next to no time they had a constitution which was adopted nearly unanimously and Sam Nujoma, the devil incarnate for many white Namibians only a few months previously, was elected unanimously as first president of a multi-party, independent Namibia. We give thanks to God for all those who sacrificed and suffered and died for this result and we congratulate the United Nations on a splendid job well done.

Minority rights can be guaranteed in a bill of rights that upholds individual rights. Minority group rights must be rejected completely as a way of perpetuating minority rule through a constitutional stratagem. If your rights as an individual are protected in a bill of rights enforceable by an independent judiciary then minorities have nothing to fear. Let us not bring in racism and ethnicity through the back door. There should be no minorities in a new South Africa—all should be South Africans first and foremost, working for a richly diverse multi-party democracy.

Mr. de Klerk's initiatives deserve to succeed and need the engine of a thriving economy. Sanctions have proved thoroughly effective for we would not be where we are without them but it is important that we recognize that the problem is not sanctions but apartheid. Get rid of apartheid and there will be no justification for sanctions. Once the process of ridding our country of this albatross is irreversible then we will call for the lifting of sanctions. It can't be said to be irreversible when we still can have the ridiculous charade of Mr. Clase and his pretend open schools policy. It can't be irreversible when you still have the Group Areas and the Population Registration Acts. Once Mr. de Klerk can announce that he proposes to repeal these abominations in the next session of parliament and establish a single education department and get negotiations going seriously, then I promise that at that moment I will stand up and say to our friends, "Lift sanctions". Not only that, I am ready to go round the world and say, "Invest or reinvest in South Africa massively". As it happens we are already calling for selective reinvestment in projects such as in housing, education and health which are controlled by blacks to empower them. We thank our friends overseas who have supported us so generously through their love, prayers and commitment to the ending of apartheid. We ask them to continue with us as we tread the uncertain and heady road to a new South Africa. Let us be bold.

Mr. de Klerk has already been commended for his courage. I would urge him to take a new, bold and imaginative step. I have already said we need a constituent assembly as a matter of urgency. Mr. Kobie Coetzee has already spoken about a coalition cabinet. Once an assembly was convened, why could Mr. de Klerk not establish an interim coalition government which is representative of all our people? If the ANC were to draw the votes it says it will, why could Mr. de Klerk not give the ANC National Executive Committee offices in the union buildings so that they can be working with their counterparts? For instance, Thabo Mbeki with his brother Pik Botha, Chris Hani with General Malan, etc. Can you imagine the



impact of a joint visit by Mr. Mandela and Mr. de Klerk overseas? Sanctions would end immediately and the rewards of boldness would be immediately apparent and there would be no obstacle to a constituent assembly which could work at less than frenetic pace to produce our constitution. Mr. de Klerk might very well appoint ANC people for constitutional purposes as deputy ministers.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 24, 1990]

**ZEPHANIA MOTHOPENG, 77, DIES; HEADED SOUTH AFRICAN MOVEMENT**

(By Christopher S. Wren)

JOHANNESBURG, Oct. 23.—Zephania Le-koane Mothopeng, the president of the Pan-Africanist Congress, which advocates the return of South Africa to its indigenous inhabitants, died today in Johannesburg Hospital after a long struggle with chest and lung cancer complicated by pneumonia. He was 77 years old.

Mr. Mothopeng began his struggle against apartheid in the youth league of the African National Congress in the early 1940's, but quit the congress in 1959 and joined Robert Sobukwe in founding the more hard-line Pan-Africanist Congress. He was elected its president in 1986 while in prison.

The philosophy of black consciousness developed by Mr. Sobukwe and advocated by Mr. Mothopeng argued that that no political settlement was possible in South Africa unless blacks regained the land that was rightfully theirs. According to this philosophy, whites could stay if they became truly African in their thoughts and actions. It also envisioned an African continent united in a single nation called Azania.

"We move from the premise that the whole land of Azania belongs to the indigenous people, the African people, who were here long before the colonialists arrived," Mr. Mothopeng said in an interview published by the magazine *Leadership* in May.

Under Mr. Mothopeng's leadership, the Pan-Africanist Congress refused to join negotiations on South Africa's future proposed by President F. W. de Klerk. While the African National Congress opened exploratory talks with the Government, the Pan-Africanist Congress continued to insist that only guerrilla warfare would end white minority rule, though at the time of his death the group seemed to be reconsidering its stand.

"Our liberation will be brought about by Africans themselves, by having to struggle for it," Mr. Mothopeng said in the magazine interview. "They will not achieve it at the negotiating tables."

Despite differences with Mr. Mothopeng's group over negotiations, land and the place of whites in South Africa, the African National Congress issued a statement this evening expressing its "immense sadness" at his death, which, it said, "has left the people of South Africa, especially the oppressed, much poorer."

The Azanian Peoples Organization, a rival black consciousness movement, urged to-night that blacks of rival political persuasions stop their factional fighting as a tribute to Mr. Mothopeng.

Mr. Mothopeng repeatedly refused to submit to the white authorities, who imprisoned, detained and exiled him. In November 1988, Mr. Mothopeng was released early from his last term in prison, a 15-year sentence for his political activities.

**LEFT AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS**

Mr. Mothopeng was born in the Orange Free State on Sept. 10, 1913, but moved with his family to the Transvaal and later to the Johannesburg area.

He taught high school in the Orlando district of Soweto. His criticism of inferior black education led to his dismissal as assistant principal there in 1952. He went to Lesotho to teach for two years before returning to Johannesburg to apprentice as a law clerk.

He was active in the African National Congress but disapproved of its multiracial philosophy and links with the South African Communist Party. He left with Mr. Sobukwe and others to found the Pan-Africanist Congress in 1959.

Mr. Mothopeng was arrested in 1960 for taking part in a defiance campaign against the pass laws used to restrict and monitor the movements of blacks, and he was jailed for two years. After his release, he was detained in 1963 and then imprisoned again in 1964, spending part of his sentence with Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners at the prison on Robben Island before being released in 1967.

He was director of a community organization when he was arrested again in 1976 under the Terrorism Act. He and his codefendants refused to plead at their trial, saying they did not recognize the court. He was sentenced to 15 years. While in Diepkloof Prison in Soweto, he became ill with cancer of the throat.

Mr. Mothopeng is survived by his wife, Urbania, three sons, a daughter and at least eight grandchildren.

**A TRIBUTE TO DALE SPANN**

**HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to Dale Spann, of Murray, KY, a longtime friend of mine who died May 8, 1990, at age 52.

Dale Spann, a native of Calloway County, KY, served for 21 years with the Murray Police Department, including service as chief of detectives. He retired as a captain. Dale also served as a Calloway County deputy sheriff and was the only county policeman in Calloway County history.

Dale Spann was a member of the Murray Fraternal Order of Police and for 6 years was a member of the Kentucky Crime Commission. He was for many years a member of Cherry Corner Baptist Church near Murray.

He was well liked and highly respected by those who knew him. In fact, to know Dale Spann was to admire him. He was my friend and a supporter of my election and reelection efforts.

Many would agree that Dale's wife, Helen Crutcher Spann, was a tremendous asset to him. Helen Spann is a talented, beautiful Kentuckian who has been honored on many occasions. Western Kentuckians remember her as a court reporter and as the longtime secretary and receptionist for former Calloway County judge/executive and county attorney, Robert O. Miller of Murray. Helen Spann also served as Calloway County judge pro-tem.

Other survivors of Dale Spann are his two sons, Rickie Dale Spann, age 21, and William Jeremy Spann, age 13; one sister, Mrs. Janice Wilson, and one brother James Spann, both of Houston, TX.

My wife, Carol, and I extend to the family of Dale Spann our sympathy.

**TRIBUTE TO SHERIFF GENE DARNELL**

**HON. IKE SKELTON**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to an outstanding Missouri law enforcement officer—Gene Darnell, sheriff of Lafayette County, my home county. Recently, Sheriff Gene Darnell announced that he will retire on December 31, 1990, after more than 30 years in the Lafayette County sheriff's office. It has been a career marked by professionalism, integrity, and dedication.

Mr. Speaker, I have known Gene Darnell for most of my life. He has been a valued and true friend and counselor. In 1959, I was pleased to recommend him for a vacant deputy sheriff position in Lafayette County, under then-Sheriff Dewey Parrott. In 1964, with the retirement of Sheriff Parrott, I was proud to serve as Gene's campaign manager in his successful bid for sheriff. I am even prouder of the record that Gene has established in his 26 years as sheriff. He has given Lafayette County tough, effective, and fair law enforcement. He has been a leader in the establishment and operations of the Mid-Missouri Major Case Squad, an organization which allows rural law enforcement officers to cut across jurisdictional lines and work together to solve major crimes. He has been recognized by his peers who selected him secretary of the Missouri Sheriff's Association.

Mr. Speaker, Sheriff Gene Darnell once told me that "the best politics is doing a good job." These are words that Gene lived by, and words that all of us in public service could take to heart. I know that all of our colleagues here in the House will want to join me in saluting Sheriff Gene Darnell, and wishing him and his wife Onie all the best in their future endeavors.

**TRIBUTE TO THE MISSISSIPPI MASS CHOIR**

**HON. MIKE ESPY**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, if not the "Birthplace of Gospel Music," Mississippi most certainly is one of the places where Gospel chose to deliver many of her offsprings. Sam Cooke was delivered there, as were Brother Joe May, the Staple Singers, the Five Blind Boys, Rev. Cleophus Robinson, the Jackson Southernaires, the Pilgrim Jubilees, Willie Banks, the Williams, and others of renown.

In 1988, after being long, long overdue, she delivered again; and boy oh boy, what a delivery. She named it "the Mississippi Mass Choir."

Under the direction of founder Frank Williams and Musical Director David R. Curry, this 100-voice choir represents every region of the State. Although they are striving to establish themselves in the music industry, their purpose first and foremost is to establish the Gospel of Jesus Christ throughout the world.

This choir is very special. Some members drive, or ride the bus 6 hours round trip, in order to make rehearsal. This specialness was demonstrated when on October 29, 1988, they recorded their first album and video in Jackson, MI; 3,000 supporters were in attendance; 1,500 more were turned away. Church as well as a recording took place on that night. An appeal to accept Christ was extended, and many came forth to accept. Joining the choir on stage were special guests Rev. Milton Biggum, Rev. James Moore, and Huey Williams.

Just 5 weeks after the release of their first album, Billboard magazine certified it as the No. 1 spiritual album in the country. Six weeks later Cas Box magazine followed suit. Ten months later, the album can still be found atop both of these charts. Such recognition is unprecedented for a debut album.

At the James Cleveland Gospel Music Workshop of America, in New Orleans, the Mississippi Mass Choir was selected as the "Choir of the Year—Contemporary," and "Best New Artist of the Year." At the 1989 Stellar Awards they were selected as the choir of the year, best new artist of the year, album of the year—traditional, and best gospel video. The awards did not stop there; they were nominated in several categories for the Soul-Train Music Award, and the Dove Award.

On August 31, 1990, Billboard magazine presented the choir with a special achievement award for maintaining the No. 1 position on their top 40 gospel chart for 45 consecutive weeks; this is a record for Gospel, and the second longest streak in the history of the industry.

In 1 short year the Mississippi Mass Choir has performed in New York, Philadelphia, Washington, DC, Atlanta, Chicago, New Orleans, Memphis, Cleveland, Jacksonville, Little Rock, Baton Rouge, Nashville, Birmingham, Indianapolis, and throughout the State of Mississippi. Through it all the choir has maintained their humility; realizing that all praise and honor belongs to the Lord.

#### THE CONGRESSIONAL BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH CAUCUS

**HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of our colleagues that on October 3, 1990, the Congressional Biomedical Research Caucus conducted its first public forum on exploring the preeminence of American biomedical research and examining the

reasons for our continued dominance in the field. The purpose of the caucus is to enhance the excellent efforts of the Congress in devoting resources to biomedical science by the dissemination of information about exciting potentials and opportunities in basic and clinical biomedical research.

The caucus organizers, Representative J. ROY ROWLAND, of Georgia, Representative SONNY CALLAHAN, of Alabama, Representative BILL RICHARDSON, of New Mexico, as well as myself, invited three distinguished biomedical scientists as speakers for our initial meeting. The first public forum addressed the topic "Why Is the U.S. Number One in Biomedical Research? How Do We Maintain Our Status?" and featured Dr. Leon Rosenberg, dean of the Yale University School of Medicine; Dr. Harold Varmus, professor of microbiology, University of California at San Francisco and recipient of the 1989 Nobel Prize for Medicine; and Dr. Cori Bargmann, a renowned new biomedical researcher at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Dr. Leon Rosenberg, dean of the Yale University School of Medicine, led the panel discussion by emphasizing the importance of the new caucus, and his delight at being among the first speaker before this group. Dr. Rosenberg described one of the more recent American success stories in biomedical research, the discovery of the cystic fibrosis gene. More than 2,000 U.S. children are born each year with this chronic disorder, with an average life span of 20 years filled with suffering for themselves and their families. Dr. Rosenberg said that this discovery illustrated the strengths of our unique system of biomedical research. It is the product of 25 years of work sponsored by the National Institutes of Health, much of it basic research that was totally unrelated to the disease. This is a prime example of the success of untargeted, basic biomedical research in eventually curing disease.

He explained that this is what is responsible for many of the remarkable breakthroughs in biomedicine—years of "basic research which led to advances that no one would ever dream about—that has been part of the brilliant plan for the biomedical research effort in this country."

According to Dr. Rosenberg, the key elements which make the United States the world leader in biomedical research is our national commitment, sustained since World War II, to improve the health of American citizens through research, by providing sufficient financial resources to this endeavor. Also important is that funds have been distributed to academic institutions where research is linked to teaching and to the education and training of young people for careers in research. Another crucial element for the success of the United States is that the funds are distributed to individual scientists who compete with each other for funds through critical appraisal of applications by their peers.

How do we keep our leadership status? Dr. Rosenberg said that we should: First, build a broader base of public support for science and biomedical research through education, awareness, and coalition building. Dr. Rosenberg suggested that this caucus is an important part of that effort; second, invest as a nation in our research enterprise in terms of

dollars. He stated, "We simply must reaffirm the national priority for health through research by allocating sufficient funds to meet opportunities which simply have never been greater"; and third, we must form a strategic agenda for a biomedical research policy which emphasizes the long view. Such a national health research policy must have the participation of government, academia, industry, and others.

Dr. Rosenberg also emphasized the cost-effectiveness of investing in biomedical research. According to Dr. Rosenberg, "If we had not developed the vaccine for polio, which was afflicting 25,000 people per year in 1950, the cost of caring for paralyzed victims of the polio virus in this single year, 1990, would exceed the Nation's entire investment in NIH since World War II."

Dr. Varmus described the beginning of his work in the laboratory, which he began at the NIH, as a physician who chose to do research. He discussed his decades of work on retroviruses, a class of viruses that cause cancer, and how the discoveries made by him and his colleagues over the past 20 years have had unexpectedly broad implications in the diagnosis and therapy of cancer. Dr. Varmus said the majority of this research has been supported through grants from the NIH. This grant money is mainly used to pay for salaries of laboratory staff and to purchase equipment and materials, most of which are made by American chemical, instrument, and biotechnology firms.

A prime illustration of the economic benefits the United States reaps from the growth of molecular biology—and are themselves undisputed leaders in their fields, selling tremendous amounts abroad. The United States' preeminence is evidenced by the strength of our biotechnology and pharmaceutical industries. Dr. Varmus said that even with the extraordinary progress over the past 20 or 30 years, "Never before has there been such call for optimism about understanding fundamental aspects of normal and diseased human beings about new means for prevention, diagnosis, and therapy and about biotechnology as a potential economic force in our society."

What has distinguished our system," said Varmus, "are the elements that encourage first the selection of the best young people to become investigators with independent laboratories. Second, the extended and stable funding of those who prove to be productive; and third, the pursuit of novel ideas."

Dr. Varmus said that his colleagues view the willingness to form this caucus with enthusiasm and gratitude. They believe that contemporary biology should compete effectively with other demands upon a battered budget. "The cost is modest," stated Dr. Varmus, "It is not small."

He added, "The economic benefits are measurable immediately as jobs and goods, later in technology and medicine. Your support for what we do and, most importantly, for what we have the potential now to achieve is an important counterweight for the fiscal shortfall and anxiety we have experienced over the past couple years."

Dr. Cori Bargmann discussed what it is like to be trained in the U.S. system and to enter



the competitive process to become an independent investigator. Dr. Bargmann said that the promise of discoveries being made by today's established scientists will be fulfilled only if students and young scientists continue to thrive in the system. She described how laboratories operate as a team and how important the scientist is in training for carrying out the work of the lab.

"Having really good scientists now doesn't mean you are going to be able to take the next step tomorrow," stated Dr. Bargmann. That is why stable support for biomedical research is so important to its success.

"There is great personal sacrifice made by young scientists," Bargmann said. "There is an expectation that graduate students and postdocs will work days, nights, and weekends, usually over 60 hours a week. I have been out of college for 9 years, and I am still in training as a postdoctoral fellow. A postdoctoral fellow is paid about \$20,000 a year. A graduate student is paid about \$12,000 a year. It is rare for a person at my age to feel that they have the time or the money to have children. There is not a lot of job security either. A good graduate school admits 30 graduate students in a year, but only hire 3 faculty members, so there is constant competition for the good research job."

Despite all the stresses involved in becoming an independent scientist, Dr. Bargmann said the American system is uniquely innovative and successful. She stated that, "This is the best place for biological research to get done" and that is why so many European and Asian scientists come here to train and often want to stay here. "The thing that keeps me and other talented people in this field despite all that, is believing in the value of what we do, and the tremendous excitement that comes from doing it. Part of it is challenges, problem solving; part of it is pure intellectual enjoyment, making a connection between two seemingly unrelated facts for the first time, or just learning something new," she added.

Dr. Bargmann told the audience:

The formation of this caucus is an immensely encouraging sign to young scientists like me. The truth is that the community of scientists needs to spend the time to convince Congress and the public of the value of research. This is a great opportunity for scientists to communicate directly with our friends in Congress to explain our goals, our successes, and our anxieties, and to hear from you what your concerns are. In the long run, for all the reasons Dr. Rosenberg and Dr. Varmus gave, it makes sense to see research as an investment and not as a luxury. The good news is, that as strong as it is, American biomedical research, together with its links to the biotechnology and pharmaceutical industry, have tremendous potential to advance and to improve our quality of life, but for that to happen, creative and motivated people have to continue to enter the field. And for that to happen, we need your support."

It should be no surprise to Members that a seminal theme of each of the scientists was the respect and commendation they expressed for the steadfast and fruitful efforts of Chairman William Natcher and ranking member Silvio Conte of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education in their commitment

to improve the health of the American people through biomedical research. In their own words, the heart of the American people is in these programs, as is theirs. We all joined in these views and were pleased that their senior committee staff who we personally invited to the forum were present. In addition, there was an excellent attendance from many congressional offices, senior committee staff, as well as press and members of scientific organizations.

In order to explore some of the issues raised by the scientists, we intend to schedule a series of programs featuring speakers on various subjects during the forthcoming Congress. We appreciate the opportunity to hear the concerns of working scientists directly, one on one with the Congress. In regard to the speakers program, we welcome any recommendations for subjects or speakers from any of our colleagues.

The membership of the caucus is growing, and next year we look forward to the caucus expanding to the Senate and becoming bicameral. Currently we have the following members on the caucus: BILL ALEXANDER, MIKE A. ANDREWS, THOMAS J. BILEY, RICK BOUCHER, BARBARA BOXER, JOSEPH BRENNAN, HANK BROWN, SONNY CALLAHAN, TOM CAMPBELL, RONALD V. DELLUMS, WILLIAM L. DICKINSON, DICK DURBIN, BERNARD J. DWYER, BEN ERDREICH, RONNIE G. FLIPPO, BARNEY FRANK, GEORGE W. GEKAS, FRANK GUARINI, JOE KOLTER, BILL LOWERY, ROBERT T. MATSUI, JIM McDERMOTT, THOMAS MC MILLAN, CONSTANCE A. MORELLA, NANCY PELOSI, JAMES H. QUILLIN, BILL RICHARDSON, ROBERT ROE, J. ROY ROWLAND, LOU STOKES, DOUG WALGREN, GUS YATRON, DON YOUNG.

We welcome all our colleagues to join and assist us in ensuring America's preeminence in biomedical research and the health of our Nation.

#### TRIBUTE TO IVYMOUNT SCHOOL

#### HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, it is a proud moment for me to pay tribute to the teachers, students and parents of Ivymount School in Rockville, MD, on winning the Excellence in Education Award under the Department of Education School Recognition Program. Ivymount was one of only four special education schools nationwide to receive national recognition.

Ivymount has been at the forefront of special education for the past 30 years. Founded in 1961 as the Christ Church Child Center, its first class set a precedent for excellence in providing outstanding educational and therapeutic services. Since its inception, Ivymount has served more than 2,400 children with developmental delays, learning disabilities, emotional problems, and multiple handicaps. Currently, the school provides programs for 190 children, ranging from infancy to 14 years of age, from Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia.

As a former teacher, I am heartened that a school, such as Ivymount, gets the recognition it deserves for the development of innovative programs and for its publications and professional presentations. Under the collective leadership of Director Shari Gelman, Assistant Director Lillian R. Davis, and a devoted staff, the school has been a leader in the Montgomery County tradition of dedicated service to the public good. These administrators and teachers give new hope and vision to the students and their parents for an improved quality of life.

This Blue Ribbon Award from the Department of Education is a reflection of what the public and private sectors can achieve jointly in serving handicapped infants and youth. This award is also reflective of the combined efforts of local education agencies, parents, students, staff, and community groups. In celebration of its 30th anniversary, Ivymount has rededicated itself to providing quality programs geared toward the betterment of the lives of our citizens with disabilities and toward their integration as full participants of their communities. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Ivymount School on receiving the prestigious Excellence in Education Award, and I wish the faculty, students, and parents continued success in promoting new programs and ideas in special education.

#### NOVEMBER IS HOSPICE MONTH

#### HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues that the President has declared November to be National Hospice Month, and to join me in honoring the important role that hospices play.

As the President proclaimed:

Employing the skills of a full cadre of health care professionals and volunteers—including physicians, nurses, counselors, therapists, and members of the clergy—hospice care enables the terminally ill individuals to live peacefully and comfortably in their final days. The dedicated men and women who provide hospice care help terminally ill patients to face natural death without feeling alone or unprepared. They also help patients' families cope with emotional suffering and loss. A vital portion of our Nation's health care system, hospice programs reaffirm the inherent dignity and worth of each individual while underscoring our reverence for human life.

I would also like to pay special honor to Camarillo Hospice, the first bereaved program in Ventura County, CA. Formed in 1978, the hospice is a hospital-based but autonomous organization, based in Pleasant Valley Hospital. Like most such organizations, Camarillo Hospice is committed to the dignity of the human experience. It is about living, not about dying. This volunteer group believes that it is the quality of life that matters, whether that life is measured in years, days or hours.

Mr. Speaker, Camarillo Hospice will provide its one-on-one care to about 1,200 individuals and family members this year alone, and

serves the communities of Camarillo, Somis, Santa Rosa Valley, Moorpark, and the Navy bases at Point Mugu and Port Hueneme. I'm sure my colleagues join me in saluting the volunteers and staff associated with Camarillo Hospice—indeed, those associated with all of the many fine hospices nationwide—for the fine work they do in providing clients and families with the emotional, practical and spiritual assistance they need.

#### IN HONOR OF THE NATIONS ASSOCIATION

##### HON. PORTER J. GOSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, recently the White House named the Nations Association of Fort Myers, FL as the 276th "Daily Point of Light," conferring well-deserved recognition and praise on one of southwest Florida's brightest stars.

I am most proud and delighted to join President Bush in praising the Nations Association and its founders, Rev. Israel Suarez and his wife Ruth. It would be difficult to find two more caring and generous people than Israel and Ruth, who have given so much of themselves to offer hope and assistance to those in need.

The Nations Association has been providing food, shelter, counseling and basic friendship to some of southwest Florida's most disadvantaged for almost 15 years. Under the leadership of Israel and Ruth, volunteers from the community have come together to donate resources, time and brotherly love to this most worthy cause.

Israel and Ruth Suarez have set a wonderful example for all of us, demonstrating the power of individual commitment and volunteer spirit. Their energy is awesome—their caring without limit, and, faced with a mighty challenge and many roadblocks, their resolve to make a difference only grows stronger. Some years ago, I recall, their facility was vandalized and the precious food stolen. The Suarez's immediately mobilized their dedicated army of community volunteers and restocked their shelves. With them there's never any question—setbacks will be overcome. As long as people need assistance, they will be there to help.

Mr. Speaker, the Nations Association and the Suarez's are excellent examples of what President Bush meant when he talked of "1000 points of light." People helping people, communities working together to solve their own problems. Israel and Ruth Suarez, and all of the many people who help make the Nations Association work deserve a standing ovation from this House and a special abrazo from each of us. Congratulations for an honor richly deserved.

#### TRIBUTE TO JARC

##### HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a Jewish association providing residential care for persons with developmental disabilities [JARC]. This week, I met with several members of JARC who are visiting Washington. These developmentally disabled adults impressed me with their enthusiasm, independence, and zest for life.

JARC was founded in Michigan in 1969 by a group of parents concerned about their children. JARC provides a continuum of residential care and support services to individuals and their families in the Detroit metropolitan area. JARC currently operates 11 Haverim Homes in southern Oakland County—Haverim means friendship in Hebrew. The Haverim Homes serve a wide range of individuals—those who have lived in institutions for many years and those who are preparing for independent living. The homes provide attractive, clean, and comfortable settings for their residents who share daily responsibilities, according to each individual's abilities.

Over 280 people currently are waiting for placement in Haverim Homes. In order to meet the needs of individuals waiting for placement, JARC has a family assistance program which provides counseling and help in locating interim placement.

In addition to the Haverim Homes, JARC offers a support program for developmentally disabled individuals who live independently in condominiums. The JARC staff trains and counsels individuals in specific areas, such as meal planning or managing emergency situations. This program enables participants to achieve greater independence each day.

JARC receives 25 percent of its operating costs through private fundraising. The Michigan Department of Mental Health and the Oakland County Community Mental Health Services Board also provide funding for JARC programs. Additionally, money contributions and personal time donated by over 100 volunteers to help to make JARC an ongoing success.

JARC's residential programs are more innovative, less expensive, and more comfortable than institutional care and I would like to see similar private residential services encouraged by the Federal Government. I commend JARC for its quality residential care and its support services for the developmentally disabled. JARC's talented and dedicated staff deserves our applause for its commitment to serving others.

#### FREDERICK H. BYSSHE, JR. TO RECEIVE BEN NORDMAN PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD

##### HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the presentation of the prestigious Ben Nordman Public Service Award to a good friend, Frederick H. Bysshe, Jr.

This award was established in perpetuity by the late Ben Nordman, who was recognized as a leader in his profession and in the community. The annual award trust fund is administered by United Way and honors an individual who epitomizes the best in the legal profession and in service to the community.

The fifth annual Ben Nordman Award is being presented on November 3 to an attorney practicing in the city of Ventura, CA. Frederick H. Bysshe, Jr. received his B.A. from University of Redlands in 1959. He then attended Hastings College of the Law, graduating in 1963.

Fred was admitted to the California Bar in 1963 and is a member of the American Bar Association, the Ventura County Bar Association which he served as president and the California Trial Lawyers Association. He is also a member of and has served as president of the Ventura County Criminal Defense Bar Association and the Ventura Trial Lawyers Association. He is a principal in the Ventura firm of Bysshe & LaRochelle.

Mr. Bysshe has been extremely active in civic affairs. He has served on the board of directors of the Ventura Archeological Society, not only helping to establish the organization, but also doing pro bono legal work for the fledgling society. He has served on the board of directors of the Ventura County YMCA, the Ventura Downtown Rotary Club, the Ventura County Diabetes Association, the Ventura County Cancer Society, and the Ventura County Master Chorale.

Although an attorney by profession, Fred has served on the board of directors of a homeowners association, where he helped to resolve neighborhood disputes outside of court. Fred has also been active in local church and professional organizations.

Fred enjoys working with children and has volunteered his time tutoring elementary school students who have reading and math problems. In addition, he was an assistant youth soccer coach for 5 years, and has served on the board of directors of the Ventura Girls Club.

For the past 3 years, Mr. Bysshe has been active in the Smoking Action Coalition of Ventura County, the Ventura County Heart Association, the Ventura County Lung Association, the Cancer Society, and the Medical Society. Through his work with these groups, Fred has helped to draft a model ordinance and to enact smoking regulation ordinances throughout Ventura County.

Please join me in congratulating my friend Fred on this occasion of his being presented the Ben Nordman Public Service Award.



# TRIBUTE TO A TEACHER

## HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of the finest teachers of mathematics in the entire Nation, Christina L. Myren of Thousand Oaks, CA.

Ms. Myren is one of the select teachers who won the 1990 Presidential Award for Excellence in science and mathematics. Since the award's inception 8 years ago, it has become the premier recognition for math and science teachers.

For those of my colleagues who do not know about this prestigious program, the Presidential awards recognize excellence and encourage our best teachers to remain in the classroom. As I'm sure we all agree, America has to do better in math and science to remain competitive in this increasingly technological age. This awards program is an important asset in that national goal.

Ms. Myren also received a \$7,500 grant from the National Science Foundation to use at Acacia Elementary School to supplement other resources to even further improve the math program there.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure my colleagues join me in congratulating Christina Myren, and in recognizing the vital job she and thousands of math and science teachers are doing to prepare today's youth for tomorrow's challenges.

# TRIBUTE TO BELLE ZIEGLER

## HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Belle Ziegler of Takoma Park, MD, a constituent in my congressional district, who will retire on November 1, 1990, after three decades of tireless and dedicated service to the people of Takoma Park.

In addition to her official duties as director of Takoma Park's Department of Recreation, Belle has served on the Maryland Recreation Association, the house and garden tour, the Takoma Park Singers, Takoma Park's Flag Committee, neighborhood youth soccer, the Maryland Kite Association, and Takoma Park Senior Citizens, to name but a few.

From the town's very special Fourth of July parade to its after school and vacation programs, athletic teams, drug prevention programs, and live concerts, Belle's leadership has made a difference in the lives of Takoma Park's young people.

At the same time, she has managed to attract and inspire countless Takoma Park adults into giving their time and talents—in some cases unknown talents—on behalf of their community. Belle has enlisted hundreds into coaching baseball and football, constructing and painting parade floats, building kites, impersonating clowns and Easter bunnies, or judging photography and flower shows. Their lives, too, have been enriched.

Takoma Park is well known for its sense of community and caring. In large measure, this is due to Belle Ziegler, to her love and enthusiasm for her hometown and for all its citizens, young and old.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will join me in saluting this remarkable woman and wishing her well in the years ahead.

# RECOGNITION OF CAMP CURTIN

## HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to a special historical place in my district. Camp Curtin, located in what is now Harrisburg's uptown district, was the largest camp of rendezvous in the Civil War. During the war, the facility processed and prepared more than 300,000 Union troops who fought in Gettysburg, Petersburg, and all the other major battles of the conflict.

All that is left of Camp Curtin now is a park at Sixth and Woodbine Streets, but the importance of its role in the war is immeasurable. The preservation of the Union can be traced back to the early mobilization of the encampment area. That is why it is so vital that Pennsylvania's part in the Civil War is recognized and understood.

Historians call the Civil War the single most important event in America's history—and Camp Curtin was a part of that history-altering event. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the community has organized to preserve and beautify the Camp Curtin State Park and increase awareness of the camp's role in the Civil War.

# DENOUNCING BUSH'S VETO OF CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

## HON. MIKE ESPY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, David Duke didn't win the election in Louisiana, but you wouldn't know it yesterday. Mr. Duke came to Washington to support President Bush's veto of the civil rights bill. He left smiling.

Our national rhetoric is that that discrimination is wrong. But the national reality is something entirely different. Ours is not a colorblind society, Mr. President; not yet.

The problem we face is discrimination—not quotas. By vetoing this bill, the President sends a message to the world that he is part of the problem.

The President had a chance to choose between the vision of David Duke and the vision of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

It's clear to see whose vision prevailed.

# HONORING CHARLES CANIFF; WINNER OF THE THEODORE ROOSEVELT CONSERVATION AWARD

## HON. PORTER J. GOSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this week Republican Members of Congress and President Bush presented for the first time the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Award, given to more than 70 individuals and groups from across the country in recognition of their outstanding commitment to conservation and volunteer efforts.

I was particularly pleased that our award winner from southwest Florida, Mr. Charles Caniff of Charlotte County, was able to attend the special award ceremony and hear President Bush's glowing remarks about his work. To Charley Caniff, the founder of the Charlotte Harbor Environmental Center, the President said "People like you represent the power of volunteerism, the power of those that might be physically challenged, and the power of an idea whose time has come."

Charley is a true inspiration. A retired marine pilot injured during brave service in World War II, Charley has long recognized the wonders of the out of doors. He talks fondly of the days when he lived in Wisconsin, where fishing and outdoor recreation were a way of life and a source of strength.

It was certainly our good fortune in southwest Florida when Charley moved to Charlotte County. As president for the Peace River Audubon Society, Charley put his tireless enthusiasm and self-effacing humor to work, fostering greater understanding and respect for our natural resources. It was his leadership and dedication that led to the creation in 1987 of the Charlotte Harbor Environmental Center, a marvelous example of what can be accomplished when government, community leaders, the school system and the private sector join forces.

The Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Award, given in the spirit of one of our Nation's first and greatest conservationists, is a small gesture of our thanks to Charley Caniff. Seeing the faces of young children light up when they learn about some of nature's mysteries and knowing that through his efforts hundreds of acres of sensitive land have been protected from unwise development most certainly offer Charley the greatest satisfaction. And well they should.

I am proud to have nominated Charley for this award and delighted that he was able to join me in Washington to claim an honor he richly deserves.

## A TRIBUTE TO BETTY SPAAR

## HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, while attending the University of Missouri as an undergraduate student, I was privileged to have a class with a charming young lady named Betty Simpson. Our paths were to cross years later when the same Betty Simpson Spaar moved to Odessa as the publisher of the *Odessan*. Through the years, Betty Spaar has not only been a friend to me, but a friend to the community of Odessa and Lafayette County.

As the publisher of the *Odessan*, Betty had received numerous newspaper awards as well as turning the *Odessan* into the largest newspaper in the county. This year, the paper received a first place award for investigative reporting by the Missouri Press Association. Betty is the recipient of the Faculty-Alumni Award from the University of Missouri and she currently serves as the president of the Missouri Press Association.

To crown her honors as a journalist, Betty Spaar has been chosen to receive the "Missouri Medal of Honor for Distinguished Service in Journalism" from her alma mater, the University of Missouri School of Journalism.

I congratulate Betty Spaar not only on this outstanding recognition but on the great contribution she has made and continues to make to her profession of journalism and to the citizens of our State. I know that my colleagues will join me to congratulate Betty for this great honor.

## INTRODUCTION OF SUPERFUND LIABILITY CLARIFICATION ACT

## HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to focus the Superfund liability debate once again on protecting the public health and safety, and the environment. Lender liability is an issue that is causing me great concern. Many of my constituents have expressed how the expansive web of liability under the Superfund Act has caused many innocent parties, lending institutions and businesses to "pull in their tentacles," potentially jeopardizing a healthy commerce.

Several recent court decisions have only exacerbated this situation. The Superfund Act or the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended, protects the rights of innocent parties and lenders. The evolving case law has created confusion under the innocent landowner defense.

The liability issues under Superfund are extremely complex. The recalcitrance of some responsible parties, and the lack of funds to clean up sites first and establish liability second, has caused a litigious, adversarial process which costs us all both financially and

with our health. It has created a nightmare where investigations on the ground are designed for litigation, sometimes at the expense of an expeditious and permanent remedial solution. It has also created certain circumstances where some innocent parties with deep pockets are being held liable for clean-up just because they have money. I am all for the polluter paying, but this adversarial climate is slowing down the cleanup process and causing unnecessary dismay of truly innocent parties.

The discussions I have had with lenders and innocent landowners indicate they are more than anxious to act in good faith and follow the rules. They just do not know what the rules are any longer. With this bill, I hope to clarify the pathway to protecting public health and the environment through clarifying the rules.

It is my intention that by offering this bill in the 11th hour of this Congress a constructive dialogue will ensue prior to the 102d Congress and the reauthorization of the Superfund Act. I want to create a foundation that will help lenders and innocent parties, without jeopardizing the intent of protecting the environment and the public.

It is my intent to offer a framework that deals with fairness, timeliness, and the future funding needs of the Superfund Program. It is not my intent to release noninnocent parties from their environmental responsibilities. I intend to look into many other issues that are of concern to me from experience in my district, as the Superfund Act is once again scrutinized.

There will be much work to do in the next Congress. A serious analysis of which problems are only perceptions and which problems are very real will be needed. The complexity of this issue necessitates open discussion between the environmental community and business. Together, we can develop the framework for protecting our health and environment well into the next century. I realize these issues are extremely complex and far reaching. I look forward to the dialogue ahead of us and being actively involved in the future of Superfund.

## INTRODUCTION TO "EMBASSY MOSCOW: ATTITUDES AND ERRORS"

## HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, as ranking Republican on the Intelligence Committee, I have expended considerable effort researching the history and consequences of the Soviet intelligence penetration of our unfinished embassy in Moscow. For fiscal year 1991, Congress was asked for a \$270 million supplemental State Department appropriation to tear down the new chancery and rebuild it—a request that, understandably, failed to excite wild enthusiasm. This year, congressional committees again have delayed and temporized, partly because potential solutions are universally unsavory. But the problem will not go

away. Lacking a final decision this year, the ghost of the skeletal building most certainly will return for fiscal year 1992 deliberations.

My findings will be submitted in two parts. Today, I am focusing on the historical and philosophical aspects of U.S. vulnerability to these types of Soviet intelligence operations. The second submission discusses intelligence implications of the various options for extricating the United States from the embassy fiasco.

Today's theme is the sophisticated and continuing nature of the Soviet intelligence threat, and the necessity of definitely turning away from former approaches to embassy security. We must abandon forever the naivete, hubris and political expediency of the past. We must recognize that Russia will continue to pose a severe counterintelligence threat, whatever the fate of glasnost and perestroika, just as it did before 1917. Despite glasnost—indeed, spurred by the uncertainties and opportunities it presents—Soviet intelligence activities against us and our allies today have reached a fever pitch. If we fail to change our ways, we cannot protect our military secrets and arms control strategy, our regional interests and initiatives, and whatever ability we may have to influence Soviet policy. If the Russians are reading our mail and listening to our conversations, they will be running circles around us.

We should be aware of the general outlook and policies which propelled us to this sorry situation in the first place, lest we repeat past errors. Primary among those attitudes was a general governmentwide neglect of counterintelligence issues, which was especially pronounced at the State Department. This negligence occurred despite continuous historical evidence of the need for extreme caution.

## EMBASSY MOSCOW: ATTITUDES AND ERRORS

(By Henry J. Hyde, Republican of Illinois)

Russia's notoriety for eavesdropping and espionage stretches back even to the czars. James Buchanan, U.S. minister in St. Petersburg during 1832-33 and later U.S. President, recounted that "we are continually surrounded by spies both of high and low degree. You can scarcely hire a servant who is not a secret agent of the police." An 1850-53 successor, Neill S. Brown, reconfirmed that "the opinion . . . prevails that ministers are constantly subjected to a system of espionage, and that even their servants are made to disclose what passed in their households, their conversations, associations, etc." Otto von Bismarck, who represented Prussia from 1859 to 1862, stated "it was especially difficult to keep a cypher secure at St. Petersburg, because all the embassies were of necessity obliged to employ Russian servants and subordinates in their households, and it was easy for Russian police to procure agents among these." The tradition intensified and became more sophisticated under the Bolsheviks and their successors. The wife of the Italian ambassador in Moscow during 1927-30 said: "Spying on the part of the authorities was so common as not even to be thought of as spying."

Footnotes at end of article.



Nonetheless, Western laxity in the face of these dangers also has deep roots. A confidential 1940 memo to the White House from FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover related the results of an investigation triggered by British complaints that shared intelligence was being leaked to the Soviets through the Moscow embassy.<sup>2</sup> The memo revealed that single U.S. employees in Moscow frequented a prostitution ring linked to Soviet intelligence and that classified documents were handled improperly and may have been obtained by Soviet workers. The code room was found open at night, with safes unlocked and code books lying on the table.

By the 1930s, technical eavesdropping supplemented human espionage. Guests at Spaso House, the U.S. ambassador's residence, at one point were given cards welcoming and warning them: "Every room is monitored by the KGB and all of the staff are employees of the KGB. We believe the garden also may be monitored. Your luggage may be searched two or three times a day. Nothing is ever stolen and they hardly disturb things \* \* \*."

In 1952, the Soviet gave U.S. representatives a carved wooden replica of the Great Seal of the United States. It hung prominently for years, at least part of the time in the ambassador's study, before a tiny microphone was found in the eagle. George Kennan's memoirs describe the event. In a theme now familiar, Kennan relates that Spaso House had been redecorated under Soviet supervision, without the presence of any American supervisors, giving them opportunity "to perfect their wiring of the house." "The ordinary, standard devices for the detection of electronic eavesdropping revealed nothing at all," but technicians decided to check again, in case our detection methods were out of date.

"Quivering with excitement, the technician extracted from the shattered depths of the seal a small device, not much larger than a pencil . . . capable of being activated by some sort of electronic ray from outside the building. When not activated, it was almost impossible to detect. . . . It represented, for that day, a *fantastically advanced* bit of applied electronics."<sup>4</sup>

In displaying this equipment to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge charged that more than 100 similar devices had been recovered in U.S. missions and residences in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe.<sup>5</sup> Jacob Beam, U.S. ambassador from 1969 to 1973, wrote that the "ever-present pressures" or residing in the U.S.S.R. included "physical surveillance, and constant bugging of conversations by various types of concealed devices."

Such Soviet monitoring techniques have been regularly discovered and occasionally publicized during the postwar period. Incidents revealed during the 1980s alone are alarming in their scope and seriousness. In 1982, we verified indications that the new embassy building had been penetrated. In 1984, we found that an unsecured shipment of typewriters for the Moscow Embassy had been bugged and had been transmitting intelligence data for years. In 1985, newspapers revealed that the Soviets were using invisible "spydust" to facilitate tracking and monitoring of U.S. diplomats. In December 1986, Clayton Lonetree's confession revealed that the Soviets had recruited espionage agents among Marine Guards at the embassy. Recently, we found microphones that had been operating in the Leningrad consulate for many years.

Although Moscow had developed over centuries a reputation for severe counterintelli-

gence risks, and although the postwar period was replete with examples of this, U.S. State Department and embassy personnel continued to act like babes in the KGB woods.

The State Department has insisted upon retaining responsibility for embassy security, arguing that it best understands living and operating in a foreign environment and contending that the ambassador must have full authority over all embassy operations. However, the Department historically has been notoriously unconcerned about security issues and even has viewed good security as antithetical to its mission. As Jeane Kirkpatrick once put it, the State Department claimed the right to manage embassy security but failed to fulfill the attendant obligations.<sup>6</sup> For instance, despite the long history of espionage by Soviet nationals employed at Western embassies, the State Department, until several years ago, successfully blocked attempts to ban or drastically reduce use of foreign service nationals.

Scholars have argued that such attitudes are not merely a temporary phenomenon, but have become intrinsic to the organizational culture of the Department. James Q. Wilson has observed that the State Department's core tasks are defined as maintaining relationships and replying to documents, which lead its officers to value diplomacy, hence communication and openness, above all else. Some of us believe good diplomacy requires good security.

"But many diplomats believe that a secure embassy is one that seems closed, uninviting, forbidding. Security means saying little; diplomacy means saying a lot, albeit carefully. Security means keeping foreigners at arm's length; diplomacy means getting to know people by, among other ways, employing them. Some diplomats do not bother to argue the point; they give lip service to security but regard the people, technical devices, and organizational procedures that make up a security system as a bothersome encumbrance that often makes ridiculous demands."<sup>7</sup>

Predictably, Wilson says, security specialists within the State Department are not promoted rapidly, especially if they must compete with foreign service officers, and security considerations have not won scarce financial resources except under prodding from Congress and other outside forces during recent years. Even then, "every outside committee that looked at the matter concluded that the department was dragging its feet." "Secretary of State George Schultz attempted to change this culture somewhat by fixing on each ambassador responsibility for embassy security, but with only limited effect."<sup>8</sup> This outlook may be intrinsic to the diplomatic profession, since, for instance, the Britain Foreign Office behaved in similar fashion during the postwar period.<sup>9</sup>

The primacy of superficial "diplomacy," or temporarily smooth relations, over security was well exemplified in negotiation of the terms under which U.S. and U.S.S.R. embassies were to be constructed. The related, painful discussions dragged out over more than a decade. The Soviets were both obstreperous and patient, to get terms and delays facilitating espionage and other purposes. They succeeded magnificently.<sup>10</sup>

Under the 1969 agreement on exchange of sites, the U.S. allowed Moscow to retain its old chancery once the new one was finished, but relinquished that right for the U.S.; by 1986 we had changed our mind and so notified the Soviets, but they have not yet con-

ceded this reciprocal privilege and doubtless will require concessions for it. In 1972, the Nixon-Kissinger determination to further detente finally overrode what apparently was viewed as quibbling over details, and we finally reached agreement on conditions of construction; these terms also were to have been completed in 1969. We made the fatal error of agreeing to use Soviet labor and materials, and in internal documents the State Department offered three reasons for this: use of U.S. workers in Moscow would allow the U.S.S.R. the same rights here, and this would present counterintelligence problems (a rare example of alleged concern in this respect, which overlooked other, larger counterintelligence problems); Soviet workers might be less costly, especially since Moscow promised full cooperation in providing workers (a promise later freely broken); and the Soviets had built all other foreign embassies in Moscow. This last point is noteworthy: other Western countries have made, and continue to make, the same counterintelligence errors as the U.S.

Negotiations to refine these conditions of construction dragged out another four years, whereupon the two sides finally signed a 1977 Protocol. Although even State Department officers had stressed the importance of maintaining parallel construction timetables and strict reciprocity in operations, in March 1977 the Department allowed the Soviets to begin construction. By 1979, when State finally secured a contract from the Soviet foreign trade firm designated under the agreement, Soviet housing units in Washington were essentially complete, and Soviet diplomats were allowed to move into them. As a result, when the U.S. subsequently ran into many construction roadblocks, its leverage to force contract compliance had decreased drastically. This contract also limited the State Department to nine on-site supervisory personnel, which gave Soviet eavesdropping technicians the run of the place; sometimes, as few as five were present. Charles Perkins, a member from 1976 to 1981 of the Moscow Security Advisory Group, claims that sophisticated measures were recommended to avoid and solve security problems at the Moscow complex; he concludes that most or all of those recommendations must have been rejected by our own people, probably for politically expedient reasons.<sup>11</sup>

In 1983, Congress decided to act on reciprocity problems at Moscow and elsewhere. It passed the Foreign Missions Act, impelled in large measure by a critique of security conditions at our posts abroad and designed to give the U.S. leverage to improve security by providing means to retaliate in kind for poor treatment of U.S. officials and assets abroad. However, the State Department concentrated on the securing of reciprocal personnel and financial benefits, preferring to ignore the intelligence mission. The Foreign Missions Office, which saw counterintelligence as its primary reason for existence, was treated as a pariah within the Department.

Under the first Reagan Administration, National Security Council personnel pushed for greater reciprocity on issues of counterintelligence sensitivity and for more effective embassy security, particularly with respect to the Soviet Bloc. This aroused the ire of U.S. Ambassador to the U.S.S.R. Arthur A. Hartman, who in 1984 sent to Washington a harshly worded classified cable which strongly resisted proposed security improvements. By his own account, Hartman used "colorful language" to stimu-

late a high-level policy review of efforts to reduce Soviet representation in the U.S. to the level of U.S. representation in Moscow. He contended this would amount to a virtual break in relations and represented an attempt by some officials to close down Soviet activities in the U.S. entirely, as well as a willingness to court a shutdown in U.S. diplomatic activities in Moscow.<sup>12</sup> Until he left Moscow in 1987, Hartman continued to oppose, via cables and personal lobbying, security improvements such as removal of Soviet nationals employed at U.S. posts. Although such persons were known to be employed or coopted by the KGB, the ambassador in 1985 made the rounds of Capitol Hill, including the House Intelligence Committee, arguing that the typewriter bugging incident had not been as serious as believed and that other alleged security weaknesses had been overblown, claiming that the embassy could operate securely despite any electronic bugging, and adding that such eavesdropping actually helped him by opening more channels to the Soviet leadership. He also echoed the State Department line that U.S. support staff was unduly subject to Soviet recruitment, unlike professional Foreign Service Officers, and that it was better to employ known KGB workers than to bring to Moscow Americans whose ultimate loyalty could not be trusted.<sup>13</sup>

In this climate, years passed with little improvement in operating procedures at the old embassy and with the Reagan Administration at an impasse over what to do about the unfinished, bugged new facility.

Following devastating terrorist attacks and espionage scandals, the State Department asked a group led by former National Security Agency Director Bobby Inman to study security issues and recommend countermeasures and policy changes. The Inman Report, finished in 1985, listed repeated penetrations of embassies in the Soviet Bloc and recommended an overhauling and restructuring of security organization within the Department of State, including a new Assistant Secretary for Diplomatic Security. In practice, however, State preferred to focus attention on counterterrorism rather than on counterintelligence. A 1985 report by the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board allegedly reached similar conclusions but also had little immediate effect.<sup>14</sup>

Another group headed by Melvin Laird was appointed to study the Moscow fiasco, and in 1987 concluded, among other things, that Ambassador Hartman knew or should have known of problems regarding Marine security guard fraternization with Soviet support staff, but failed to take appropriate action. This report appears to have been quashed by the State Department, which apparently objected to criticism of an ambassador whom it considered exemplary, and to whom a large bonus had been given for outstanding work in Moscow.<sup>15</sup> These attitudes and the passage of four years without a decision on the bugged new embassy infuriated Senator Ernest Hollings, who in April 1987 helped galvanize the Senate Intelligence and Appropriations Committees into demanding demolition of the bugged embassy. Hollings also allegedly suggested that the Attorney General prosecute involved State Department officials for criminal negligence.<sup>16</sup>

Thus, while cultural inclinations within the State Department have contributed to the neglect of security, it is only fair to observe that until recently, no other executive agency was willing to press vigorously for change.

Intelligence agencies also long have neglected counterintelligence, as has been documented by many investigations pursuant to this decade's multitudinous spy scandals. Here, too, some recent improvements have been made, but the more exciting and rewarding pursuit of positive intelligence collection remains the dominant ethos and preoccupation.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation, for its part, sometimes may, for the record, voice its concerns about unwise reciprocal diplomatic arrangements over which it theoretically has some partial jurisdiction. Examples include permitting the Soviets to build an embassy and consulate at points in Washington and San Francisco which were ideal for intercepting communications, and accepting Soviet construction terms within negotiations to build embassies in each other's territory. But while often raising relevant counter intelligence issues for the record, the Bureau seldom makes vigorous attempts to block policies which it feels are unwise from a counterintelligence point of view, because the FBI is ever conscious that it is a relatively small player in the foreign policy arena, and because it does not wish to be accused of obstructionism or provincial myopia.

Another important contributor to the new embassy fiasco was the hubris of US Intelligence, which considered itself the world champion in technical intelligence and believed that it could not be bested, despite indications over the years that this bravado was both false and foolhardy—and not only with respect to the Soviets. If the Soviets planted "bugs," we would surely find and disarm them. Hence the blithe unconcern over negotiations, which allowed Soviet workmen to build the structure using precast Soviet beams and pre-poured concrete, with minimal U.S. supervision at the site.

Belated discovery that the Moscow embassy was structurally riddled with eavesdropping devices and that, as reported in the investigation headed by James Schlesinger, we "do not yet understand either the technology or the underlying strategy," was a most deflating shock. Schlesinger testified before the Senate Budget Committee on June 29, 1987 that:

"In past years, the Soviets were sufficiently behind us that we were able to detect penetrations, and neutralize them. That was the assumption in building this facility. We now face a rising curve of Soviet technology, with no gap between what the Soviets can do and what we can do; indeed, in some areas they have been ahead of us \* \* \*. If one permits the Soviets to precast concrete columns and beams off-site, the prime party to blame is not the Soviets, but ourselves. We have presented them with too much opportunity, too much temptation for them to resist \* \* \*."

With respect to both embassy construction and operations, we have a lot to learn from the Soviets."

While even Schlesinger accepted the assertion that U.S. bugging technology long was clearly superior to that of the Soviets, the 1952 incident concerning the bugged eagle, described above, should have been sufficient warning that the Soviets long have been capable of innovative and effective techniques, even of technological leaps. Although Soviet gadgets and gizmos are not consistently what we would consider state of the art in terms of design and performance, the overriding requirements are that they work and, above all, that the target be unable to find them. As revealed in the

chronology above, in these goals they unquestionably have succeeded on numerous occasions, and doubtless in many more instances of which we remain ignorant. The American premium on sophisticated wizardry and pride in our overall technological superiority often leads us to ignore the possibility that others could be doing to us the same things of which we ourselves are capable, so we do not take elementary precautions against known or possible techniques. This tendency appears to be abetted by a lack of detailed information exchange between those aware of the latest Western technology advances and those who must defend against penetrations by the Soviets and others. Both turf and security concerns prevent dissemination of information that would enlighten security and counterintelligence personnel.

Most demoralizing and infuriating of all, the waste of hundreds of millions of dollars on the new embassy could and should have been avoided, because U.S. Intelligence had timely warning about Soviet plans. After a 10-year silence, KGB defector Victor Sheymov revealed publicly that during 1980, only six months after construction had begun on the embassy foundation, he repeatedly insisted in the strongest terms that the U.S. should halt work on the building because the KGB planned to riddle the structure with eavesdropping devices, using sophisticated techniques so the bugs would be impossible to eradicate.<sup>18</sup> Sheymov revealed that devices would be imbedded in the pre-poured concrete and in the steel beams. In addition, the Soviets would tunnel to the building foundation, and from there the building design would allow the Soviets to channel both listening and video devices all the way to the top floor at times of their choosing, after the walls were constructed. In a third round of redundant penetration, additional devices would be installed in furniture, equipment, etc., as opportunities arose.

Despite Sheymov's acknowledged credibility, construction continued, with attendant cost overruns, for another five years. The first independent confirmation of Sheymov's 1980 warnings was acquired in 1982, but it was not until 1985 that we conducted tests sufficiently persuasive to elicit, finally, a decision to halt construction. Placement of responsibility for the prior failure to act has been disputed. Some claim that the State Department refused to heed Intelligence Community warnings because of its traditional disregard for counterintelligence problems and the wish to avoid a diplomatic row, a long delay in acquiring coveted new quarters and painful renegotiation of the treaty. Others cite the Intelligence Community's naive conviction that it could both find and eradicate all the bugs.<sup>19</sup> Probably it was a combination of both.

Since U.S. intelligence agencies and the State Department have harbored crippling attitudes, it was inevitable that the Soviets toyed with us and for decades exploited our overseas facilities to their substantial benefit. It was, as the saying goes, like taking candy from a baby—time after time after time. Occasionally, we would discover that we were being "had," but until Congress became outraged over the weakness of U.S. counterintelligence and consistently sustained its outrage, pressure and threats over a number of years, little changed.

Following the Moscow embassy scandal, the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board reportedly recommended that sole responsibility for embassy security be taken



away from the State Department bureaucracy and given to a new quasi-independent inter-agency group reporting directly to the Secretary of State and with explicit right of appeal to the President. This "Security Evaluation Office" was indeed formed and physically located at CIA, but it was boycotted by the State Department. There followed a monumental and yet unresolved "turf war" between the State Department and CIA/SEO, with the State bureaucracy still refusing to recognize SEO's right to monitor adherence to standards. As part of its campaign to undermine SEO, State did establish a security oversight group within its Office of Inspector General, which has begun to address some substantive problems.

The State Department's determination to avoid outside oversight on embassy security has been so strong that it declared it was willing to take the entire \$270 million for tearing down and rebuilding the Moscow Embassy out of its own already strained budget, if need be; partial funding by U.S. Intelligence apparently would allow unacceptable leverage over policy.

While the executive branch has exhibited indecision on many embassy security and counterintelligence issues, agencies did finally agree that the new embassy would have to be rebuilt. After years of debate, in 1989 they even reached a simmering consensus that the most viable option was to tear down and rebuild on the same foundation. For its part, however, Capitol Hill, which must fund any solution, remains in disarray. Within the House of Representatives, single-minded concentration on financial issues by the Appropriations Committee, as well as the Foreign Affairs Committee's fear of losing authority to the Intelligence Committee, have both abetted executive branch turf battles over responsibility for embassy security and impeded well-considered selection of how to deal with the bugged structure in Moscow. As will be discussed in a second installment, the counterintelligence implications of both the possible alternatives of the delay in implementing a decision sometimes have been accorded little attention on the Hill.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise noted, quotes on this topic within the following paragraphs are from James S. Pacy, "An Essay in Quotes," *Foreign Service Journal* (October 1, 1987), p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Philip Shenon, "1940 Memo Criticized U.S. Embassy," *New York Times* (May 27, 1987).

<sup>3</sup> Saul Pett, "Bugged U.S. Embassy Stands—for Now—as a Reminder of the Cold War," *Los Angeles Times* (Feb. 25, 1990).

<sup>4</sup> George F. Kennan, *Memoirs, 1950-1963, Volume II* (Little, Brown & Co., 1972), pp. 155, 156.

<sup>5</sup> John M. Goshko, "At Moscow Embassy, Continuous Shadow War," *Washington Post* (August 22, 1985).

<sup>6</sup> Jeane Kirkpatrick, "Our Colossal Failure in Moscow," *Washington Post* (April 20, 1987), p. A15.

<sup>7</sup> James G. Wilson, *Bureaucracy*, (Basic Books, 1989), p. 93.

<sup>8</sup> Wilson, pp. 94-95.

<sup>9</sup> Peter Wright, *Spycatcher* (Dell Publishing, 1987), pp. 367-68, 394, 434-35.

<sup>10</sup> See U.S. General Accounting Office, Report to the Chairman, Committee on the Budget, US Senate, *U.S. Embassy, Moscow: Why Construction Took Longer and Cost More Than Anticipated* (October, 1987), GAO/NSIAD-88-23.

<sup>11</sup> Charles M. Perkins, "Where Moscow embassy went Awry," *U.S. News and World Report* (May 18, 1987), p. 8.

<sup>12</sup> Robert Gillette, "Tighter Embassy Controls Not a Cure, Hartman Says," *Los Angeles Times* (May 2, 1987), p. 31.

<sup>13</sup> See, for example: Bernard Gwertzman, "\$5 Billion Plan Aims to Protect U.S. Embassies," *New York Times* (Sept. 29, 1985), p. 1; and John Walcott,

U.S. Suspected Embassy Spying for Years," *Wall Street Journal* (April 3, 1987), p. 4.

<sup>14</sup> Stephen Engelberg, "Reagan Was Told in '85 of Problem in Moscow Embassy," *New York Times* (April 3, 1987).

<sup>15</sup> See, for example: Richard Halloran, "Envoy is Blamed in Moscow Spying," *New York Times* (Jan. 20, 1988); "Having a Fit," *Washington Times* (July 28, 1987), p. 3; George C. Wilson and Molly Moore, "Ex-Ambassador Shares Blame for Moscow Scandal," *Washington Post* (May 8, 1987), p. 3; and Bill Gertz, "Officials Claim State Closets Report Criticizing Hartman," *Washington Times* (July 22, 1987), p. A3.

<sup>16</sup> Bill Gertz, "Spy Law May Apply to Negligent Staff," *Washington Times* (May 1, 1987), p. 1.

<sup>17</sup> "For the Record," *Washington Post* (July 1, 1987), p. A18.

<sup>18</sup> See George Lardner, "Unbeatable Bugs: The Moscow Embassy Flasco," *Washington Post*, June 18, 1990, pp. A1, A21.

<sup>19</sup> For allegations to this effect quoting State Department officials, see Lardner, p. A21.

## TRIBUTE TO BURGESS WINTER AND JOHN DORSEY

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate today to commend Burgess Winter, Magma Copper Co.'s president and CEO, and John Dorsey, the general manager of mining operation in Superior, AZ, for their innovative efforts to resurrect the copper industry in Superior. Deemed an unprofitable operation during the copper-price depression of the mid-1980's, the Superior mine was shut down in 1982. However, the decision was made to reopen the mine, and, in February, John Dorsey led a team of workers in a massive restoration project that was nothing short of a miracle. Today, the Superior copper mine is running full steam ahead, with the production per man-shift double what it was before the shutdown and the cost of production cut in half. This success was due in large part to Dorsey's fostering of teamwork in the operation of the copper mine.

I commend to my colleagues a feature article appearing in the *Arizona Daily Star*, September 23, 1990, which tells the comeback story of Magma's copper mine in Superior, and its workers' "Pursuit of Team Excellence" under the leadership of John Dorsey:

[From the *Arizona Daily Star*, Sept. 23, 1990]

### PURSUIT OF TEAM EXCELLENCE

SUPERIOR.—It was something close to a miracle when 20 tons of copper concentrate was shipped out of this old mining camp on the last day of August.

The Superior mine—the birthplace of Magma Copper Co. in 1910—had been all but given up for dead during the copper-price depression of the mid-1980s.

But today, a team of about 300 Magma workers is bringing one of Arizona's richest copper-ore bodies back into production with an innovative work spirit and a visible sense of pride.

John Dorsey, general manager for Magma's Superior Division, is riding in a cage crammed with about 60 miners who are ending an eight-hour shift working about 4,000 feet below the surface of a mountain about 100 miles north of Tucson.

The miners are caked in mud, dust, grease and sweat as they eagerly await a glimpse of daylight from overhead during the six-minute ride to the surface.

Dorsey chats with John Tomerlin, team leader of the day crew.

Tomerlin is a third-generation Magma miner and a veteran of both the "Old Superior" operation and the company's mainstay complex at San Manuel.

"It's good to be back," he says of the revival of the mine where he worked for nine years before its shutdown in 1982. "But I never thought it would happen," he adds.

Tomerlin says working now at Superior is different. "It's a lot better now. Everybody tries to cooperate and work more as a team."

Johnnie Brake, also a veteran of both Superior and San Manuel, agrees that "a lot of things work better" under the new operation. He expresses concern that individual bonuses might be diluted by the team approach, but says any problems can be discussed openly with anybody, up to and including the general manager.

"Pursuing Team Excellence" is the operating slogan at Superior.

### RICH GRADE OF COPPER ORE

Although Superior is blessed with an extremely rich grade of copper ore, high production costs eventually cost the jobs of 1,500 people eight years ago when Magma was a subsidiary of Newmont Mining Corp. Pumps were shut off in 1986, allowing the mine to flood with ground water to the 3,000-foot level.

The Superior ore now is grading at about 6 percent copper, roughly 10 times better than the ore at the San Manuel mine, which is mined under radically different methods and on a scale that dwarfs the new Superior operation.

Shortly after Magma became independent of Newmont in 1987, company officials began to consider what could be done with Superior, which was costing the company about \$1 million a year as it stood idle.

The options included a sale of the property, taking on a joint-venture partner, or finding a new, less expensive way to bring the mine's riches to production.

Dorsey, a University of Arizona engineering graduate assigned to Magma's corporate planning staff, led a team of people who finally proposed that a new, smaller team of miners could work the rich veins of the mine and send substantial copper concentrates to the huge San Manuel smelter.

The decision was made last October to restart the pumps, bring the water level down in the mine, and take a look at its condition.

What the Magma team found when they first reentered the mine in February was worse than expected, Dorsey says. Acidic water had corroded metal pipes, ruined miles of electrical cable and rotted timbers. Some of the tunnels were thigh-deep in thick mud covering rusty rail tracks.

Collapsed tunnels had blocked some of the mine's extensive ventilation system, which is capable of sending refrigerated air into some of the deep, hot areas where the temperature of the rock walls can reach 150 degrees.

Some of the work had to be done by workers crawling through tight spaces, Dorsey says.

The original clean-out and restoration crew worked under a contract firm, LP Enterprises. But those workers were converted to Magma salaried employees a few weeks ago. A \$700 bonus was paid to most of them

because the target date for concentrate production was met "with a few hours to spare," Dorsey notes.

The \$13 million restoration project is about two months ahead of schedule, he says, even though the mine's condition was worse than anticipated.

Production is now running at about 500 tons of ore per day, he says, with a target of doubling that by the end of November. Again, a bonus awaits the Superior team if it successfully meets the target.

When Magna suspended Superior's operations in 1982, production was running at about 3,200 tons per day.

Burgess Winter, Magna president and CEO, says he is "absolutely delighted" with the results at Superior. He says production per man-shift today is about double what it was before its shutdown. The cost of production, he says, has been cut in half.

Superior was once considered just a source of feedstock to the San Manuel smelter, Winter says, and little attention was paid to cost. Today, Superior must stand on its own because Magna can and does buy concentrates from around the world for its smelter, the largest of its kind in the world.

Winter says the known reserves at Superior would last eight years under the current mining plan, but "if there is any less than double that, I'll eat my hat." The company is already planning an extensive exploration program for the area.

Dorsey says it is the involvement of the workers in the operation of the mine that is making it a success.

The company "post everything" on the walls of the plant office showing costs, productivity and the potential for profit, he says.

The workers at Superior are, in effect, going to be owners, he says. They clearly understand the correlation between cost and profit.

"You can't have ownership without the knowledge base. We want to publish all our costs and all of our productivity figures. That's what they'll be managing. Their goals are based on these costs and when they exceed those goals, they'll be rewarded."

In the old days, cost figures were kept secret and management seldom asked for input from the frontline workers.

Today, it is not unusual for workers to stop by the office at the mine after a work shift to brainstorm with engineers about how to tackle a problem, Dorsey says.

"Instead of a handful of managers trying to control costs, now we have 30 managers," he says. Workers are careful to choose only the tools and supplies sufficient to do the job, leaving behind more expensive equipment, he adds.

"I want everybody here to know as much about the division as I do. I want them to know what our plans are," he says. "These guys can give you a lot of input if you just ask them."

Walls have been knocked out in the office building near the mine entrance to better handle groups of people talking openly, he points out. There is no longer a separate changing room for "managers." Between Dorsey and a newly hired miner are three management layers, as opposed to about 15 at the "Old Superior," he says.

All employees get the same salaried benefit package, including retirement benefits and a 401k plan, he says.

Entry-level miners start at a salary of \$350 a week and maintenance miners earn \$510 a week. But those amounts can in-

crease from 10 percent to 90 percent under bonus incentives, Dorsey says.

A rigorous employment-screening process is used to select people who can work well in the team atmosphere, Dorsey says. Questions are based not so much on skills as "attitudes," he says, such as what would the employee expect from a supervisor under a given situation.

Work-team members take part in the interview process for new employees. After that, about 40 percent of the prospects fail the company physical, and most of the failures are due to drug-use detection by hair analysis.

Dorsey says everything about the operation is negotiable with employees—except safety.

He estimates roughly half the work force is from the local area.

Doug Nelson, manager of safety, says the contract-mining system at Superior penalizes bonus pay if there is an injury. He says proudly that there were no major accidents during the "real tough" rehabilitation.

He said the "Old Superior" had a "not real good safety record." He credits Dorsey with management "genius" in giving workers input into everything. It's a philosophy of "How can we do this job better?" not "You'll do it my way or you're fired."

## A STRONG DEFENSE IS STILL VERY MUCH NEEDED

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, last night we passed the fiscal year 1991 defense authorization conference report. In making the decision as to whether or not it was a good measure that adequately met the national security needs of our Nation, I focused on the threats that still exist and potential threats against which we must be prepared. One of the threats we face today is in the Persian Gulf, namely the aggression of Iraqi Dictator Saddam Hussein. Much has been said about Saddam, his motives, and whether or not he is a unique threat. In this month's Air Force magazine is an excellent commentary which, I believe, gives a very sound analysis of this situation and our future defense needs.

The debate about how much and what type of defense we need for the future is certainly not over. Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to carefully review this editorial. I think it makes a very powerful contribution to this debate.

The article follows:

[From Air Force Magazine, October 1990]

### THE FIRST THIRTY DAYS

(By John T. Carrell)

In August, just as the nation was turning out the lights on the defense program, crisis struck in the Middle East. Six days after Iraq invaded Kuwait, U.S. Air Force fighters were on location in Saudi Arabia, ready to fight, and a massive airlift had been assembled to deliver ground forces, equipment, and supplies.

At this writing in early September, it is unknown whether the culmination is to be war, stalemate, or some sort of negotiated settlement. Whatever happens, the first

thirty days of the crisis should have been instructive.

As David Border put it in a Washington Post column, the crisis shattered a "dangerous myth" that the U.S. no longer needs military strength. It further demonstrated, Mr. Broder said, that "we bought a lot more in the military buildup of the 1980s than the overpriced toilet seats Pentagon critics held up to constant ridicule."

As Mr. Broder points out, the United States is fortunate to have airlift and sealift capacity "that made this deployment a logistic miracle" and weapons that "would be the telling difference if war comes."

Slow learners, however, remain among us. They say the Iraqi despot, Saddam Hussein, is a unique threat, that his military power is overrated, that he can be defeated with relative ease, and that it would be easier yet if our forces had simply, sturdy equipment rather than the esoteric weapons on which we spent our money.

That is hogwash. Of course this threat is unique. Most threats are. Before August 2, the instant experts who now perceive no other threats were not worried about Iraq either.

Of course the United States can defeat Iraq in battle, but we should not expect a pushover. Many of Saddam's weapons are below par, but even the older arms have some military value, and an appreciable part of his equipment—MiG-29 fighters and Su-25 attack aircraft, for example—is modern.

Some of his troops are ragged, but he still has a million of them. The quality of his chemical weapons may be questionable, but it's good enough to put our own forces into hot, bulky, protective gear.

The United States owes its advantage to advanced capabilities. Our aircraft and tanks are better than Saddam's. We can fight at night. We can operate against lethal defenses. Our well-trained forces have the benefit of timely information from airborne and battlefield sensors. We can place power where it's needed.

Analyst Jeffrey Record, who created a furor last spring by suggesting the Air Force had outlived its usefulness, now writes that "we would be stupid to try to slug it out with Iraq on the ground" and that "U.S. airpower could prove the decisive instrument of Iraq's defeat."

It was not necessary to develop the American military presence from scratch. U.S. ships and capable carrier-based fighters were already in the area. Nevertheless, everyone breathed a bit easier once the Air Force and some ground divisions arrived to put more muscle in the order of battle.

The prompt positioning of superior forces stopped Iraq short of uncontested domination of forty percent of the world's oil. The United States says there won't be a war unless Saddam starts it, but that leaves some problems hanging.

Rep. Les Aspin (D-Wis.)—whose House Armed Services Committee voted, two days before the invasion of Kuwait, to cut defense by \$24 billion next year—says, "Our bottom line boils down to ridding the world of Saddam Hussein or his army." In Mr. Aspin's view, if Saddam merely pulls out of Kuwait with his forces intact, he can still intimidate his neighbors with raw power that he has demonstrated his willingness to use.

"It would not be long—two to five years, say—before he made his next land grab," observed The Economist. "By the mid-1990s, the West is likely to depend rather more than now on oil from the Gulf, and the



Soviet Union may depend rather less on the good-will of the West. Beating Mr. Hussein then, when Iraq could be nuclear-armed and economically strong, would be much harder."

The crisis caught radical reductions to U.S. defense in the planning stage and the defense industrial base beginning to disintegrate. Neither the defense program nor the industrial base is yet beyond recovery. A wise nation might now reconsider their importance in light of recent experience.

Furthermore, the U.S. should look again at the signals it is sending, especially to those who do not mean us well.

The sobering fact is that deterrence failed in the Middle East.

Perhaps Saddam is a megalomaniac, and no logic would have forestalled him. The more likely assessment, though, is that he "miscalculated" when he invaded Kuwait and threatened Saudi Arabia.

If the second view is correct, what led him to miscalculate and figure he could get by with aggression? Who else, in what situations, threatening which U.S. interests, might also miscalculate—and why?

### LET'S MAKE ENGLISH OUR OFFICIAL LANGUAGE

#### HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, Senators RICHARD SHELBY and HOWELL HEFLIN of Alabama have introduced in the Senate legislation that would designate English as our Nation's official language. S. 3179, the Language of Government Act, is companion legislation to H.R. 4424, which I have introduced in the House.

Soon after the Senate bill was introduced, Senator SHELBY submitted an editorial for USA Today, setting forth his reasons for proposing this legislation. The article was published in the October 15 issue of the newspaper. It is a thoughtful examination of the reasons this country needs an official language by a distinguished Member of the Senate. I submit this article for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and invite my colleagues in the House to read it and think about this issue in the weeks ahead. And when the 102d Congress convenes, I urge full debate on the language-of-Government issue and passage of this most important legislation. Thank you:

#### LET'S MAKE ENGLISH OUR OFFICIAL LANGUAGE

WASHINGTON.—I'm from the South. You can recognize it immediately from the moment I open my mouth. What comes out can be described as a "Southern drawl."

Working in the Capitol, I encounter colleagues from all over the country who bring with them ethnic diversity, as well as accents and dialects dramatically different from my own. They come from Hawaii and Iowa, Arkansas and Alaska, Maine and Montana—they have names like Akaka and Murkowski, D'Amato and Breaux, Boschwitz and Metzenbaum. And though thousands of miles often separate us geographically (and sometimes ideologically), we are all able to communicate, to exchange ideas, to even, occasionally, argue about policy.

This is possible only because we all speak English. English is our common language by custom, however, not by law.

Last week, I introduced legislation, in the U.S. Senate to change all that. My bill would make English the official language of the United States by requiring that all official acts of government be performed in English. The bill does not affect language spoken in homes, churches or businesses; it would not interfere with government services in languages other than English for purposes of public health and safety or criminal justice.

The time has come for the United States to formulate a clear language policy. We are a diverse nation, composed of many races, religions and cultures. We take pride in our heritage and recognize that our country as a whole has been successful because of this unique cultural diversity. As this country continues to grow and welcome new immigrants, it has become more essential to preserve our common language—with all its dialects, accents, quirks and subtleties.

America has always been viewed as the land of opportunity. Early immigrants immersed themselves in the whirlwind of this growing democracy, learning the language and customs of their adopted land without losing their cultural identity. They realized that English was the commerce of their new country and that, in order to participate, they had to be able to communicate. Today, we can still foster a national language without sacrificing the positive effects of multilingualism and plural cultures.

My legislation is clearly not the final word on fostering swifter assimilation into our society. We can do more to help immigrants adapt to their new culture and language. We must continue to develop and extend our national and community literacy and language outreach programs. Businesses have also become involved in the goal of training a well-educated workforce capable of maintaining our country's competitive edge globally.

The doors to educational, economic and political opportunity will remain closed to those without the key of common language. This bill isn't about discrimination; it's about fuller participation.

### UNFAIR FDIC PREMIUM INCREASE

#### HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a copy of the October 1, 1990, letter written to Hon. L. William Seidman, the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation here in Washington, from Ballard W. Cassady, Jr., executive vice president of the Kentucky Bankers Association in Louisville, KY, which I would like to share with my colleagues.

Ballard Cassady has written to FDIC Chairman Seidman with regard to his views concerning the across-the-board premium increase which has just been announced for banks nationwide in an effort to rebuild the deposit insurance fund. I believe my colleagues will be interested in Ballard's comments, especially his views that Kentucky's financial institutions "wish to do our part for America and we will continue to support our industry in every way possible, but America has to support us as well and that can be

done through decreasing regulatory burdens so that we can compete more effectively domestically and internationally."

I urge my colleagues to read the comments of this outstanding Kentuckian. The letter from Ballard Cassady follows:

KENTUCKY BANKERS ASSOCIATION,  
Louisville, KY, October 1, 1990.

HON. L. WILLIAM SEIDMAN,  
Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SEIDMAN: It is at times like this that bankers in Kentucky feel out of the "mix" or "decision loop" the most. Our entire assets are only 39.6 billion dollars and our deposits are 31.7 billion dollars (as of December 1989). We realize that those numbers would make a good size "branch" for one of our country's major money center banks.

Year after year we make our annual trip to Washington with our Board of Directors and other bankers from our membership to discuss our statewide banking environment with the FDIC, OCC and Federal Reserve. Year after year we are applauded for the exemplary performance of our banks. It is a good feeling to know that our regulators are proud of our performance, and it also makes us proud to know that playing by the rules has paid off, not in massive earnings, but in strength of assets.

We constantly attend meetings on state, regional and national levels where banking issues are discussed "ad nauseam". We attend strategy meetings for political issues and meet with regulators to discuss the burdensome constraints on banking. It seems we always come away feeling that new laws and regulations are being piled upon us, not for problems experienced in our state, but for problems experienced elsewhere. These are places that most of our consumers have never been, nor have a desire to go. Problems such as time required for cashing checks, life-line banking, Community Re-Investment, and real estate appraisals, just to name a few, are not present in our state. Over 80% of our banks offer some form of life-line banking to fixed income and retired individuals.<sup>1</sup> Our banks contribute over 12 million dollars a year to state and local charities.<sup>2</sup> Our banks offer either immediate or one day clearance on checks in the same Federal Reserve district. And real estate appraisals—what a joke this will turn out to be. Somewhere along the line of bureaucratic genius, someone decided if we had certified appraisals instead of just appraisals on single family home loans that all would be just fine. Their rationale, I suppose, was that even if the economy deteriorated and took a turn for the worse, we could get our money back I guess it's because they are "certified" appraisals. Whoever thought that one up should get two awards—one from the appraisers organization for "service above and beyond to the enhancement of revenue for appraisers" and one from the economist society for "rewriting the laws of economics."

I apologize for straying from my points of discussion, but in all honesty this appraisal bill will go down in history as one of the cruelest jokes ever perpetrated on the American public. It will accomplish nothing except raise the cost of getting a home loan.

The point I am trying to make is that these problems exist in New York or Los

<sup>1</sup> Survey conducted by KBA.

<sup>2</sup> Same as above.

Angeles and in Dallas or Boston—in other words, in the major cities. These problems don't exist in the majority of towns and communities across this great nation. Every time a new law or regulation is put into effect for these minority offenders, it affects everyone and the cost is outrageous. We have always gone along because it was important that our industry provide the best and safest means for the financial needs of the public. If these added cost burdens would help straighten out our "big brothers", then so be it. More often than not, we must absorb the cost for problems created elsewhere and "Big Brother" has no incentive to straighten up.

Now the time has come for us to scream foul. If there are problems in the banking industry they have been due to economic problems, regulatory burdens and the inability of banks to compete effectively with other financial providers due to constraints imposed through Congress and regulatory divisions. They are not problems of fraud and mismanagement as evidenced in the Savings and Loan crisis.

We scream foul because the FDIC thinks that a level across the board premium increase is the answer to rebuilding the fund. Once again, we pay for problems elsewhere. One of our smallest rural bankers approached me recently to say that in the long run many of those states where banks made bad lending decisions, or were caught unaware of economic downturn, will come out ahead. His example was as follows:

"If you can build a 20 story office building or an industrial complex in Dallas that defaulted and thus caused a drain on the bank and if eventually failed, our fund (BIF) would be used to 'clean up the mess.' This in turn causes us to receive a higher premium for our coverage here. Nevertheless, when things in Texas get better—and they will—they will have a 20 story building and an industrial complex to facilitate growth and we won't. The state of Texas ought to love it every time a bank or an S&L fails because no matter how you look at it, they made development loans."

I admit this sounds pretty simple, but it also rings of the truth. There has to be a more equitable approach to this problem of returning the FDIC fund to the desired level of \$1.25 of insurance coverage per \$100 in insured deposits.

I also realize this may sound a little too American but, how about rewarding those who play by the rules and punishing those who don't?

Novel idea, right? How about paying premiums based on capital (i.e., if you have 6% capital, you pay x cents per \$100 in insured deposit. If you have 7% you pay X cents minus Y per \$100 in insured deposits and gradually decrease the scale as your capital increases). The opposite would happen if you had lower capital (i.e. for 5% capital, you would pay X cents plus Y per \$100 in insured deposits and gradually increase the scale as your capital decreases).

We've heard most of the arguments against such a fair system. The "one for all—all for one argument", the "higher premiums will drive them over the edge argument", etc. We believe it is time that our country start making people and institutions "pay for their own sins", so to speak. Congress and America has seen what support pricing and the refusal to "bite the bullet" has done to us. It's called a 3 trillion dollar debt and it's called the S&L crisis. We ask only to be treated fairly. We wish to do our part for America and we will continue to

support our industry in every way possible, but America has to support us as well and that can be done through decreasing regulatory burdens so we can compete more effectively domestically and internationally. It can be done through a fairer disposition of FDIC premium increases and it can be done by changing the examination process from one of confrontation to one of information and assistance.

Mr. Seidman, I will close this letter now. I apologize for the length, but I find this situation to be of great importance to the bankers of my state, as well as myself. If I can be of any assistance to you, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

BALLARD W. CASSADY, JR.,  
Executive Vice President.

## THE LOGIC OF ABORTION

HON. FRED GRANDY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the adoption of the D.C. appropriations conference report.

I, like my colleagues from Illinois, Mr. HYDE, New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, Louisiana, Mr. HOLLOWAY, and across the country do not argue that District of Columbia does not need funds, or that this bill surpass its 302(b) allocation. We rise in opposition due to the language contained in this legislation which would permit abortion on demand in our Nation's Capital. Some argue that we are denying them the right that other States enjoy, this may be true. But the fact is that we can, we have, and I pray we will continue to do so, because as my colleague from Illinois has stated so eloquently, I will choose human life over home rule any day that I can.

Dr. Gregory S. Clapper, a professor at Westmar College in my congressional district, has authored a persuasive article entitled "The Logic of Abortion" which effectively illustrates how abortion is fundamentally the killing of an innocent human being. I submit the contents of this article for the RECORD and wish more of my fellow Members were logical and truthful about this issue:

### THE LOGIC OF ABORTION

(By Dr. Gregory S. Clapper)

It is easy to become defuddled when trying to take an intelligent stand on the questions of the legality and morality of abortion. If one attempts to evaluate the whole range or arguments which are advanced by the advocates of the various positions, one will soon become bogged down in a muddy swamp of appeals to the Bible, legal precedent and the latest medical speculation. What is needed is an understanding of abortion which has clear ramifications for public policy by relying only on criteria which are accessible to all and by requiring no particular religious commitment. In outlining such an understanding, I will focus on whether or not the act of abortion is an act of killing.

Let us first establish that killing is the willful removal of a necessary condition for life. This definition is the result of an analysis of the grammatical behavior of the verb "to kill." When someone has been killed by a bullet or a knife through the heart, for ex-

ample, one has been deprived of a necessary condition for life, namely, the capacity to have blood pumped throughout one's body. When a person had bled to death, the necessary condition for life deprived that person of his or her blood. When a person has been shot in the head, he or she has been deprived of the brain functions necessary for life. This definition holds for all examples of killing.

Abortion is an act which prevents human life from coming into the world as a full-term baby by prematurely terminating the gestation period of that baby. This gestation period is a necessary condition for human life—no gestation period, no life. Therefore, abortion is act of killing.

Looking at abortion in this way releases us from the sophistry (fostered by the Roe v. Wade decision) of trying to determine whether life starts at the first, third, sixth or whatever month of development. We can take as our standard of life a full-term baby, or even a twenty-one-year-old, without contradicting the view that abortion is killing. For the gestation period is a necessary condition for life of a human being of any age.

Now one might wonder, since eggs and sperm by themselves are also necessary conditions of life, is not birth control, then, also killing? The answer is no. Abortion removes a necessary condition from the preexisting causal nexus which, if not interrupted, would have yielded a full-term human being. Pre-conception birth control means choosing not to set the causal nexus in motion. Conceiving a child should be a discretionary action but the time for discretion is before sexual intercourse, not after conception.

It might be said that any argument for abortion-as-killing avoids the "real world" situations that the pro-choice people address. Once we cut through the slogans, we can see the pro-choice version of a moral argument. The say "consider the poor 13-year-old in the ghetto who did not know that sex could make her pregnant, or the 45-year-old woman with three grown children and a recently deceased husband . . . these are the contexts in which the decision for abortion is made."

My only rebuttal is a question: Granted that these situations are tragic, will taking a human life decrease or increase the tragedy? Certainly ethics involves more than logic, but it does not involve less, and we cannot avoid the logical fact that abortion is killing.

It is important to emphasize that I am defining abortion as killing and *not* necessarily as murder. This distinction allows public law to permit abortion in certain specified cases, just as killing is not always judged to be murder and killers are allowed to go unpunished in certain cases (e.g., killing in self-defense). A case might be made, for instance, for a legal abortion when the life of the mother is in danger, for then it is a choice between two lives, and there is no ethical reason always to prefer the younger life in such circumstances.

But exceptions such as the mother's life being imperiled (or where rape was involved) were already included in many state laws before the Supreme Court decision and are moral light-years away from abortion "on demand." Whatever specific exceptions society finally decides upon, it is clear that the decision to kill should be controlled by socially determined criteria as set forth by legislative bodies and *not* be left up to the personal judgment of any particular individual. Seeing abortion as an action of killing is



not to be cold to human concerns, it is simply being clear about what is at stake.

Because the birth control techniques that exist today are less than perfectly effective, sex can lead to pregnancy. Outside of cases of rape, women, then, do have "control over their bodies;" they can choose to engage in sex or abstain. If they engage in sex they should be prepared, *along with their sex partners*, for either parenthood or the act of killing. What this comes down to is that we are responsible for our actions. This has never been a popular message, but it is one that we must hear and act upon if we are to call ourselves moral.

## PRESIDENT BUSH'S VETO OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1990

**HON. WAYNE OWENS**

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 25, 1990*

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, President Bush's veto of the Civil Rights Act of 1990 is a real blow to the working women of America. In fact, this is a slap in the face to the majority of Americans, because women make up 52 percent of our population.

What this administration has said is that, "No, women do not deserve the right to sue for discrimination in hiring or promotion in the workplace." This administration has said, "Women may only receive court orders to stop further sexual harassments or may receive equitable relief in the form of back pay for cases of intentional discrimination, but that is all."

We all know the conditions women in the workplace face. They are often denied jobs they are qualified for or are not promoted beyond a certain level because of preconceived notions about women in the working world. We know in some places they endured sexual harassment. This bill said stop, enough is enough, these inequities will no longer be tolerated.

Here are some things all of us don't know. According to the Economic Policy Institute, four out of five American families would make less today than 10 years ago if they didn't have working mothers. More mothers today are working, they working longer hours and their incomes are increasingly vital to their families. To put at risk this critical segment of working America to discrimination and harassment, without recourse, is an unconscionable act.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a hurtful and wrong decision by the President. The civil rights bill was a carefully crafted piece of legislation enthusiastically endorsed by the large majority of Congress. It was refined over many, many months to address the concerns of the President and still it was vetoed. So now, we search for reasons why.

Over and over we heard the President say this measure would force employers to impose hiring quotas. So the language was altered to specifically mandate that, "The mere existence of a statistical imbalance \* \* \* is not alone sufficient to establish a disparate impact violation." About 30 amendments were adopted to make the bill more palatable to the White House. In the weeks leading up to final

congressional approval, the bill's conferees accepted additional compromise language with the President's veto specifically in mind. In the end, all was in vain.

Indeed, administration officials such as John Sununu and Bordon Grey tried to include language that would allow "community or customer relationships" as a defense of discriminatory hiring or promotion. I find it outrageous that they would even consider that sort of language as viable and I am not alone.

Civil rights leaders have cried foul. This veto is categorically rejected by the majority in Congress and it is possible that this will be the first veto by President Bush that is overridden. Editorial opinion leaders, including Business Week, urged a Presidential signature. Leaders in the business community who softened their opposition quietly said this appeared to be election year politics. Arthur Fletcher, appointed by the President to chair the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, termed the White House language on "customer relationships" as "an absolute outrage." The National Black Republican Civil Rights Task Force expressed dismay.

And Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that we are all hurt by this veto. The President's decision will hurt women and minorities in the job market and in the workplace. Not only will it be more difficult for them to find employment; once there, their protection under the law will have been diminished. This is not the kinder, gentler America we were lead to envision, and for the sake of decency, civility, and fairness in the workplace, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to join me in overriding this veto.

## THE IMPORTANCE OF SCIENCE AND MATH EDUCATION

**HON. DON RITTER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 25, 1990*

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues who earlier rose in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 996, and I congratulate my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers for bringing this package to fruition.

This bill is vitally important, for we are on the verge of losing an entire generation. Not long ago, it was honorable to go into teaching and the scientific and engineering professions. Now our best and brightest young people flock to law and finance. Television reinforces an image of scientists as strange, and gives us role models like the lawyers of L.A. Law and the investment bankers.

Our students' test scores in science and math pale beside those of kids elsewhere. Seventy-nine percent of seventh graders, and well over half of high school juniors, cannot solve a moderately challenging algebra problem. More than half of our students take science courses—if they take them at all—from teachers with inadequate science backgrounds.

There are great opportunities for students to use modern technology. We aren't cultivating our kids' interest in science and mathematics at an early age, and we're losing the kids we

get interested. There's an estimated shortfall of over 50,000 scientists and engineers in the United States by 1996, and over 500,000 by the year 2010.

This has wide-ranging impacts. The cover of this week's Time magazine asks "Can America still compete?" The answer is yes, and the key to our future competitiveness is quality. Quality is a management and work philosophy, based on worker involvement, training, education, teamwork, and recognition.

The quality revolution is already here. Major companies—such as IBM, Xerox, Motorola, and Federal Express—are turning to quality to improve the way they do business. The companies that just won the Malcolm Baldrige Award, our highest award for quality, are real American success stories.

Education is the basic building block of quality. You cannot have satisfied, motivated employees who are not educated and trained for their demanding jobs. This is no secret. In Japan and Germany, students prepare intensively in school for their careers.

We need a new human consciousness in this country. We must encourage our students to study science and engineering, by making it more interesting, and by respecting scientists and engineers more.

This bill provides incentives for students to become teachers in science and mathematics. This new corps of leaders will excite others to follow in their footsteps. The bill funds other scholarship programs, and initiatives to accelerate the spread of science and technology in our schools. Perhaps just as important is a recognition that people such as the late president of Sematech, Bob Noyce, are national treasures. Bob Noyce's memory will continue in the teacher scholarship program, which this bill names after him.

This bill is a momentous step forward. Yet there is still so much to be done. Far too few of our students develop a basic understanding of science, let alone the ability to use advanced technology. This scientific illiteracy is a national scandal. All Americans, even those who won't become scientists or engineers, should understand some core scientific concepts.

The time has come for action, and I am proud to support this bill.

## INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AT A CROSSROADS: GLOBAL PIRACY AND INTERNATIONAL COMPETITIVENESS

**HON. JIM KOLBE**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 25, 1990*

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, as a vice chairman of the congressional competitiveness caucus, I have become increasingly concerned about a growing trade issue, that is the protection of intellectual property rights within our own country, and abroad.

Protection of intellectual property rights is of vital importance to the health and safety of American consumers and the U.S. economy. All Members should recognize the very important threats piracy of U.S. technology poses to

our economy. The competitiveness caucus, along with the Congressional Economic Leadership Institute has been instrumental in educating Members of Congress on this important issue. Recently, the institute sponsored a lunch for Members of Congress to present their most recent report, "Intellectual Property at a Crossroads: Global Piracy and International Competitiveness."

The report provides a good overview of what Congress has done recently in terms of intellectual property rights and what the Congress will face in the near future, especially at the conclusion of the Uruguay round. One phrase in the report sums up the critical nature of this problem—"Infringement of America's trademarks, copyrights and patents is robbing the United States of its birthrights—its innovative spirit." This problem goes beyond legal definitions. It is a serious trade concern which costs the American economy billions of dollars every year.

The report notes that the International Trade Commission estimated that U.S. industries lose up to \$61 billion per year to foreign pirates. If these figures are correct, foreign piracy of American innovations is equivalent to half the U.S. trade deficit.

Every American company—from startup biotechnology concerns to auto parts manufacturers to software giants—has a story to tell about infringement of its intellectual property. This trade problem is enormous. We should no longer view this issue as a matter just for the Judiciary Committee.

If Members have not seen the institute's report, I urge them to get a copy and read it. I would be happy to provide a copy of the report to any Member who would like one.

In addition, I would like to submit for the RECORD, a copy of the statement made at this luncheon by Chris Steffen, the chief financial officer of Honeywell, Inc. His comments go to the heart of this matter. I recommend my colleagues consider Honeywell's experiences and the real bottom-line effect weak intellectual property protection has on U.S. industry.

REMARKS TO CONGRESSIONAL ECONOMIC LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE AND CONGRESSIONAL COMPETITIVENESS CAUCUS BY C.J. STEFFEN

Thank you Representative Schneider. I want to thank you and everyone else here for your interest in protecting America's intellectual property.

Perhaps because of all its legal and technical complexities, intellectual property has not attracted much attention—until recently.

The Congressional Economic Leadership Institute's excellent new study on intellectual property is just one sign of the growing concern about this issue.

At last, we are recognizing that protecting the rights to our innovations is right up there with all the other big global competitive issues.

I know this from first-hand experience. My company, Honeywell, is a high-technology global company. About a third of our \$6.1 billion in sales of control technology comes from international markets. We spend over \$280 million a year in R&D. And we are international market leaders in what we do.

But all that high tech, R&D and marketing savvy are not enough. To remain leaders in the global marketplace, we need standardized international rules for protecting

our rights to our intellectual property, particularly our patents.

Right now those rules do not exist. Because they do not, Honeywell is losing hundreds of millions of dollars every year to those who steal our patent rights. And the Honeywell story is being replayed throughout high-tech corporate America.

The International Trade Commission reports that piracy of U.S. business's intellectual property adds up to between \$43 and \$61 billion dollars a year—or 30 to 50 percent of our trade deficit.

You can help us protect our patent rights and, therefore, keep alive our incentive to invest in high-tech research.

Right now, GATT is conducting negotiations in Geneva. One of the 15 issues under discussion—at America's insistence—is intellectual property. On October 15th, all of GATT's 100 or so member nations will submit their final proposals.

At stake for America in the intellectual property negotiations is our "core competency." Every nation has its industrial strengths. Technical innovation is ours.

If they asked America: What business are you in? We would and should answer: We are in the business of innovation.

And the raw material for that business is R&D. Last year, U.S. industrial R&D totaled about \$65 billion dollars. This year it will probably reach about \$74 billion.

And according to the congressional economic Leadership Institute, about 23 percent of our exports have a high content of intellectual property—versus seven percent in 1950. That reflects the globalization of high-tech.

But the incentive to keep investing money, brains and creativity into high-tech research is being undercut by the disarray of intellectual property laws around the world.

That disarray is manifesting itself in outright theft of patent rights—as well as market-access barriers created by differences in nation's laws governing intellectual property.

For example, Honeywell is now in the home stretch of a lawsuit against the Japanese camera company Minolta for infringement of Honeywell's autofocus technology. Honeywell pioneered and patented the auto focus technology that made the single lens reflect camera practical.

As is pretty standard in high-tech industries, we offered a preview of our autofocus technology to camera manufacturers so they could design prototype cameras. It is clear to us that Minolta engineers used the technology to develop a substitute module, put it in their Maxxum camera and thereby avoided purchasing the Honeywell proprietary product. As a result, Minolta enjoys worldwide camera sales of \$1 billion dollars a year.

For obvious reasons, Honeywell is among the American companies who refuse to be innocents abroad anymore. We own our intellectual property. It is about time we all started to act like owners and aggressively defend our rights. In our case, we wish we did not have to do this, especially since our relationship with the Japanese business community, dating back to 1920, has been very good.

In addition to the piracy, America's technical investment is also being short changed by trade barriers created by differences in intellectual property laws around the world.

One kind of barrier comes from what I call "sins of omission." Many developing countries have no or weak protection for intellectual property.

That, in effect, closes off whole countries to us. Why go in with expensive, gee-whiz technology where it is perfectly legal to copy it?

Another type of trade barrier exists because of vast disparities in the developed nations' patent systems.

For example, in Japan, the patent system is based on the first-to-file versus America's first-to-invent. This means the Japanese system does not require a search of existing proprietary technology in the field; the U.S. system does.

In Japan, 18 months after the patent filing, detailed information about the technology is made public. And that is done even before the Japanese Patent Office decided if it will issue a patent. Therefore, we could lose out on both counts—information about the technology an eventual patent protection. In the U.S., patent information regarding a technology is confidential.

The upshot is: Frequently American companies find they have little practical choice but to license their inventions in Japan rather than manufacturing or selling them themselves. That can significantly limit potential revenue. It can also undercut the incentive to keep investing in R&D.

In addition—and this is important—the shape of intellectual property laws in Japan and other countries—what they cover or do not cover—is also shaping American companies' decisions about what technical research to pursue. As a result, America could wind up losing its leadership position in whole areas of technology where we have plenty of runway left; for instance, bio-engineering, information resources and optoelectronics.

Thus, American business needs the GATT talks to produce a strong intellectual property agreement. A strong agreement must have four components:

One, there have to be common standards for protection of all types of intellectual property—patents, copyrights, trademarks and trade secrets.

Two, there has to be a common international patent system. This may require, of course, some legislative changes in our system.

Three, timely resolution of disputes. This may require initiatives to speed up our own patent and judicial processes.

And, four, and most important, is the enforcement piece—border controls. Infringing goods should be seized at the border. The enforcement part is key because, there, as in most trade sanctions, it can act as a deterrent.

Obviously, and GATT agreement will have to be phased in. During the interim, we need to hold onto whatever protection we are getting from U.S. trade laws.

Those trade laws recognize that international patent infringement is not just a commercial matter; it is a matter that has to be settled between governments.

One especially powerful trade law is the amended Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930. Section 337 allows U.S. companies to seek redress with the ITC if they have made a substantial investment in developing patented technology or have made a significant effort to license it. That means that companies do not have to actually manufacture the product to have standing under U.S. trade law.

Why is this important, R&D can take many paths and not all of them have to go the whole nine yards to actual product development. In itself, the technology can become the tradeable commodity. Section



337 addresses this growing trend in America's high-tech sector.

Under Section 337, a company can petition the ITC to review a suspected patent infringement. A ruling is made in 12 to 14 months—versus the years involved in going through the U.S. courts. If infringement is proved by the ITC, the product will not be imported to the U.S.

During the horse-trading at GATT, it is imperative that 337 not be traded away. Right now, the ability to stop infringing goods at our border is the best thing we have not only to halt the piracy but also to give other nations the message: "Hey, guys, don't even think about it!"

When GATT comes up with an agreement, you in the Congress have to pass legislation implementing it. If that agreement does not offer strong protection for intellectual property, then forget about it. A bad agreement is worse than no agreement. And that is because, with any agreement, there will be pressure for us to give up Section 337.

At GATT, the stakes for America's high-tech sector are high. And so are the opportunities. For instance, trade in goods and services with high intellectual-property content will continue to soar. That will ease protectionist pressures to reduce imports and allow us to go on the offensive to boost our exports.

The business of America and of Honeywell is innovation. To be in that business, our country spends \$130 billion dollars a year in higher education. And we invest \$140 billion dollars a year in government and industrial R&D.

Depending on what happens at the GATT, the innovation business will get better or get worse. With your help, it can get a whole lot better.

We at Honeywell ask you to communicate once again to the administration what we need to protect our intellectual property, as well as the urgency of this issue. This may well be our last chance in this century to get a global agreement in this critical area for America.

#### WHO WILL PAY FOR THE BIG ONE?

#### HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, October 17, marked the first anniversary of the Loma Prieta earthquake, which devastated the San Francisco Bay area. The likelihood of a massive earthquake in a number of States is a real concern to seismic experts, engineers, and policymakers. The recent activity along the New Madrid Fault is a grim reminder that earthquakes are not a California-only problem. Overall, 39 States are at risk of potentially serious earthquakes in the future.

The following article from today's New York Times makes a compelling case for creating a Federal earthquake insurance program to mitigate the personal, physical, and economic consequences of future catastrophic earthquakes. Equally important, a Federal earthquake insurance program would preclude, with Government assistance, what most everyone acknowledges to be a massive contingent li-

ability that will result from future catastrophic earthquakes.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 24, 1990]

(By Peter Passell)

#### WHO WILL PAY FOR THE BIG ONE?

The earthquake that slammed through the San Francisco Bay area in October 1989 killed 62 people and destroyed \$5 billion worth of property. The next time the earth's giant tectonic plates slip a few yards, both people and property may be at far greater risk.

By Government estimates, a quake hitting the wrong place at the wrong time of day could kill up to 95,000 and leave a \$100 billion cleanup bill. Los Angeles and San Francisco are prime targets, of course. But the peril is hardly confined to California; the Federal Emergency Management Agency believes that Seattle, Salt Lake City, Memphis and Charleston, S.C., are also at "major" risk.

If the Big One hits—make that "when" it hits—who will pay? Even in California, relatively few property owners are covered by earthquake insurance. But Robert E. Litan, an economist at the Brookings Institution, estimates that damage from quake-related fires and injuries could still result in up to \$50 billion in insurance claims. Honoring these claims, he argues, could severely deplete insurers' reserves, driving some into bankruptcy and turning others into risk-taking zombies.

Mr. Litan's preferred fix, described in the latest edition of *The Brookings Review*: mandatory Federal earthquake insurance, with premiums set to cover actuarial risks.

Just one California property owner in four carries earthquake insurance; nationwide, the figure is below one in 20. If such insurance is available and most people choose not to buy it, why should the Government insist?

One reason, Mr. Litan suggests, is that the private market overprices the product. Only those at greatest risk currently buy coverage, and insurers are apparently unwilling or unable to attract lower-risk customers with lower premiums.

Another reason is that owners have insufficient incentives to pay for insurance because the Federal Government stands ready to reimburse them for a portion of their losses. American taxpayers, Mr. Litan reckons, shelled out \$17 each for disaster relief in last year's San Francisco quake.

Uncle Sam could play hardball, giving legal notice that in the future the Treasury would help only those who help themselves. But the threat would probably not be credible; Americans are no more likely to deny relief to uninsured victims of an earthquake than they are to deny medical care to injured motorcyclists who did not wear helmets.

A third and perhaps most compelling reason is that casualty insurers are poorly geared to bear the earthquake risks already on their books. A not unlikely \$50 billion hit, Mr. Litan calculates, would drain the industry of about 40 percent of total reserves. Some insurers would go bankrupt; others would be forced to raise rates sharply to meet regulatory requirements.

The process might be manageable in theory, but would certainly be problematic in practice. Mr. Litan, a longtime analyst of the savings and loan debacle, worries that earthquake losses would be injurious to the casualty insurers' financial health, much the way the interest rate squeeze of the

early 1980's started savings and loan associations down the path to collective ruin.

When faced with the alternative of double-digit premium increases, he believes, vote-conscious regulators might allow insurance companies to operate with low (or negative) net worths. And once insurers were deep in a financial hole, they would have powerful incentives to generate premium revenues by taking ever greater chances.

Mr. Litan favors legislation that would effectively require anyone who wanted a home mortgage to buy Federal earthquake coverage. The bill, sponsored by Representative Al Swift, a Washington Democrat, and David Dreier, a California Republican, would set premiums according to actuarial risk. Buildings designed or modified to minimize quake damage would get a break on rates.

The average premium in California for a no-deductible policy, Mr. Litan believes, would run between \$104 and \$194. In Memphis and Charleston, the same coverage would run from \$15 to \$28.

Federal earthquake insurance would still leave private insurers with enormous exposure to quake-related claims for fire, disability and death losses. The Swift-Dreier bill would cover the gap with Federal reinsurance, giving private insurers years to spread the costs across their premium base.

Federal involvement is no panacea. If Washington's record in insuring farm crops is a precedent, setting premiums at actuarially sound levels would prove very difficult. But one way or another, Mr. Litan argues, Washington to going to bear a lot of the cost of the Big One. Any step that forces property owners to protect themselves is probably a step in the right direction.

#### IN REMEMBRANCE OF EDWARD J. ALLEN—LAW OFFICER, POET, AND PRO-LIFE ACTIVIST

#### HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1990, a heroic man, Edward J. Allen, died. He lived a long, productive and giving life.

Edward Joseph Allen was born November 13, 1907, in Erie, PA. He grew up in that southwestern Pennsylvania city and, on May 26, 1937, he married his hometown sweetheart, Dorothy Mae Davenport. They were blessed with two children and six grandchildren. Ed began his career as a patrolman in Erie and later worked with the FBI during World War II to assist Federal agents on investigations concerning sabotage, espionage, and subversion. After the war, he attended the FBI National Academy and in 1948 became police chief of Youngstown, OH.

In Youngstown, Eddie teamed with a reform-minded mayor to drive the Mafia influence from that city. His efforts won him national recognition and Youngstown the "All-American City" Award in 1950. Later, in 1963, he published a book, "The Merchants of Menace," which analyzed Mafia activity in the United States.

He went on to become chief of Ohio's Department of Liquor Control and in 1955 was

selected from a nationwide field of candidates as chief of the Santa Ana Police Department. He served with distinction in this position until August, 1972 when at 65 he was forced into mandatory retirement. The chief was known as a competent, hard-nosed dedicated police officer. He was a critic of a lax judicial system and an advocate of local control and appropriate punishment. Over the years, Eddie was able to blend the old police traditions with new police methods. In doing so he never abandoned the tough, bedrock principles that have characterized his personal and professional life.

He was active in the church. He served as a lector at St. Joseph's Catholic Church in Santa Ana and also established a "jail ministry." Twice each week Eddie, along with a parish priest, headed to the local jail to spread the word. He was past-vice president of the Holy Name Society for the diocese of Los Angeles. And, from 1985 until his death, he served as a member of my congressional advisory board on religious affairs.

Edward J. Allen was also a hero within the Orange County pro-life movement. Long before the courageous men and women of Operation Rescue began to receive recognition for their work, Ed stood on the front lines. While peacefully picketing an abortion mill, run by the infamous Dr. Allred, he was arrested for trespassing when he entered the office in an attempt to get an appointment with the clinic manager. He refused to plea bargain and spent time in jail—reflecting and praying. He wrote many poems during his life-time, but his poetry of his later days reflects his dedication and devotion to the antiabortion movement.

Mr. Speaker, Eddie Allen was truly a man worthy of emulation. He was an exemplary civil servant, a loving husband and father, a protector of the innocent preborn children and a humble servant of the Lord. I would like to share with you several of the poems, Mr. Allen wrote and urge you to ponder the words and the meaning they have for all of us:

#### THE UNHEARD VOICE

Mute and silent, lost and alone,  
I walk amid the throng, unknown,  
My world is hushed and calm and still,  
Could I communicate at will  
Your world would know a boundless heart  
With all the love it could impart. . .  
Withal, I needs must try and try  
With yearning hands, appealing eyes,  
To halt the crowd and make it hear  
The voice that purls within my ear,  
It speaks a silence I would shout  
To drive the raucous turmoil out. . .  
Your world is deaf much more than I,  
It does not hear my muted cry,  
It does not hear the voice I hear  
Whispering in my inner ear  
As silently His path I trod:  
"Be still, and know that I am God!"

EDWARD J. ALLEN.

#### GAOL-HOUSE SOLILOQUY

(To All Imprisoned Pro-Life Activists)

My Wash-Bowl, my Bunk-Bed, my Toilet,  
and I,  
This elegant trio, as time passes by  
Are compeer companions who silently stars  
As Breakfast and Lunchtime and Dinner  
we share:  
I can't do without them, I need them, all  
three,

But they'd get along (better still) without  
me!  
For "they also serve who just stand and  
wait"  
For my brothers and sisters who share my  
own fate:  
Us Prisoners All, in His service agree,  
As Wash-Bowl and Toilet and Bunk-Bed  
serve me!

My wan, watchful walls, my ceiling, my  
floor,  
All likewise commune behind our locked  
door,  
Content and serene, they shall stoically stay,  
'Til one day, like me, they shall wither  
away,  
Back to the dust of the earth whence we  
came  
'Til the Trumpet shall sound, and He calls  
us by name!

Thus oftly I muss as I sit here alone:  
They all serve their purpose, but what of  
my own?  
Have I served as well as my cell has served  
me?

—Ah no, trio mio, 'tis grave Mystery:  
Thou hast never sinned against Him Who  
made thee,  
While all of us "humans" have sinned  
grievously!

Thou art void of Reason, yet servants of  
Love,  
Hence servants of Life, your Creator  
Above!

While "intelligent" women and men on His  
earth,  
Are denying His children the Right to  
their birth!

Dear God of our Fathers, howe'er could this  
be?

That "Courts" would consort with the  
powers-that-be

In the dark nether-world, with such devilry  
That they savage the wombs of Thy chil-  
dren-to-be?!

For O, my companions, locked in here with  
me,  
These "least" of His Image would serve  
Him like thee,

E'en though void of Reason until they  
mature

To know Good from Evil, for Ay to endure  
By making the "choice" of serving God's  
Will,

As thou hast served mine, my needs to ful-  
fill:

Stalwartly! True!—and Obediently,  
My lowly and loyal and lorn trinity!

My Wash-Bowl, my Toilet, my Bunk-Bed,—  
and I?

Still loyal to Life and to Love 'til I die  
But to live in "the nurseries of Heaven on  
High!"<sup>1</sup>

(I was born on the day Francis died: No-  
vember 13, 1907)

Man is the creature of God's Holy Breath:  
It ill becomes Justice to give birth to Death;

#### ABORTING JUSTICE

The lawyers<sup>1</sup> and the judges play their  
game:

Just how you "phrase" the question, that's  
the thing!

To block the Truth both sides go laboring to  
quash the truth in toto, hence defame

The Name of Justice, and in winnowing  
The blinging chaff of "legalese" they bring

\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>1</sup> Francis Thompson: "My song I do but hold for  
you in trust, I ask you to but blossom from my  
dust: . . . Pass the crystalline sea, the Lampads  
seven: Look for me in the nurseries of Heaven!"  
<sup>1</sup> Luke 11:46/53.

The sacred oath they take to utter shame!  
With Life or Death of Innocents at stake,  
The Right to Life is our Creator's Cause!  
Where lies the guilt when courts of "Jus-  
tice" make A mockery of His Immortal  
Laws?  
If not in Truth, then courts of Justice lie,  
Whence "nothing but The Truth" they cru-  
cify!

EDWARD J. ALLEN.

#### TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

(It's subsidiaries and the American Medical  
Association and Dr. Allred)

O ye, who spurn thy Maker's Sovereign  
Will,

To intercourse with Satan's Sinful Seed,  
Begetting in thy dark of mind his Creed:

His salivating lust of flesh to fill:  
That male and female have the right to kill

The images of God, in word and deed,  
The Hinnon Valley's fetid flames to feed

The maw of Moloch: Mod Abortion Mill!  
Ah, knowest not whose life thou dost abort?

Fall on thy knees, thy Maker to implore!  
It is thine own that you are cutting short!

Confess thy Sins, then rise, and sin no more!  
Attempts to save God's littles one's a

crime?  
Thou dost give birth to Evil in our time!<sup>1</sup>

EDWARD J. ALLEN.

From Orange County Jail, 7-23-1986.

#### PANAMANIAN RESISTANCE TO FINANCIAL CRIMES MUTUAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE TREATY MUST BE ADDRESSED

#### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I have an abiding interest in Panama in the area of drug trafficking and money laundering. Therefore, I am deeply concerned about recent Panamanian resistance to efforts aimed at cleaning up their banking system, which served as a drug and money-laundering center for years under General Noriega.

A Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty [MLAT], initiated by Panamanian and U.S. officials in August, was designed to give our officials greater access to evidence and information from Panamanian banks. The pact, which is subject to approval by the Panamanian National Assembly, has met opposition from officials in the Government and banking industries. Panamanian businessmen fear that the agreement would ruin the country's lucrative position as a tax haven and dollar-based financial center, while Government officials see it as a violation of their national sovereignty.

However, as American diplomats and law-enforcement officials have repeatedly noted, similar agreements between the United States and thriving banking nations such as Switzerland, the Bahamas, and the Cayman Islands already exist.

I am aware that there has been progress in the area of interdiction and confiscation of narcotics passing through Panama. However,

<sup>1</sup> Ezekiel 3:17/23 (The Prophet as Watchman).



the overall problem of narcotics trafficking and money laundering persist. I am disturbed, for example, by a recent report by the Department of State which suggests that narcotics trafficking activities have continued unabated in outlying areas of Panama, and that money laundering activities are also continuing, despite Government efforts to tighten restrictions. This same State Department report indicates that these failures are at least partly attributable to weaknesses in the Panamanian Governments drug fighting apparatus, which is, understandably, still in the process of rebuilding and reorganization. There may also be breakdowns in necessary cooperation between the relevant Panamanian and American agencies involved in the fight against drugs.

I am also concerned that objection to the MLAT to combat money laundering is a result of political infighting among Government officials and conceivably by those in Panama who are involved in money-laundering or other illegal financial practices. The opposition to the measure is strong. If submitted for formal legislative approval, it is understood this agreement would be defeated. However, reaching an agreement on this treaty that covers money-laundering and other financial crimes is critical to United States-Panamanian cooperation on narcotics control.

At this point, I would insert in the RECORD an article that appeared in the New York Times on October 22, 1990, that discussed Panamanian resistance to the financial crimes MLAT:

[From the New York Times Oct. 22, 1990]

**PANAMA RESISTING MOVE TO CLEAN UP BANKING SYSTEM**

(By Mark A. Uhlig)

PANAMA, October 21.—American officials are encountering unusually stiff opposition from Panamanian Government aides and businessmen in efforts to crack the shell of secrecy, and presumed illegality, surrounding Panama's multibillion dollar international banking trade.

When United States troops invaded Panama 10 months ago and deposed the leadership of Gen. Manuel Antonio Noriega, American officials felt that they would get cooperation and information on banking activity, including illegal money-laundering, much of it related to drug trafficking.

But while most Panamanians welcomed American help in ousting General Noriega, efforts to forge closer cooperation between the two countries in fighting money-laundering and other financial crimes are being opposed.

**PRELIMINARY ACCORD DENOUNCED**

A preliminary American-drafted Mutual Legal Assistance Agreement intended to give United States officials greater access to evidence and information for Panamanian bank accounts was initiated by the two Governments in August.

But the agreement, which must be approved by the Panamanian National Assembly to take effect, has since become the subject of a bitter national debate here, provoking public denunciations from Government officials who say that it would violate Panama's national sovereignty, and from businessmen, who say it would ruin the country's lucrative position as a tax haven and dollar-based financial center.

"One of the main problems of the agreement is that it would end our ability to have deposits, from the United States or any

other country, based on a secret agreement with the bank," said Guillermo Fernández Quijano, vice president of the Panamanian Chamber of Commerce. "We are against illegal activity anywhere in the world, but we have to be reasonable about our banking system."

American diplomats and law-enforcement officials have repeatedly discounted those objections, noting that similar agreements already exist between the United States and thriving banking nations like Switzerland, the Bahamas and the Cayman Islands.

They say that the pact is a minimal step toward restoring the integrity of Panama's banking center after years as a drug and money-laundering center under General Noriega. And they note that Panamanian bank deposits have rebounded by as much as \$2 billion this year, to a total of about \$14 billion, despite uncertainties over the new accord.

But the outcry, led in part by Foreign Minister Julio Linares, has forced the Government of President Guillermo Endara to repudiate the preliminary agreement, and American officials now acknowledge that the agreement would probably be rejected if submitted for formal legislative approval.

"There is a misunderstanding of what this is all about, and a vastly exaggerated reaction about what its effects might be," the United States Ambassador to Panama, Deane R. Hinton, said.

"Politically, it makes it difficult," Mr. Hinton said in an interview at his residence overlooking Panama City. "We want an agreement that will work, and an agreement that won't be ratified won't work."

**PATTERN OF CONNECTIONS**

Tensions have been heightened on the Panamanian side by provisions that make progress on the legal assistance agreement a condition for \$84 million of the \$420 million in United States aid to Panama that was approved by Congress this year. That linkage has inflamed nationalist sentiment, creating what many Panamanians describe as an American-imposed choice between the aid and the prospect of long-term damage to the banking industry.

Panamanian businessmen and some officials also denounce what they say are American attempts to extend the agreement beyond money-laundering to "fiscal crimes" like tax evasion, which many concede is a central motivation for foreign depositors who place their money here.

"If the proposed accord was limited to drug-trafficking and money-laundering it would have been signed a long time ago," Mr. Linares said in a speech this month.

But diplomats and American officials say that the proposed accord, which has not been made public, would cover tax-evasion cases only at the discretion of Panamanian authorities. And they express concern that nationalist objections to the agreement have been spurred by political infighting among Government officials and by Panamanians with vested interests in money-laundering or other illegal financial practices.

"You look at all this and there seems to be a pattern of connections," Mr. Hinton said, referring to banks that have taken the lead in opposing the new accord. "You have to ask yourself: Are they trying to protect criminal activities even though they are not criminals?"

**BANKERS LOBBY AGAINST BILL**

For Panamanians, any stigma associated with publicly opposing the pact, and there-

by appearing to support money-laundering or other crimes, has been largely diluted by the nationalist sentiment. And bankers have lined up to lobby with President Endara against the bill.

But against the weight of American aid restrictions and diplomatic pressure, officials on both sides say that the dispute cannot remain stalemated indefinitely. And even Panamanian experts say that the final issue will not be whether the banking industry chooses to accept some degree of outside scrutiny, but how and under what terms.

"Panama will outgrow the money-laundering problem and remain an important center of international banking operations," predicted Nicolás Barletta, an economist and former Panamanian President who was instrumental in creating the country's liberal banking legislation in 1970. "It is in the national interest to Panama to get rid of money-laundering and to fight it with all we've got."

**UNLEASH PAPERWORK WATCHDOG**

**HON. CLYDE C. HOLLOWAY**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. HOLLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, with Congress passing new legislation and Federal agencies promulgating sweeping new regulations at a dizzying pace, control over Federal paperwork burdens has never been as important. In 1988 alone, small owners spent nearly 1 billion hours filling out Federal forms at a cost of over \$100 billion—SBA survey. Now is not the time to back off from the Federal Paperwork Reduction Act and to allow the Government's paperwork watchdog to remain unauthorized. The House began that process a few nights ago and a superior Senate bill should be working its way back to this Chamber before we recess. Let's move ahead and ensure that small business owners are not overburdened by Federal paperwork requirements. I am submitting a column by John Sloan, president and CEO of the NFIB, which explains many of the problems facing small businesses in the area of Federal paperwork:

[From the Small Business Angle]

**UNLEASH PAPERWORK WATCHDOG**

(By John Sloan)

Washington specializes in making nasty, boring or tedious jobs sound more pleasant than they are. Take for example "information requests." To the rest of the country, they are called government forms, usually completed by business owners wearing sour expressions.

It's the rare person who enjoys filling out forms. The groans heard around tax time are as loud about completing the 1040s and schedules A and B as much as for shelling out money to Uncle Sam. (The Treasury Department, the parent of the IRS, imposes three times the paperwork burden of any other federal agency.)

The Office of Management and Budget estimates that collecting, reporting and maintaining files for all federal information requests to be completed in 1989 would keep 850,000 paper pushers employed full time—1.7 billion work hours.

Small-business owners put in nearly a billion of those hours, according to the Small Business Administration. In addition to completing the lion's share of federal requests, these forms and regulations are far more costly to small firms than to their large competitors. Small-business owners, on a per-employee basis, pay triple the amount large firms do to complete federal paperwork.

In 1980, Congress addressed this burden by passing the Paperwork Reduction Act. The act set up a watchdog office within the executive budget office to sniff out unnecessary and redundant rules and forms. The watchdog, called the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, estimates that paperwork has been reduced by 500 million hours since 1981, translating into a saving of \$10 billion a year.

Both critics and supporters of the office question those estimates. Members of the National Federation of Independent Business see federal paperwork increasing at an alarming rate. The sensible policy response would be to provide small business with a more powerful paperwork watchdog.

But Congress, instead of giving the information office more teeth, has left it in limbo. Lawmakers did not act before the statutory deadline of Sept. 30 to keep the office officially funded.

The funds were allowed to expire because some consumer and labor groups believe the watchdog vetoed some forms for political reasons. The groups launched a campaign to eliminate the office, gutting the paperwork reduction law.

In evaluating forms and rules, the office checked for unnecessary and redundant demands and applied a "practical utility" test. Practical utility is Washington jargon for using all information collected.

The critics said they wanted to know why forms were rejected. That's reasonable. The law could have been changed to accommodate this request rather than killing the whole paper work-reduction program.

Small-business owners need a scrappy junkyard dog to make a real dent in federal forms, but a paperwork Poodle is better than no watchdog at all. If consumer and labor groups had to wade through the mountain of repetitive paperwork that small-business owners do, they'd soon be howling too.

## THE ABSENCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN IRAN

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, as the United Nation's second investigating team, headed by Mr. Rynaldo Galindo Pohl gets ready to publish its second report on human rights violations in Iran, I hope this second report will not be a repeat of the earlier pohlwash.

Mr. Pohl's earlier report to the Secretary General maintained that there has been no public executions in Iran for a period of five months, when all he had to do was to read current official Iranian newspapers which boast of public beheadings and hangings. A cursory look at some of the regime's press shows at least 382 individuals who were hanged or beheaded publicly. Just in the 6-week period starting the beginning of Septem-

ber and ending the middle of October, 175 public executions were officially reported in the State-controlled press.

It is widely believed though, that Khomeini's heirs in Tehran had executed hundreds of political prisoners publicly as "drug dealers". Reports from Iran confirm this fact as one of the regime's latest victims reportedly shouted moments before his public execution, "I am a political prisoner and a Mojahedin sympathizer."

It would be very unfortunate, indeed, if the UN would accept a repeat of the earlier report, thereby calling into question its own credibility as the world's body for resolving international problems according to international law and universal principles.

At this time I would like to share with Members of this distinguished body, statements made by officials of the Rafsanjani regime which provide further evidence of the Iranian Government's endorsement of public executions:

### STATEMENTS BY OFFICIALS OF THE IRANIAN GOVERNMENT

Moghtadiah, Head of the Supreme Court, Tehran Radio, May 27, 1990: "We must cut off thieves' hands, i.e., the four fingers must be amputated from the right hand at the joints, and the thumb and palm remain intact \* \* \* Because the act of thievery is committed with the right hand \* \* \* And this will expose and humiliate the thief as long as he lives."

Moghtadiah, Head of the Supreme Court, Tehran Radio, Dec. 31, 1989:

"We were discussing the abominable and shameful act of sodomy. Both sides involved in this act are sentenced to death. But the religious judge is given 5 different options as to the way in which the death sentence is carried out:

"1. Beheading by sword.

"2. Stoning.

"3. Throw them down from a height, such as a cliff or from the top floor of a tall building.

"4. Bring down a wall on top of them such that they are killed under the debris.

"5. Burn them alive.

"It is even permitted that any one of these punishments is carried out in conjunction with burning. That is, first behead or throw down or stone to death or kill under the debris and then burn the corpses."

Assadollah Badamchian, Political Deputy for the Supreme Court, Ressalat, June 25, 1990: "When a killer is executed or stoned before a large crowd, it creates fear among the people and prevents them from committing murder. For this reason, the religious law has recommended public executions in certain cases."

## GROWTH OF WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESSES

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Small Business, I held a series of hearings in 1988 on the rise of women entrepreneurs in the American economy and on the obstacles to growth which their businesses face. As a result of those hearings, I introduced the Women's Business

Ownership Act which—2 years ago today—was signed into law by the President.

I am pleased to report that the key provisions of that law have been successfully implemented in the intervening 2 years. Briefly, they include the creation of a national women's business council, the establishment of a pilot program for training women entrepreneurs, the institution of a small loan program in which the Small Business Administration guarantees loans up to \$50,000, and the revision of the Equal Credit Protection Act to increase protections for commercial borrowers.

My awareness of the important role women business owners play in the economy was heightened during preparations for the 1988 hearings, by the testimony I heard from witnesses, and the many meetings I had with women entrepreneurs and other experts while drafting the Women's Business Ownership Act. I would suggest, however, that in the country at large the impact and significance of women entrepreneurs as a group have been largely underestimated.

I hope that this will change with the publication of a report released this month by the Bureau of the Census entitled "Women Business Owners." Based on figures from the 1987 economic census, this survey documents that women-owned businesses are a vital sector of the American economy: They grew in number four times faster than all businesses during the period of 1982-87.

Other highlights of this survey are well worth reporting here. They include: Between 1982 and 1987, the number of women-owned firms increased 57 percent; between 1982 and 1987, the number of women-owned firms with paid employees nearly doubled; women are showing significant gains in nontraditional sectors such as manufacturing and construction; and women own 30 percent of all U.S. companies.

If there is strength in numbers, the trends for women entrepreneurs as reported by the Census Bureau are clearly encouraging. Indeed, to underscore the progress, I would like to point out that, prior to the 1970's, women owned less than 5 percent of the Nation's businesses. Nonetheless, there remains work to be done. For example, the Bureau's findings show that only 15 percent of women-owned firms had paid employees.

Mr. Speaker, the national women's business council is scheduled to issue its annual report to the Congress at the end of the year suggesting goals and initiatives which it deems necessary to remedy the real—but often subtle—barriers that still block women entrepreneurs from full participation in the economic mainstream. I look forward to analyzing the council's recommendations and taking appropriate legislative actions in the next Congress to effect public policies which will capitalize on this dynamic sector of the economy. We can afford to do no less.



# GEORGE BUSH VETOES THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1990

## HON. KWEISI MFUME

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, last night President George Bush vetoed the Civil Rights Act of 1990. From this day forward, I think that it should be known that the President, not Congress, failed the American people and killed this bill. George Bush now joins Andrew Jackson and Ronald Reagan as the only Presidents to veto important civil rights legislation.

The Civil Rights Act of 1990 was introduced at the outset of the second session of the 101st Congress. President Bush and his advisers had almost a full year to submit their proposed amendments and recommendations to this bill since it was he who had problems with the bill. Instead, all we received was hollow rhetoric about how this bill would force employers to impose employment quotas and that this is a bad bill.

Mr. Speaker, the President's latest veto is a shallow attempt to make Congress look like the culprits on this issue. I have said all along that President Bush had no intention of passing a civil rights bill. The proposal he offered Congress this week is the son of the rejected Michel-Kassebaum alternative.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush's proposal missed the mark about what the Civil Rights Act of 1990 aimed to do. The President's proposal does not overrule the primary provisions of the damaging Wards Cove decision and effectively overrules the Griggs decision and every other Supreme Court ruling striking down job bias and discriminatory employment effects.

It is unclear who the President was defending regarding his position on this bill. His popularity with many segments of the voting public is very high. Nonetheless, many persons who support the President and would benefit from this bill are now out in the cold.

Mr. Speaker, I feel bad that women, Jews, African-Americans, Catholics and others may not be able to challenge discriminatory practices and even weaken Supreme Court decisions authorizing voluntary affirmative action agreements between employers and workers. All this from a President who received a 65-percent approval rating from the African-American community nationwide a few months ago.

I hope that the American people understand what is happening to basic employment rights in this country. It appalls me to the bone that the President would posture for 10 months on this important legislation while thousands of Americans may never receive equal treatment or justice under the law.

Mr. Speaker, no wonder President Bush's standing in the polls and before the American people is declining. It appears that those characteristics that people feared during the campaign of 1988 have begun to rear its ugly head.

# TRIBUTE TO GOV. ROSE MOFFORD

## HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in this, the longest sitting of Congress since World War II, I have come to the realization that almost everything has been said, but not every one has said it. I would like to add a shout salute to a modest, dedicated public servant who is retiring from her service to the State of Arizona. At the end of her current term, Gov. Rose Mofford will conclude nearly 50 years of public service.

I have often joked with Rose that our backgrounds were too similar to ignore. She was born in the small town of Globe, near my hometown of St. Johns in the same year as I, and made a career of public service. I flatter myself with the comparison.

Rose Mofford has held almost every position in State government. She was appointed secretary of State in 1977 and was elected to the post in 1978 and again in 1982. In 1988, the State of Arizona called Rose to provide her leadership and the Mofford touch to its highest office.

Rose Mofford arrived in the Governor's office at a critical time in Arizona's history. Her predecessor, upon his impeachment, had so dismantled the public's confidence in State government, it appeared irreparable. However, as with many of her previous challenges, Rose accepted this one without hesitation. She brought to the office grace, charm, ability, and dedication, qualities that endeared her to all Arizonans.

It would have been easy for Gov. Rose Mofford to assume the role of caretaker and avoid the difficult decisions demanded of a Governor. That is not Rose Mofford's style. Without the benefit of the honeymoon afforded other Governors, Rose handled a contentious legislature with the deft ability of a veteran. She lobbied for and secured funding for prenatal care, teen pregnancy prevention, and education. While commonplace in other States, in Arizona, Governor Mofford was charting new waters.

Rose Mofford has never shied away from the challenge that was thrust upon her. She was, I believe, underestimated by her opponents to their disadvantage. Had they bothered to ask by opinion, I would have given them some simply advice, "Do not take her for granted."

My most sincere gratitude goes to Rose Mofford for bringing my home State through a crisis which jeopardized its status in the 1990's. However, under Rose Mofford's stewardship the State continues to grow, is providing for its disadvantaged citizens, attracts industries looking to expand or relocate and maintains a high standard of living for its residents. Phoenix will be the site of the Super Bowl in 1993 and major league baseball may be on its way. Once again, Arizonans can remark proudly that the Grand Canyon State is second to none.

For all this we thank Gov. Rose Mofford.

# AMERICAN TEXTILE INDUSTRY BICENTENNIAL WEEK

## HON. MARILYN LLOYD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the congressional textile caucus and the principal sponsor of House Joint Resolution 518, I am extremely pleased at the passage of this legislation on October 16, 1990.

As you know, 1990 is the 200th anniversary of the founding of the domestic textile industry. This bicentennial celebration is an important event, and it is fitting to commemorate this occasion by designating the week of October 13 through 20 as "American Textile Industry Bicentennial Week."

Back in 1790, when Samuel Slater began the successful production of cotton yarn in Pawtucket, RI, he had no idea that he would be providing the spark for the American industrial revolution. From these humble beginnings, the industry would ultimately grow to over 2 million workers employed in all 50 States.

Further, by paving the way for the successful establishment of an industry which has been a leader in America for 200 years, Samuel Slater and the Slater Mill deserve the recognition and thanks of this Nation.

Where would we be without the American textile industry?

Without its \$50 billion annual contribution to our economy?

Without the 10,000 different items the industry provides to our Armed Forces, including the camouflage and chemical protective gear needed by our service men and women in Operation Desert Shield?

Without an efficient American industry which employs over 2 million workers, most of whom are women and minorities, and which shows it cares about its employees by being ranked first in safety by the National Safety Council 3 of the last 4 years?

Very simply, Mr. Speaker, our American textile industry has made this a better country, and passing this resolution is a fitting way to commemorate its bicentennial and to show our gratitude for the textile industry's contributions to our history and to our everyday lives.

I thank each of my colleagues who cosponsored House Joint Resolution 518, but I would like to especially commend my colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTELY], in whose district the Slater Mill was established two centuries ago. The gentleman from Rhode Island was the original cosponsor and I certainly appreciate his hard work to secure the support of a majority of the House for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the passage of this resolution and want to extend my personal best wishes to all those employed in America's first basic industry for a happy American Textile Industry Bicentennial Week.

## SCOUTING FOR FOOD

## HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues the Scouting for Food Drive of the Boy Scouts of America. As chairman of the Select Committee on Hunger, I would like to commend the Scouts for their dedication to helping to reduce hunger and to meet the needs of this Nation's poor.

In most places, Scouting for Food will be held the week of November 10, 1990. In the Dayton, OH, area, which I represent, the drive will be conducted in February which coincides with Scouting Anniversary Month. I consider it a great privilege to be named honorary chairman of this year's drive in Dayton.

Last year in Dayton, we collected 1 million cans totaling more than 60,000 pounds. Nationwide, during 1988 and 1989, Scouts collected 132 million cans of food. I am hoping to surpass the record this year.

Hunger is a severe problem here in this country. An estimated 20 million Americans, including 4 million children, go hungry at some time every month. Between 1983 and 1985, the average number of households requiring emergency food increased almost 40 percent. About 70 percent of these families had children to feed.

During Scouting for Food, local Boy Scout councils will ask for donations of nonperishable items with nutritional value such as peanut butter, baby formula, packaged meals, and pasta; and canned foods like tuna, chunky soups, meats, fruits, vegetables, and stews. The Scouts will organize the collection and arrange with local agencies to warehouse and distribute the food to the needy.

Scouting for Food is more than collecting food for the needy. The Boy Scouts see the program as a way to get more people involved with helping the poor. Only through strong public commitment can we eliminate the problems of hunger.

Doing the good turn has always been a cornerstone of Scouting's citizenship and character-building efforts. By helping the hungry people of this country, the Scouts are truly doing a good turn.

## HORROR STORIES FROM THE AMERICAN HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

## HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention excerpts from letters which have come to me from all over the country about the terrible injustices being perpetrated by the health care system in this country. These letters expose the injustices of the health care system, and reveal a sense of hopelessness and frustration among those Americans who have been its victims. The let-

ters I share with you transcend class distinctions. They give voice to the middle-American who is caught in a system which is failing them, just as it fails the poor and disadvantaged.

A couple from Burke, VA, wrote about how their company's insurance policy excluded from due to preexisting conditions from which they both suffered. They also pointed out that in effect, Americans are almost slaves to the system of medical insurance currently in use. American workers are dependent on company provided insurance, are often underinsured, and are at the mercy of the stability of the company. Clearly, this couple recognizes that this is not a position to be in, and they explored there has to be a better way.

A man from Streamwood, IL, wrote that after having been laid off due to a corporate merger, he was unable to retain medical insurance from his new employer because of a preexisting condition. The man was shocked and dismayed at this calloused approach to the well-being of responsible and productive members of society. He claims that America's health care system is based on the survival of the healthiest.

A woman living in Alaska wrote to express her dismay at having been caught in a system which has failed her. When the woman was a full-time college student in California she was diagnosed with cancer. She carried student insurance at the time and believed that she was adequately insured. She did not anticipate a serious illness with such staggering medical expenses. "I discovered too late the limitations of my insurance plan," she wrote. Unable to pay her medical bills, the woman sought help from the State. She was not able to work, but she did not qualify for any assistance. Having exhausted all resources, she was declared a medically indigent adult. Now, after having fought cancer and the insurance industry, the woman is in a position of not being sufficiently insured and being unable to buy insurance because of a preexisting condition. Such a no-win situation causes one to ask "Why does it have to be like this?"

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that as my colleagues listen to the voices in these letters they resolve to play an active role in ensuring that someday, very soon, it won't be like this. The time for a national health program is now. Each day, millions of Americans are being gravely hurt by the business of health insurance. It is time that a framework is created in which all Americans, regardless of race, class, age, physical condition, or employment status, are able to achieve the fundamental degree of human dignity provided by basic health care rights.

## 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF "OXI" DAY

## HON. JACK BUECHNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, it is said that the only causes worth fighting for are those which are lost. There is a large measure of

truth in this. History has recorded numerous instances where in the face of insurmountable odds, for forces of humanity have met and triumphed over the forces of oppression. Waterloo, Gettysburg, Midway, famous battles—each one waged to return the journey of human civilization toward the path of enlightenment.

Yet, there are numerous less well-known but no less important conflicts fought against even longer odds; footnotes in the historical record to be certain, but shining examples of the triumph of the human spirit no less. This week, people of Greek origin around the world, and in my district, will gather to proudly remember one such conflict—the valiant effort fought by Greece in opposing the invading armies of the Axis Powers at the onset of World War II.

October 28 is known to Greeks as "oxi" day, so designated because in 1940, when Benito Mussolini demanded the unconditional surrender of the Greek people, there response was eloquent in its simplicity—"oxi" the Greek word for "no". When confronted by the spectre of surrender in the face of overwhelmingly superior military forces, they chose to stand fast. What followed will be forever noted in the annals of heroism as a succession of victories by the Greek forces. Although ultimately overwhelmed by force of superior arms, the sacrifice of the Greek people was instrumental in slowing the nefarious onslaught of the Axis Powers in other theaters, and will forever remain a tribute to their valor.

Mr. Speaker, to hold fast in the face of certain defeat, to willingly confront adversity with no chance of success, is an exaltation of that most precious of human commodities; dignity. and, though the ultimate triumph of humanity is uncertain, one certainty foreordained is that it will never be achieved by those who are faint of heart, but rather those who are bold of spirit. I ask each of my colleagues to join me in honoring those Greeks of bold spirit, who on October 28, a half century ago, chose to meet infamy with honor. Truly they have prevailed.

## WESTCHESTER CHILDREN'S BLOOD FOUNDATION TO HONOR RITA AND DICK LOWENSTEIN

## HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the Westchester Children's Blood Foundation in honoring Rita and Dick Lowenstein. The Lowensteins have been active community leaders in Westchester County for many years, and have selflessly committed countless hours to the benefit of others who are less fortunate.

The Lowensteins have been involved with the Children's Blood Foundation since its inception 27 years ago, when Rita became a member of the board. She has served on the board and Dick has been an active advocate and fundraiser for the foundation ever since.



Over the last 27 years, the Children's Blood Foundation has been the source of significant financial support to laboratories which focus on children's blood diseases, including leukemia, blood cancers and, more recently, AIDS. Many children will spend their lifetime visiting hospitals weekly for blood transfusions, and the work of the blood foundation has been instrumental in their ability to lead fulfilling lives.

In addition to the foundation, the Lowensteins have been active in numerous other Westchester County organizations. Rita has been active in the PTA and the League of Women Voters, and Dick has been president of the Lakeshore Association, a homeowners organization in their community of Greenhaven.

I am delighted to be able to join the Westchester Children's Blood Foundation in honoring Rita and Dick Lowenstein. I have long admired their dedication to service and commitment to improving the lot of others. I take this opportunity to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation for all they are doing for Westchester.

#### INTENT OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

**HON. VIC FAZIO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 25, 1990*

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to reauthorize the Higher Education Act of 1965, I want to stress my conviction that we must continue to ensure that all students—regardless of their socioeconomic status—have access to the kind of postsecondary education that best meets their needs, interest, and abilities.

If we close the door of educational opportunity, it is not just thousands of individuals who will suffer. Our Nation's economic future is also at stake.

If the United States is to remain economically competitive in the 1990's and the 21st century, we will need increasing numbers of skilled workers. Traditional 4-year colleges will educate a segment of the work force. However, only 50 percent of high school graduates go to college and only 42 percent of them get a college degree.

We cannot forget the rest of the American work force who may not go to college but may need some postsecondary education. They too will play an important role in our economic future.

When we authorize student financial aid programs, the legislation should recognize the diversity of postsecondary education options available to students. We should ensure that financial aid does not exclude any one type of education.

Further, as we take action to reduce student loan default rates, we must continue to recognize the importance of student aid to individuals. We should not deny a student access to student aid because of the type of school he or she chooses to attend.

There is no doubt that default rates are too high and have become a very serious and costly problem. We must take tough, but fair

steps to fight fraud and abuse in student aid programs and ensure that students pay back their loans.

What we should not do is deny access to education to our young people, especially low-income people who otherwise may not get the education and training they need for meaningful employment. To deny those at the bottom of the economic ladder the opportunity to go to school would defeat the whole intent of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

#### JOE PICKLE, WEST TEXAS LEGEND CELEBRATES 80TH BIRTHDAY

**HON. CHARLES W. STENHOLM**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 25, 1990*

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, every community is usually indebted to a few citizens for the contributions they have made in the life of our American cities. One of my constituents, Mr. Joe Pickle of Big Spring, TX, will be honored next month in celebration of his 80th birthday on November 24. The city of Big Spring is fortunate to have been the recipient of the great leadership of this man.

Joe Pickle grew up in Big Spring where he was and is an active participant in its continual development. He is a graduate of Baylor University, where he served as editor of the Daily Lariat, the university newspaper. After graduation in 1932, Joe returned to his hometown and joined the Big Spring Herald as a young reporter earning the magnificent salary of \$8 a week. Over the years, he rose through all ranks of the paper and remained as editor until 1975. He also authored a book entitled "Gettin' Started" that chronicled the first years of Howard County of which Big Spring is the county seat.

His father, Joe B. Pickle, served as mayor of Big Spring and his sisters served as schoolteachers in the community. His brother, Jake Pickle, is the U.S. Congressman from the 10th District of Texas and has served in this body for nearly 27 years.

Mr. Speaker, as a strong civic leader, Joe Pickle took the lead in establishing the Howard County Junior College and was most instrumental in bringing about its creation. That school continues to play a vital role in the community life of Big Spring.

And it was Joe Pickle who took the lead, personally and in his editorial column, in creating the Colorado River municipal water district, probably the most important entity in all of West Texas. That river authority has preserved Lake J.B. Thomas and E.V. Spence Reservoir at Robert Lee, TX, and the newly completed O.H. Ivie Reservoir and the S.W. Freese Dam.

This river authority, of which Joe is the secretary of the board, supplies the basic water needs of West Texas and I daresay those communities would have dried up years ago had this water not been made available to them. The continuing water needs have amounted to years of legal battles and hours of dedication. And, on top of all that, Joe Pickle always has time for his community. He has remained active in the Boy Scouts, Lions'

Club, and the Baptist church where he has served as chairman of the board and, at one time, as a member of the Southern Baptist delegation. Joe is indeed a man known for his friendly smile, gentle humor, and willingness to help.

Mr. Speaker, this man has been a giant leader in his community and certainly he and his family have every reason to be proud of such a distinguished life and career. He is a role model for all of us to follow.

#### PERSONAL THANKS TO SANDY LEWIS

**HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 25, 1990*

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to Sandy Lewis, a young woman who, during her all to short tenure in my office, has consistently gone above and beyond the call of duty for myself and the people of the 16th Congressional District of Florida.

Sandy is a special person who is participating in a special program, the Presidential Management Internship Program [PMI]. PMI's are permanent workers in other governmental agencies who are loaned to other agencies and the Congress for a specific amount of time. Sandy is permanently employed by the State Department and, due to the wealth of knowledge and expertise acquired at the Department, she has been invaluable to me and my work as member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. Speaker, when the 102d session of Congress convenes in 1991, the State Department will be regaining, and I will be losing one of the most dedicated, intelligent, and diligent employees I have ever had the pleasure of working with. Although I have been critical of the State Department on a number of occasions, I applaud and commend whoever it was at Foggy Bottom who had the smarts to hire Sandy Lewis.

#### ARIZONA GRAZING FEE

**HON. JON L. KYL**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 25, 1990*

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, during the House debate on the Synar grazing fee amendment on October 15, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman SYNAR, stated incorrectly that the State of Arizona charges a grazing fee of \$5.99 per animal unit month [AUM].

According to the commissioner of the Arizona State Land Department, the following grazing fees were charged by the State of Arizona over the last 8 years: \$1.3965 per AUM in 1990; \$1.4345 in 1989; \$1.1875 in 1988; \$0.6555 in 1987; \$0.7315 in 1986; \$1.0450 in 1985; \$1.0545 in 1984; and \$1.0735 in 1983.

**NOW IS THE WRONG TIME TO INCREASE TAX BURDEN ON SMALL BUSINESS**

**HON. CASS BALLENGER**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, America's largest small business advocate, the National Federation of Independent Business [NFIB], each month reports on the economic condition of the small business sector of America's economy. Data released for September 1990 indicates that all is not well with American small business. In fact, the data suggests this body should not impede the prospects for entrepreneurial opportunities through greater regulation and taxation.

For example, NFIB small business optimism index has fallen to its lowest point since the 1980 recession. Even the 1982 responses did not produce readings that were this low. Optimism is way down. Moreover, 9 of 10 components of the index fell from the month earlier. These include: capital spending, hiring plans, labor market conditions, inventory investment plans, and noticeable price increases.

Mr. Speaker, let's not push small business owners into deep recession through an increased Federal burden placed on them by the Congress. Instead, we should be thinking of ways to liberate small business from Federal policies which strangle their operations.

**HOUSE PASSES 37 PERCENT-INCREASE IN ALZHEIMER'S-AGING RESEARCH**

**HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging and its Subcommittee on Health and Long-Term Care and senior member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, I want to loudly applaud an \$85 million increase, the largest expansion ever, in Alzheimer's-aging appropriations funding for the National Institute on Aging. At the same time, let me say that I am also extremely pleased to see the passage of Home Health Care and Alzheimer's Disease Amendments (H.R. 5112).

These amendments are drawn from two bills introduced by me and a bipartisan, House-Senate Alzheimer's and aging CARE coalition. The first bill is the Comprehensive Alzheimer's Assistance, Research and Education Act [CARE], (H.R. 4770; S. 2602) and the second bill is the Independence for Older Americans Act (H.R. 4863; S. 2654). Joining me in the bipartisan, House-Senate CARE coalition are Representatives SNOWE, WAXMAN, STARK, DOWNEY, OAKAR, RINALDO, REGULA, and BRUCE and Senators METZENBAUM, HARKIN, PRESSLER, HATFIELD, GRASSLEY, and GRAHAM.

With respect to new authorization, the House and Senate have passed the Home

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

Health Care and Alzheimer's Disease Amendments (H.R. 5112), including provisions for State Alzheimer's programs, the Pepper Independence Centers, the Task Force on Aging Research, and an expansion of Alzheimer's disease research, diagnostic, and treatment centers. The State Alzheimer's programs, advanced in the original version of H.R. 5112 by myself and Representatives BRUCE and WAXMAN, will create a Federal-State partnership to reach out and provide badly needed assistance to Alzheimer's victims and their families.

These aging and Alzheimer's expansions represent a substantial down payment on the full program contained in the Alzheimer's CARE bill (H.R. 4770) and the Independence for Older Americans Act (H.R. 4863). Though the House and Senate are to be applauded for their willingness to take this step in a time of tight budgets, the next down payment will come due next year.

After years of effort by the national Alzheimer's Association and the members of the bipartisan, House-Senate Alzheimer's aging CARE coalition, a major breakthrough in Alzheimer's research funding has been made in the House passage of the conference agreement for the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations. The 1991 appropriations for the National Institute on Aging was raised a dramatic 37 percent higher than the 1990 level—over an \$85 million increase, with the highest priority being given to Alzheimer's-related research.

Though still short of the over \$500 million called for in the Alzheimer's CARE bill, the conference agreement represents the biggest victory in this 10-year battle. Next year we vow to return to have Alzheimer's-related research finally achieve parity with the other major diseases: cancer, AIDS, and heart disease.

**TRIBUTE TO ROBERT J. BYLONE, JR.**

**HON. GUS YATRON**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to a bright and talented young man from Orwigsburg, PA. I am speaking of Robert J. Bylone, Jr., a member of the Boy Scouts of America.

On November 11, 1990, a ceremony will be held for Robert at the Schuylkill Masonic Lodge No. 138 to honor him for his fine achievement in attaining Eagle rank. This rank is the highest award a Scout can receive. Only 1 in every 10,000 young men in the United States make it to this level.

Through his hard work and tenacious efforts, Robert has proven himself more than worthy of this honor. Aside from being a life Scout, Robert has won numerous awards. Among these other honors is the Arrow of Light Award, Den Chief Service Award, outstanding patrol leader and senior patrol leader awards. Robert is also extremely active in high school. He is a member of the national honor society, Enviorthon Team, and he was a lead member in his high school 1990 musi-

cal. The items I have mentioned are only just some of the few in Robert's repertoire of accomplishments. It is without a doubt that Robert J. Bylone, Jr., is a great asset to the future of our country.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure and a honor for me to present Robert's achievements before you and the other Members of the House of Representatives, as well as the rest of the Nation. Moreover, I am certain that this is only one of the many times that Robert will be honored for his accomplishments. Let me take this moment before the House to commend Robert on his promotion to Eagle rank and to wish him the best of luck and success in all of his future endeavors.

**NEIL COMPTON RECEIVES TEDDY ROOSEVELT AWARD**

**HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 22, 1990, Dr. Neil Compton, of Bentonville, AR, was honored at White House ceremonies presenting the Teddy Roosevelt Conservation Award.

President George Bush recognized Dr. Compton for outstanding accomplishment and achievement in the areas of conservation and wise stewardship of natural resources.

One of Arkansas' foremost conservationists, Dr. Compton was a founder and first president of the Ozark Society, a group formed in 1962 from the nature conservancy to promote preservation of the Buffalo River in north central Arkansas as a free-flowing stream.

It was my honor to work with him and the group, authoring and introducing the legislation signed into law in 1972 which added the Buffalo National River to our National Park System. Dr. Compton played a key role in organizing support and generating public awareness of the need for preservation.

Neil Compton's lifelong interest in nature has taken many forms, including serving on the Citizen's Advisory Committee of the Southwest Region of the National Park Service from 1973 to 1977. He was appointed an honorary national park ranger in 1987.

Dr. Compton is the author of "The High Ozarks, a Vision of Eden," published in 1982, and has another book ready for publication, "The Battle for the Buffalo River."

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to bring the most recent national recognition of Dr. Compton's great conservation work to the attention of the 101st Congress.

**THE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION CONFERENCE REPORT**

**HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1990

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my extreme disappointment with the conference report's treatment of sec-



tion 365 of the House-passed bill. The conference agreement does not include a provision I authored in the House bill regarding the availability of emergency medical units of the Armed Forces. Conferees failed to understand the importance of this provision, which would have directed the armed services, and in particular the Army, to retain sufficient capability to provide emergency medical assistance in the same manner as was performed by emergency medical helicopter units, such as MAST or Medevac, that have been deployed.

The leadership of the House and Senate committees apparently did not understand that these emergency medical units provide emergency services not only to civilians, but the military personnel as well. MAST, or Military Assistance to Safety and Traffic, units help transport civilian accident victims to local trauma centers, and Medevac, or Medical Evacuation, units transport military people injured in the line of duty in remote areas, such as desert training ranges, or thick forest wilderness. Conferees failed to understand that if these emergency units are deployed and not replaced, military personnel who have suffered serious injuries may not receive prompt medical assistance. Civilians injured in remote rural areas might likewise be denied access to life-saving health care facilities without these capabilities.

Conferees also assume that nearby military units will be capable of providing alternative medical services to replace deployed MAST and Medevac units. There are some military reservations and some remote civilian areas, however, where no replacement capability will exist. This is exactly the point of my original language. There are cases where the nearest military medical facility will be 100 miles away. In those instances, injured military personnel and the civilian communities in remote areas will simply not be able to receive prompt emergency services.

I want to reiterate my serious concerns regarding the outcome of the conference on this section of the bill. It is not satisfactory. If I cannot correct this problem in this legislative vehicle, then I will do so at the next opportunity, and I ask for the help of the managers of this bill, and the chairmen of the conference in both Houses, to help me in that effort.

#### TRIBUTE TO C. JAMES PATTI

#### HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. C. James Patti, a pioneer and an outstanding leader in the effort to promote the U.S. merchant marine. Jim is the 1990 recipient of the Propeller Club's Maritime Person of the Year Award. Many of my colleagues and I are extremely pleased that the Propeller Club, itself a strong voice in the promotion of American shipping, chose to bestow this honor on such a deserving member of maritime community.

During his 20-year career, Jim has devoted himself on both a local and national level to defending U.S. shippers—inland and deep

sea, domestic and international. Jim manifested his strong interest in shipping issues shortly after his graduation from college, when he joined the Washington, DC staff of the Transportation Institute, then only 2 years old. While with the institute, he obtained his J.D. from Catholic University and expanded his responsibilities to become counsel and vice president. Jim was instrumental in establishing the institute's legislative department on behalf of its member shipping companies.

In 1980, Jim became vice president of the newly formed Maritime Institute for Research and Industrial Development, where he continued to put his legislative expertise to work, particularly on Capitol Hill. In 1985, following the death of Maritime Institute President Julian H. Singman, Jim was chosen by the board of directors to take over as president.

In addition to membership in the American Bar Association and the Delta Theta Phi law fraternity, Jim is a member of the Bar of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. He served as president of the Propeller Club, Port of Washington, DC, from 1981-83 and presently serves on the Propeller Club's national executive committee.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the 1980's, Jim went to battle against another executive, far less friendly to the American merchant marine, who worked in the White House down the street.

Jim fought tirelessly against the Reagan administration's short-sighted and misguided policy of cutting support for U.S.-flag vessels. Now the Bush administration, in light of the prominent role played by the U.S. merchant marine in the mobilization of U.S. troops to the Middle East, is reconsidering those cuts.

Mr. Speaker, Jim is one of the staunchest advocates in Washington for a strong and capable merchant marine. He has called for an expanded shipping industry in order to meet the economic and security needs of our Nation. Here in Congress, we need to heed this critically important call.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that Jim Patti is in the truest sense an American patriot—a man who has always put his Nation and family first. It is an honor for me to call him a friend.

#### ANTI-ARAB BIGOTRY AND VIOLENCE

#### HON. GEO. W. CROCKETT, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, anti-Arab bigotry and violence—which is a species of anti-Semitism—has been inflamed by the present gulf crisis.

The New York Times, on September 9, editorialized that "American Jews—and I would add Afro-Americans, too—have reason to be particularly sensitive about demonizing a Semitic people. In unthinking caricature, Arabs are portrayed as either demented terrorists, or greedy oil sheiks. This is a variation of the hateful depiction of Jews, as rapacious bankers or sinister revolutionaries. Anti-Semitism is anti-Semitism in both forms."

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I offer, for the consideration of my colleagues, a "Statement of Concern" endorsed by the National Conference of Black Lawyers, American Civil Liberties Union, the Jewish Peace Fellowship, the National Council of LaRaza, and several other religious and civil organizations.

#### LISTEN TO SMALL BUSINESS

#### HON. BILL GRANT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge my colleagues to listen to their small business-owners when they are traveling around their districts in December and January. I hope they hear the same voices and the same message I have been hearing, and they take notice.

My constituents have been telling me they are tired of Congress playing fast and loose. The National Federation of Independent Business' [NFIB's] mandate surveys bear out that the Federal budget deficit is a top concern of small business. They have seen us up here on the news for 2 weeks not heeding their concerns about the deficit. They are sick of Congress playing hide-and-go seek with their money.

Small businessowners are particularly concerned because they see a deteriorating economy and uncertainty. Washington does not seem to understand the principle of balancing spending and revenues. Business people will rightly ask why we cannot balance the Nation's checkbook. And, judging from the action taken by this Congress, I am not sure we have an answer which is going to satisfy anyone.

It is my hope that over the next few days, my fellow Representatives join me in looking to small business, the backbone of our economy, for suggestions on how to proceed now and in 1991.

#### CONGRESSMAN KILDEE HONORS REV. REUBEN RUSSELL

#### HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in paying tribute to an outstanding humanitarian from my hometown of Flint, MI, the Reverend Reuben Russell. Reverend Russell is retiring from his position as pastor of Vernon Chapel AME Church in Flint and is being honored at a community farewell dinner on November 8, 1990.

Reverend Russell has been pastor of Vernon Chapel AME Church since 1961. In that time he has become one of the great spiritual and community leaders in Flint. He has devoted countless hours to counseling members of his congregation and has worked tirelessly to assist all segments of the community.

After graduating from high school in Alabama, he came to Michigan to pursue employment. While working a variety of jobs, he entered college. Upon graduation from college, he entered Wilberforce University for his seminary education. He was ordained in 1941 and began pastoring in Roseville, MI. He then moved to Muskegon Heights where he pastored until he came to Flint in 1961. Wherever he has preached, Reverend Russell has committed himself to serving God and the people of that community.

Reverend Russell has shown his commitment to Flint through his numerous community activities. He is the treasurer of the Greater Flint Opportunities Industrialization Center, serves on the board of the Flint Neighborhood Improvement and Preservation Project; chairman of the Division of Church and society of the Greater Flint Council of Churches; has held leadership positions in the Flint branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and is a member of the board of directors of the Genesee-Lapeer Chapter of the American Red Cross. Reverend Russell is also first vice president of the Concerned Pastors for Social Action and has served faithfully as a volunteer for the March of Dimes for over 25 years. Reverend Russell has also served on the Chaplain's Advisory Committee of the Michigan Department of Corrections.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor and a privilege for me to pay tribute to Reverend Russell. He has faithfully served the people of the Flint community for 30 years, providing spiritual leadership, leading the battle against racism, and speaking out for equal rights for all people in this world. While he is retiring from this phase of his career, I know that he will remain in the Flint community continuing to provide leadership and counsel to those less fortunate. Reverend Russell exemplifies all that is good in humanity. He has served his God and community with the greatest devotion. I am a better person for having known him, and Flint is certainly a better community for his presence.

### THROW THE BIG SPENDERS OUT!

**HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine from Orange, CA, Mary Widdows, passed along to me an articulate statement from Real America regarding the current budget hoax being perpetrated on taxpayers. The statement is in the form of an open letter. I commend it to my colleagues.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I commend the work product of the National Taxpayers Union to my colleagues. The NTU has accurately described the real problem with fiscal policy in Washington, DC: Big spenders.

Were voters inclined to remove these big spenders from office, citizens would once again regain control of their country's future.

### AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS,

OCTOBER 10, 1990.

House of Representatives,  
Capitol Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBERS: After listening to your excuses and explanations, it is quite clear why the deficit continues, and in fact is increasing as a major spectacle and catastrophe for America.

This country was founded on fair representation. Somewhere along the way government lost the path that taxpayers walk down. In an environment when the David Dukes of the world are almost elected to powerful positions, it is time to realize how much government has strayed from the values of integrity, honesty and a strong work ethic.

Ignore your colleagues and the newspapers and start listening to common sense and reason. The simple truth is that the number one reason President Bush was elected was that his lips said "No New Taxes".

The problem isn't Republican vs. Democrat. It is that all of you can't quit spending our hard-earned income. You're out of control. Congress is undisciplined and believes the answer to all problems is to spend more money and raise taxes. Listen to Kennedy, Gephardt, Chafee, Bentsen, Rostenkowski and D'Amato. They sound like parrots.

I haven't heard one proposal which addresses the real problem. The blank checkbook needs to be taken away from Congress. Spending is easy. It buys current votes but hurts all taxpayers. We need to limit the number of congressional terms, pass line item vetoes and begin to run this country as the rest of us run our personal lives and businesses. We need to make the public aware of the amounts of pensions paid to retired congressmen. Examples include: Tip O'Neill (\$65,640), Carl Albert (\$100,000), J. William Fulbright (\$75,000), Barry Goldwater (\$66,900), Mike Mansfield (\$136,000). Many of the retired congressmen now receive more annually than they earned in Congress. How can Congress vote to raise their personal paychecks while at the same time vote to limit ours? Without these and other controls, the deficit will only return or be hidden elsewhere (off-budget items and/or state budgets). I'm against any proposal to raise any tax UNTIL some guarantees are in place that assure spending is under control. After all, we played this game with Gramm-Rudman.

Quit lying to the American public. There are no spending cuts. At best there is just a decrease in spending growth. And now you have the nerve to announce, with pride, that you passed a budget (without substance with details to follow. This is unacceptable! Uncontrolled spending cannot be solved by uncontrolled taxation.

Wake up, Washington! This is no joke. Taxpayers from all income levels are now professing to vote all incumbents out of office. The sheep are stirred up and their numbers are growing.

[From the National Taxpayers Union, Mar. 22, 1990]

CONGRESSIONAL BIG SPENDERS IN TAXPAYERS' RATING TAKE "LET THEM EAT CAKE" ATTITUDE TOWARD TAXPAYERS, SAYS NTU

WASHINGTON, DC.—National Taxpayers Union (NTU) Chairman James Davidson today released a taxpayers' rating of Congress on the grounds of the U.S. Capitol before a four-foot by six-foot cake with a sculpted relief of the Capitol dome. David-

son pointed out the names of the 112 members rated as Big Spenders etched in red icing on the cake, saying "the red icing symbolizes the red ink of deficits the Big Spenders have consistently voted for."

Davidson criticized the Big Spenders named in NTU's 1989 Congressional Spending Study, an annual report card on Congress' spending habits, saying "the Big Spenders in Congress are so out of touch with the majority of Americans who oppose higher taxes and spending that they are taking a 'Let them eat cake' attitude toward American taxpayers."

More than twice as many members were rated as Big Spenders than the 52 who earned the Taxpayers' Friend rating by voting to hold the line on wasteful spending.

"NTU has no partisan axe to grind," Davidson pointed out, "because we analyzed every roll call vote in Congress, 154 House votes, that affected federal spending, including votes for more defense spending and more social spending."

NTU's 17th-annual survey also included good news for taxpayers: scores for members of Congress rebounded significantly from 1988, although Davidson said the average scores still are "unacceptably low."

Congress voted more often to control spending in 1989 as average scores jumped 15 points in the House of Representatives. A higher score indicates that a member of Congress voted to save more tax dollars.

"I don't remember scores shooting up as much, except in 1981, President Reagan's first year," said David Keating, executive vice president of NTU, who directed the study research. "President Bush's 'read my lips, no new taxes' budget may have had some effect."

In fact, President Bush would have scored 59 percent in the House siding with taxpayers more than half the time, if he had actually cast votes based on the positions Congressional Quarterly reported he took on spending issues before Congress. However, former president Reagan, who scored 67 percent in the House bested Bush's first-year figures in seven of his eight years in office.

Overall scores got a big boost from repeal of the Catastrophic Health Coverage Act of 1988 last year, which probably accounted for at least half of the score increase, according to NTU.

NTU named 41 House members Taxpayer's Friends for achieving scores of 57 percent or better.

Rep. Jim Sensenbrenner, a Wisconsin Republican, with 80 percent, captured the Taxpayers' Best Friend Award.

Two House Democrats achieved the Taxpayers' Friend distinction when Rep. Andrew Jacobs of Indiana scored 62 percent and Rep. Timothy Penny of Minnesota hit 57 percent.

"This proves that congressmen often thought of as moderates or liberals also can be fiscal conservatives," said Davidson.

On the down side, leading the pack of Big Spenders, whose scoring 33 percent or less in the House, were Representatives Lindy Boggs (D-LA) and John Murtha (D-PA) at 23 percent.

Republicans overwhelmed their Democratic colleagues by 50 percent to 36 percent in the House.

The National Taxpayers Union is a non-profit, non-partisan organization representing 200,000 members interested in reducing spending and taxes.

Editor's Note: Listed below are the members of Congress named "Taxpayers'



Friends" and "Big Spenders" by NTU in 1989. Members are listed in state order along with their "Congressional Spending Score". A higher score indicates more support for controlling spending and taxes.

#### TAXPAYERS' FRIENDS

Arizona: Stump, 60 percent; Kyl, 62 percent.

California: Herger, 60 percent; Shumway, 64 percent; Moorhead, 57 percent; Dreier, 60 percent; McCandless, 61 percent; Danne-meyer, 72 percent; Rohrabacher, 60 percent.

Colorado: Brown, 61 percent; Hefley, 59 percent.

Connecticut: Shays, 60 percent.

Idaho: Craig, 58 percent.

Illinois: Crane, 70 percent.

Indiana: Jacobs, 62 percent.

Iowa: Tauke, 60 percent.

Kentucky: Bunning, 62 percent.

Minnesota: Boschwitz, 57 percent; Penny, 57 percent; Frenzel, 71 percent.

Missouri: Hancock, 68 percent.

New Hampshire: Humphrey, 70 percent;

Smith, 69 percent; Douglas, 59 percent.

New York: Solomon, 59 percent.

North Carolina: Coble, 58 percent.

Ohio: Kasich, 59 percent.

Oregon: Smith, D., 58 percent.

Pennsylvania: Walker, 67 percent; Gekas,

60 percent.

Tennessee: Duncan, 65 percent.

Texas: Bartlett, 58 percent; Barton, 60

percent; Archer, 63 percent; Fields, 63 per-

cent; Combest, 61 percent; DeLay, 60 per-

cent; Armey, 65 percent.

Utah: Hansen, 60 percent; Nielson, 65 per-

cent.

Wisconsin: Petri, 67 percent; Roth, 62 per-

cent; Sensenbrenner, 80 percent.

#### BIG SPENDERS

Arkansas: Alexander, 25 percent; Antho-

ny, 28 percent.

California: Fazio, 30 percent; Edwards, 32

percent; Roybal, 31 percent; Dixon, 32 per-

cent; Hawkins, 29 percent; Dymally, 24 per-

cent; Anderson, 26 percent; Brown, 32 per-

cent.

Florida: Smith, 33 percent; Fiascell, 32 per-

cent.

Hawaii: Akaka, 33 percent.

Illinois: Hayes, 33 percent; Savage, 30 per-

cent; Lipinski, 24 percent; Collins, 30 per-

cent; Rostenkowski, 25 percent; Annunzio,

33 percent; Evans, 30 percent; Durbin, 33

percent.

Indiana: Long, 32 percent; Jontz, 33 per-

cent; Hamilton, 32 percent.

Iowa: Nagle, 29 percent; Smith, 27 per-

cent.

Kentucky: Mazzoli, 33 percent; Perkins, 28

percent.

Louisiana: Boggs, 23 percent; Hayes, 34

percent.

Maine: Brennan, 30 percent.

Maryland: Hoyer, 29 percent; Mfume, 32

percent.

Massachusetts: Donnelly, 33 percent.

Michigan: Davis, 32 percent; Ford, 33 per-

cent.

Minnesota: Vento, 33 percent; Oberstar, 33

percent.

Mississippi: Whitten, 33 percent; Espy, 31

percent.

Missouri: Clay, 33 percent; Gephardt, 26

percent; Volkmer, 32 percent.

Nevada: Bilbray, 32 percent.

New Jersey: Dwyer, 32 percent; Roe, 30

percent; Torricelli, 31 percent; Payne, 30

percent.

New Mexico: Richardson, 34 percent.

New York: Hochbrueckner, 31 percent;

Downey, 29 percent; Ackerman, 33 percent;

Scheuer, 33 percent; Manton, 30 percent;

Towns, 29 percent; Owens, 33 percent;

Solarz, 31 percent; Rangel, 33 percent;

Gilman, 30 percent; McNulty, 33 percent;

Boehlert, 33 percent; McHugh, 28 percent;

Nowak, 31 percent.

Ohio: Luken, 33 percent; Kaptur, 27 per-

cent; Sawyer, 33 percent; Oakar, 32 percent;

Stokes, 31 percent.

Oregon: AuCoin, 33 percent.

Pennsylvania: Borski, 33 percent; Kost-

mayer, 34 percent; Murtha, 23 percent;

Coyne, 28 percent; Walgren, 33 percent.

Tennessee: Ford, 30 percent.

Texas: Chapman, 31 percent; Wilson, 33

percent; Brooks, 33 percent; Pickle, 24 per-

cent; de la Garza, 33 percent; Coleman, 30

percent; Gonzalez, 27 percent; Bustamante,

28 percent; Frost, 30 percent; Andrews, 33

percent; Ortiz, 29 percent.

Utah: Owens, 32 percent.

Virginia: Boucher, 29 percent.

Washington: Morrison, 33 percent; Dicks,

33 percent.

West Virginia: Mollohan, 27 percent; Wise,

25 percent.

Wisconsin: Aspin, 32 percent.

### THE CONCESSION POLICY ACT OF 1965

#### HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation which is long overdue. The Concessions Policy Act of 1965 has created an exclusive club of concessioners who maintain a monopoly on concessions at over 100 of our national parks, including hotel operators in Yosemite National Park and ferry operators at the Statue of Liberty.

The Secretary of the Interior has publicly stated his desire to change this system in an effort to make services more competitive and bring in more franchise fees to the Government. In my view, Mr. Speaker, this can only be accomplished by repealing the two most egregious clauses of this act—preferential rights and possessory interest.

My legislation repeals these clauses and requires the Secretary of the Interior to develop and implement a new system within 90 days for the renewal and extension of existing contracts and permits, the granting of new contracts and permits, and providing new or additional services through concessioners in areas of the National Park System. This new system must secure competitive bids and advertising for concessions contracts and to the extent possible, limit the term of these contracts to 5 years.

Further, my bill would require the Secretary to review existing contracts, many of which are sweetheart deals, to determine if any of these contracts were awarded outside of the normal Park Service procedures and if so, whether or not the contract can be terminated on that basis.

The Secretary is also required to provide access to Ellis Island by way of a bridge connecting Liberty State Park and Ellis Island. The working families of America deserve free and easy access to one of our greatest national monuments.

Finally, I have requested that the Secretary review the concessions serving the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island to determine if there is sufficient access for the public and if the cost of the ferry service to these national monuments is justified. The concessioner virtually doubled its rate to the islands, limiting the access to the millions of people expected to visit this year.

### SUPPORT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 653, DESIGNATING OCTOBER 30, 1990 AS "REFUGEE DAY"

#### HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, October 30, 1990, will mark the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Refugee Act, a bill which established a comprehensive and balanced policy for the admission and resettlement of refugees in the United States. Since the passage of that act, the United States has welcomed millions of refugees who have fled persecution in their own countries.

Mr. Speaker, the international effort to protect refugee populations around the world, and the U.S. policy which has given us these new and productive citizens, are deserving of recognition. This resolution, recognizing some of the current pressing refugee needs around the globe, and citing the lead role of the United States in addressing these needs, is an appropriate sign of congressional support for this humanitarian effort. It is also a fitting addition to White House ceremonies that will be held on October 30 to honor the courage of refugees and encourage a continued U.S. response to their plight.

### SAVE AMERICAN TEXTILE JOBS

#### HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, the textile machinery industry is very important to my home State of Alabama and to our Nation. We need the jobs this industry provides for American workers.

It is a sad fact that we have lost thousands of jobs in the textile machinery industry. The Commerce Department found that jobs in textile machinery declined from over 35,000 in 1974 to under 17,000 in 1985.

Fortunately, it's not too late to turn this trend around. The industry needs new technology to stay competitive. That's why I have cosponsored H.R. 1461 which would support the research and development necessary to overcome this technology gap.

The bill would put 5 percent of the tariffs on imported textile machinery to use in industry research and development. This type of support would be a real shot in the arm for one of our basic manufacturing industries.

We cannot afford to lose any more jobs in the manufacturing sector. And, in light of the current crisis in the Persian Gulf, we clearly must maintain the ability to produce our own textile machinery. We should not depend on foreign countries to deliver these machines.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1461. Let's keep American jobs where they belong—here at home.

### HONORING MIRACLE PROVIDER CHURCH

**HON. TED WEISS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to an invaluable community resource in the 17th Congressional District of New York whose tremendous work merits special recognition.

The Miracle Provider Church has served its Bronx community for over 10 years under the outstanding leadership of the Reverend Carrie Higgins. This church has, during that decade, operated a soup kitchen and a highly successful food program to distribute hundreds of bags of food to the needy each week. It staffs a youth home for homeless boys and girls and pregnant unwed mothers. The church runs a homeless shelter, a 24-hour hotline for suicidal callers, rape victims, and other crisis victims, and provides alcohol rehabilitation services as well.

As if that tireless work were not enough, the Miracle Provider Church has just dedicated a new building which will serve as a soup kitchen, food pantry, afterschool educational program and community center.

The Miracle Provider Church is a model of compassion for, and commitment to, our less fortunate neighbors. The vitality of Reverend Higgins' church speaks to its great success in providing life-enhancing services to the poor, hungry, homeless, and needy. The city of New York and, indeed the Nation, need more organizations with this level of dedication. I commend the church's very fine work and wish it continued success.

### OPPORTUNITY LOST TO EXPAND HEALTH COVERAGE

**HON. THOMAS J. TAUKE**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Speaker, the Tax Reform Act of 1986 contained a key provision that allows for self-employed taxpayers, primarily farmers, ranchers, and small business owners to partially deduct their health insurance expenses. On September 30, this important incentive to expand health care coverage expired. Much to my dismay, the budget package does not extend this critical tax deduction for small business owners, farmers, and ranchers.

The Small Business Administration reports that health insurance costs for small businesses have increased at a pace greater than the

national average. The National Federation of Independent Business [NFIB] reports that during the past 6 years, the No. 1 problem facing small businesses is the cost of health insurance. In addition, one-third of all farmers do not carry health insurance due to high health insurance premiums. Moreover, according to the NFIB Foundation, over 90 percent of small businesses consider health insurance to be prohibitively expensive.

The demise of this important deduction eliminates one of the few mechanisms that small businesses and farmers have had to offset ever-increasing costs of health insurance. It is also important to remember that small business owners and farmers are already at a distinct disadvantage in comparison to large corporations. While the partial tax deduction for the self-employed is being allowed to lapse, corporations retain 100 percent deductibility of their health care premiums. Where is the equity?

I would also note that in our rush to finalize a deficit reduction package, another fundamental public policy objective has fallen by the wayside. The extension and expansion of the 25-percent partial deduction for self-employed business owners, farmers, and ranchers is not a special interest tax deduction. Without this deduction, thousands of small business owners and farmers will not be able to provide health insurance for themselves and their employees. We should not allow this to happen.

### THE CRANSTON-GONZALEZ ACT

**HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, of which the conference report was approved by the House today, contains a new program which I sponsored, the Family Unification Program. These remarks are intended as a supplement to the information contained about the Family Unification Program in the conference report.

The Cranston-Gonzalez Act establishes a new, \$35 million authorization of section 8 rent subsidies under the Family Unification Program. These section 8 subsidies will be provided to families who are otherwise eligible for section 8 and whose children are at imminent risk of placement in foster care or are prevented from returning from foster care primarily due to lack of adequate housing. The conference report makes clear that the conferees intend that funding for this initiative will be separate and above funding for the existing section 8 programs.

It is intended that local housing authorities collaborate with public child welfare agencies in implementing this initiative. Clearly, housing authorities and child welfare agencies both should have a role in the determination of families' eligibility for the program. To promote such collaboration, it is important that the Secretaries of Housing and Urban Development and Health and Human Services jointly notify all local housing authorities and public

child welfare agencies about this new initiative.

The House response to this problem was more extensive than the conference approach: Both the fiscal year 1991 House budget resolution and the House omnibus housing bill created a Family Unification Program which provided section 8 certificates as an entitlement to all families for which inadequate housing was resulting in initial or prolonged separation of children from their families. The conference could not authorize this entitlement program, however, because the Senate budget resolution did not contain the requisite new entitlement authority for the program. With the continued bipartisan support of those in both Houses who have supported the measure in the past, though, I will continue the effort to make the Family Unification Program an entitlement program in the future.

### HONORING THE EAST SAN GABRIEL VALLEY REGIONAL OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM

**HON. ESTABAN EDWARD TORRES**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a special educational program, the East San Gabriel Valley Regional Occupational Program. The U.S. Secretary of Education announced on September 16, 1990, that the East San Gabriel Valley Regional Occupational Program was named the winner of the U.S. Secretary's Award for Outstanding Vocational-Technical Education Programs by the Department of Education.

The Vocational-Technical and Education Program competition is fierce at the national level. Rating factors include: setting objective standards to measure students' competency and evaluate progress in attaining basic skills and training; working closely with secondary and postsecondary schools, and placing graduates in the job market once their training is completed. The East San Gabriel Valley ROP Apparel Marketing and Merchandising Program reinforces basic academic skills through hands-on learning experience in merchandising and marketing.

The Apparel Marketing and Merchandising Division of the Regional Occupational Program was nominated by the California State Department of Education as their entry into the national competition. It gives me a sense of pride to know that educational programs in the 34th Congressional District have attained high achievement and acknowledgment by the Secretary of Education. These programs have the highest standards of excellence in vocational occupational training. They integrate the basic skills of instruction with intense occupational training. The San Gabriel Valley Regional Occupational Program has demonstrated success in placing students in the job market throughout our economy. They are the best in occupational programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the leaders in occupational training of my congressional district, the East San Gabriel Valley Regional Occupational Program,



the winner of the Secretary's Award for Outstanding Vocational-Technical Education Program.

## VETERANS DAY

**HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1990

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, as you know, Congress is expected to adjourn before this November 11 Veterans Day celebration. That is why I take the opportunity today to pay

honor to those who have come to our Nation's defense when our security has been at risk.

To understand Veterans Day we should reflect on our past. For over two centuries our country has been a bastion of freedom and democracy. We have been guided by one of the most magnificent documents ever written—the Constitution. When our way of life and values were threatened, it was our veterans who valiantly responded. If not for their efforts, the United States of America, and indeed the world, would be a very different place.

It is particularly appropriate that on this Veterans Day we note that there are young

American men and women serving in the Persian Gulf. Furthermore, we would be remiss if we did not also recall those Americans who are still listed as prisoners of war or missing in action. Our thoughts and prayers are with them and their families.

In closing, I would like to remind all Americans that celebrating Veterans Day should not merely be done by waving flags, having parades, and taking the day off from work. It should go beyond that. We have an obligation and duty to sincerely and truly honor those who have selflessly served in our Armed Forces so that all Americans can continue to enjoy our freedoms and democracy.