

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A COURAGEOUS CALL FOR ACTION TO STOP THE ANTI-HOUSING ELITISTS

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, housing programs are under the most concerted attack since the Federal Government accepted a role in helping to provide decent shelter for all Americans.

With these programs under siege and with the very future of housing and community development at risk, it is vital that people knowledgeable about the Nation's needs in this area speak up.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I was so impressed by the gutsy remarks delivered by David O. Maxwell, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Federal National Mortgage Association [Fannie Mae] to the board of directors of the National Association of Home Builders in Dallas on January 18.

Citing some of the outlandish proposals for cutting housing programs, the Fannie Mae chief lays it on the line in very clear language:

What the elitists seek to do is to put into law their antihousing bias under the cover of the deficit reduction package. That way, they can avoid careful consideration of these radical changes in housing policy in open forums established for this purpose, such as the Senate and House banking committees.

Mr. Maxwell went on to tell the NAHB:

As keepers of the American housing dream, we together must stop the ideological assault on homeownership. The halls of Congress should rock with our protest on behalf of half a century of bringing homeownership to Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD the text of Mr. Maxwell's remarks in Dallas and commend them to anyone truly interested in preserving the Nation's commitment to decent housing for all Americans:

THE ATTACK ON MRS. BAKER'S HOUSING DREAM

(Remarks by David O. Maxwell, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, the Federal National Mortgage Association)

It feels mighty good to get out of that stewpot called Washington to visit with friends.

Yes, America's home builders and Fannie Mae are good friends. Through good times and bad, we have stood up for each other. The result has been a standard of homeownership in America that is the envy of the world.

Like all good friends, we don't always agree completely on every issue. In fact, a lender friend of mine said to me that other day: "Your new underwriting standards must make speaking at the NAHB like Daniel in the lion's den." I don't believe

that at all. I don't feel the need for divine intervention to get out of here alive. If I did, I'd have a long and very uncomfortable wait.

No, my friends, I feel more like Joshua than Daniel this morning. In the words of the spiritual, I want to command the children to shout and bring tumbling down the walls of those in Washington, who would, if we let them, destroy every vestige of support for the American dream of homeownership.

I want to make sure you leave here knowing what these elitists have in mind. Make no mistake about it, they are cold-bloodedly determined to drive the American home buyer into a ruinous competition for mortgage money with Wall Street merger maniacs and the tentacled, multinational octopus of the world. They will succeed—if we do not have the courage and determination to stop them.

Now, let me observe right up front that these are not issues affecting the federal budget deficit. The attack to which I refer is on the public-private partnership in support of housing that doesn't cost the taxpayers of this nation a penny. The attack is motivated solely by an ideological hostility to governmental support of any kind—on or off the budget—to give the low-, moderate- and middle-income home buyers of this country a chance to compete for capital.

These people are cleverly disguising their attack by wrapping it in the flag of deficit reduction—a national priority we all support. By using such camouflage, they do the President a great disservice.

I've never heard President Reagan say he wanted to tear down all the supports that have made us a nation of homeowners. I've never heard him advocate destruction of institutions that help low- and moderate-income Americans buy homes without a penny's cost to the taxpayers. But that's what they would like to accomplish.

I don't have to tell you Fannie Mae is a major target of the conspiracy in Washington against home buyers of modest means. But I should tell you, as good friends, how disheartening this assault is to us. We have worked for five years to turn our company around. We have not burdened the Administration, or the American people, with the need for some kind of expensive bail-out.

Our turnaround strategy is well on the road to success. From a company that was losing \$1 million every working day in 1981, we have earned a solid profit in 1985. And we look to the future with optimism.

I know this achievement is of special interest to you because we have weathered the hard times of the 1980s together. I will always be proud that so many home builders told us after the recession of 1981-82 that without Fannie Mae they would not have made it through. My friends, without you, we would not have made it through either.

And now that Fannie Mae is back on her feet, you can be certain she'll always be there when you need her.

Obviously someone needed us in 1985. Our business volumes set a record for us. We purchased \$21 billion of mortgages for our

portfolio. We issued \$24 billion of Mortgage-Backed Securities. That \$45 billion translates into more than 900,000 home mortgages for Americans in 1985 alone. We will be just as aggressive in the marketplace in 1986.

We will be equally conscious of quality. We intend to stick to the basic changes we made last year in our underwriting standards and mortgage credit criteria, because we believe they are right. We did not make those changes because of the foreclosure losses from loans made in the recession of 1981-82. That cat is out of the bag. We have learned to live with all the unwanted kittens she has produced. And that's a lot of unwanted kittens. Rather, we made our underwriting changes for two fundamental reasons:

First: The current economic environment is radically different from the 1970's. Housing price inflation will no longer make up for underwriting mistakes. It would be foolhardy for us to do business as if nothing had changed.

Second: Our experience clearly shows that certain loan products and features lead with near certainty to foreclosure for many borrowers. It would be irresponsible for us to continue to offer those products and features.

To continue to accept high levels of foreclosures from loans we're making now could undermine the integrity of the home mortgage as a sound investment. Investors without faith in the underlying quality of their investment would not continue to invest. Our industry would soon have trouble raising the capital to finance future housing needs. So our changes were an important step to maintain investors' faith in the home mortgage.

Mixed with our business decision to make the changes was an overriding moral concern. Our industry doesn't want to see people buy homes they can't keep. Owning a home should be an experience to treasure, not regret. It is better for a family to postpone the purchase of a home until they can meet the monthly payments. It is better for a family to lower their expectations of how much house they can afford than to get in over their heads. It is better for a family to forego purchase of a home than to go through the agony of foreclosure.

What has been the reaction to our underwriting changes? Generally speaking, highly favorable. Naturally we could not fully satisfy every player in the marketplace and still effectively reduce credit risk. At the same time, we realize that no such changes are perfect. So, we continue to monitor them in response to customers' concerns. Where we can respond to those concerns without reopening the door to undue exposure to credit risk, we will do so.

I want to thank John Koelemij and Kent Colton for presenting NAHB's own reservations and suggestions to us candidly and forcefully. In our several meetings with John and Kent, we reviewed the underwriting rules and their effects in great detail. As a result, effective immediately, we are making several refinements in our new rules. I appreciate the opportunity to make

● 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.

the first public announcement of these refinements here at the NAHB's Board meeting today.

First, we will lift our prohibition on seller contributions to adjustable-rate mortgages with less than ten percent down. A seller will be allowed to pay closing or financing costs of these loans up a maximum of two percent of the sales price or appraised value, whichever is less.

Second, the current six percent limitation on contributions to fixed- and adjustable-rate mortgages with 25 percent or more down will be increased to nine percent of the sale price or appraised value, whichever is less.

Third, points on unplanned permanent buydowns will not be limited if they are incurred solely as a result of shifts in interest rates between the time of signing a sales contract and closing the loan.

Fourth, if an immediate family member makes a gift of at least 20 percent of the sales price, we will waive our requirement that a borrower must make a five percent downpayment in cash.

Fifth, our current definition of long-term debt, which includes all installment and revolving debt, will be changed to include only that installment and revolving debt that extends beyond ten months.

Sixth, we will streamline our documentation requirements to speed up approvals for loans with low loan-to-value ratios—loans that represent a more significant portion of our builder business than many of you might imagine.

In new lender guides Fannie Mae will distribute this month, we are including these refinements and clearing up misunderstandings, including one that has caused home builders concern: our 25/33 percent income standard for fixed-rate mortgages above the 90 percent loan-to-value ratio. Some have said this standard is set in concrete. It isn't. And it never was.

Let me repeat: We will allow lenders to go as high as 28/36 percent if there is sound justification for doing so. We want to buy high ratio loans of good quality.

We're also including in the guides a clarified appraisal policy. We have stood with NAHB in rejecting the mechanistic and unrealistic approach of "cash equivalent" appraisals. Fannie Mae will require appraisers to report sales concessions for comparables where the information is reasonably available. They then should adjust values based on the actual effect such concessions have on those values.

We believe these refinements, taken together, substantially address the concerns expressed to us by NAHB and others without sacrificing, in any way, our commitment to loan quality. Of course, Fannie Mae will keep its doors open for further discussion with you. You are true friends. You came to our side in last year's user fee battle, and helped to win that fight. That battle was part of a much larger war against governmental support for housing. It is led by those elitists I mentioned earlier. Their command post is the Office of Management and Budget.

The scope of their attack in recent years has been epitomized by their treatment of HUD's budget.

HUD's budget, including federally assisted housing, has been cut 65 percent since 1981. None of us would argue that these programs should not bear their fair share of budget cuts. But 65 percent?

If other federal spending had been cut so deeply, there would be no deficit today.

Although their final 1987 budget proposals have not been formally released, it's well known what these anti-housing zealots aim to do next. And I know the NAHB shares my deep shock at what we have heard.

They want to double the downpayment required for FHA and VA mortgages.

They want to cap the income level to qualify for an FHA loan at \$40,000.

They want to limit Ginnie Mae's guarantee to only 80 percent, instead of 100 percent, of a loan.

They want to further cut HUD's budget for low-income housing assistance.

They want to gut rural housing.

They want to impose a confiscatory tax on government sponsored housing enterprises, a tax that would hit especially hard at Fannie Mae.

They even had the audacity to float the idea of selling FHA, which is the same thing as abolishing it. Fortunately, that balloon was quickly popped. But don't think you've heard the last of that FHA proposal. These people are tenacious. Even though we defeated their housing tax proposal last year, they are right back with an even more destructive housing tax this year.

The consequences of their attack, if successful, would be disastrous for millions of potential home buyers.

By capping the income requirement at \$40,000 for FHA buyers, they would eliminate about one-third of the people who bought homes through FHA last year.

By reducing the Ginnie Mae guarantee to 80 percent, they would—in the words of Warren Lasko, one of the most knowledgeable experts on Ginnie Mae in this country: "absolutely pull the rug out from under the Ginnie Mae program."

And who would be hurt by the tax on Fannie Mae? Not a rich home buyer. No buyers of \$200,000 homes need worry. The average size of the home loans we purchased in 1985 was about \$50,000. The average size of a loan in our portfolio and in MBS pools is about \$40,000. Those are not the mortgages of rich people. They are the mortgages of American families Fannie Mae was created to serve.

What would happen to these families if this tax were enacted?

OMB itself admits this tax would cost Fannie Mae more than \$1 billion over the next five years. Whether we pass that cost on or not, this would signal the end of Fannie Mae's ability to provide affordable mortgage money to home buyers.

Why are these OMB bureaucrats making such reckless proposals? Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are not part of the federal budget. These enterprises cost the taxpayer nothing.

No, what the elitists seek to do is to put into law their antihousing bias under cover of the deficit reduction package. That way, they can avoid careful consideration of these radical changes in housing policy in open forums established for this purpose, such as the Senate and House banking committees.

The OMB assault against housing is so bitter and so far-reaching, one is tempted to ask:

Where do these elitists live?

Have they never had to buy a house through FHA, or VA, or a Fannie Mae approved lender?

Obviously, they have not driven a nail, used a mason's trowel, or spliced a joint. Nor have they stood with you in a barren field with the blueprints for homes to be built for Americans because there is an FHA, a VA, a Ginnie Mae, a Fannie Mae.

I would wager that none of them would be moved by a passage from Russell Baker's book, "Growing Up," in which he simply and eloquently sums up what the dream of a home is all about. He writes:

"I'd never seen my mother more radiantly happy than the day we moved in. The house was on Maryland Road in the Irvington section of Baltimore. For my mother it was that 'home of our own' she had talked about from my earliest memory. It was the place of permanence, the permanence embodied for her in the word 'home.' She was to live there for the next 35 years."

That's what our business is all about—giving Americans a chance to fulfill one of the most important parts of the American dream. No other part of that dream is shared so widely by Americans. From the first wave of immigrants who came to industrialize America, to the new generation of Americans that is computerizing her, the common dream was and is that of Mrs. Baker: "to have a home of our own, a place of permanence."

In this country, as nowhere else in the world, we have shaped our political will to make certain that the opportunity for homeownership is not just for a privileged few. We have forged a public-private partnership to put homeownership within reach of most Americans. It has transformed a nation of immigrants into a nation of homeowners.

Before the partnership was formed, only 44 percent of American families could claim homeownership, out of a population of 130 million. Now—only 50 years later—65 percent claim that homeownership, out of a population of 235 million.

And it is not just the fact that they own a home, it's the kind of home they own. Its size, its amenities, its materials—all those things that you—the builders—put into the American home to make it the envy of the world.

As keepers of the American housing dream, we together must stop the ideological assault on homeownership. The halls of Congress should rock with our protest on behalf of half a century of bringing homeownership to Americans.

BUDGET HYSTERIA: A COLOSSAL MYTHOLOGY

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, so much has been written and said about budget deficits and how to reduce them that I am sure few, if any, Americans are sure of just what is the best way to proceed.

It is for this reason that I am pleased to share with my colleagues at this point in the RECORD the column by Robert J. Samuelson which appeared in the Wednesday, January 29, 1986, Washington Post. His restraint and lucidity are refreshing, especially in contrast to much of the rhetoric which has assailed us from all sides in recent months.

I commend Mr. Samuelson's commentary to my colleagues, and hope that his cogent views will be given the careful consideration they deserve.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE MYTHOLOGY OF DEFICITS

It's budget time again. Washington has resumed its obsession with budget deficits. You will hear much that is confusing and wrong. The foremost myth is this: Closing the deficits requires a massive retrenchment of government or huge tax increases. Don't believe it. The truth is that a combination of modest tax increases, selective cutbacks in domestic spending and a further slowdown of the defense buildup would shrink the deficits quickly.

Deficits have become a stubborn political problem only because we have made them so. Deflating the deficits involves paying a little more, receiving a little less. It's a thunderstorm, not a typhoon. You never would know it from Washington's clamor and clatter. Deficits have created a high-pitched political schizophrenia. Closing them is essential, but doing so would be unbearably painful. Debate over Gramm-Rudman-Hollings—the law that supposedly requires a balanced budget by 1991—simply has raised the rhetorical hysteria to new heights.

Politics is about conflict and choice. The conflicts and choices engaged by the deficits are relatively ordinary. Compare them with some landmark legislative events of our era: passage of the Civil Rights Act (1964), Medicare (1965) and the environmental legislation of the 1970s. All these involved basic changes in the ways the nation conducts its affairs. Can the same be said of trimming guaranteed student college loans—to cite one proposed spending cut—or raising taxes 6 percent?

From the outset, budget deficits have inspired a colossal mythology. Consider:

Myth. President Reagan created the deficits by cutting taxes and raising defense spending.

Reality. Any president would have faced unpopular choices. By the late 1970s, the budget had reached a political impasse. In 1979, defense spending was the lowest proportion of gross national product since 1948. Taxes were at postwar highs. Interest expenses on the federal debt were held down by undesirably low—inflationary—interest rates. An aging population and high health care costs were raising Social Security and Medicare spending automatically. The consensus was to raise defense spending and reduce inflation. President Reagan's agenda sharpened the conflicts, but he did not create them. Even with his tax cut, the tax burden in 1985 equaled the 1970s' average.

Myth. High budget deficits caused high interest rates, leading to the dollar's high exchange rate and the huge trade deficit.

Reality. The 1980's high interest rates mainly reflect a deliberate decision by the Federal Reserve to raise rates to halt the 1970s' inflation. Rates rose well before large deficits emerged. A study by economist Frederic Mishkin of Columbia University attributes most of the rate rise to Federal Reserve policy. Economists Lawrence Summers of Harvard University and Olivier Blanchard of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology found that the Federal Reserve triggered the higher rates, although deficits played a role after 1982. Reducing budget deficits might provide some rate relief, but relatively high interest rates may be a necessary antidote to inflation.

Myth. Cutting the deficits requires draconian tax increases or spending cuts.

Reality. They would be draconian only if spending cuts or tax increases absorbed the full burden of deficit reduction. By contrast, consider a combination. A 25-cent-a-gallon oil excise tax would raise about \$50 billion;

the tax increase would be between 5 and 7 percent, and—with oil prices falling—might not raise retail prices. Higher cigarette and alcohol taxes could yield \$5 billion. Another \$30 billion could be saved by eliminating less important domestic programs (examples: Amtrak, the Small Business Administration), imposing user fees for some government services and freezing for a year the cost-of-living adjustments for Social Security and other retirement programs. A defense slowdown could produce between \$20 billion and \$30 billion in savings.

Any packages of more than \$100 billion of spending cuts and tax increases actually would yield larger deficit reductions. Why? First, it would lower government borrowing and interest expenses. And second, taxes already are increasing slightly faster than spending. No one pretends the necessary changes are painless, but bipartisan posturing has exaggerated the pain. Reagan portrays any tax increase as a catastrophe. Congressional Democrats wildly accuse the president of trying to gut all social legislation since the New Deal.

Common sense is the main reason for dealing with the deficits. They are no way to run a government. Their evils are long term, and they are as much political as economic. Uncorrected, deficits become worse as interest expenses accumulate. The longer this continues, the more wrenching the political decisions necessary to reduce the deficits. The political stalemate erodes public esteem for government. And, sooner or later, persistent deficits risk either reduced investment or, because the Federal Reserve would create money to cover the deficits, renewed inflation.

But it matters how deficits are reduced. Mindless spending cuts, as ordained by Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, could cripple many worthy government programs. No spending cuts could result in crippling tax increases. Deficits are not unmanageable, but the first step to managing them is to regain perspective. They are more than a molehill, but a lot less than a mountain.

SALT II ENHANCES PROSPECTS FOR ARMS CONTROL

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last month I sent a letter to the President encouraging his continued adherence to SALT II in 1986 beyond the expiration date of December 31, 1985.

Yesterday I received a formal and positive response from the Department of State which I would like to share with my colleagues.

In this letter the administration wisely reiterates the President's view that success in Geneva is enhanced by continued adherence by both superpowers to existing strategic arms agreements.

Furthermore, in stating that "Our position on SALT II is . . . we will live under its agreements and not violate them," the administration has wisely rejected the ill-advised counsel of the Department of Defense to respond to Soviet violations of SALT II with United States violations of that treaty.

Earlier this month, our distinguished colleague, Congressman LEE HAMILTON, wrote a

very important editorial which appeared in the January 16 *Christian Science Monitor* on the need to preserve U.S. adherence to the SALT II Treaty. Representative HAMILTON points out that while official U.S. policy is not to undercut the SALT II agreement, there are elements in the administration pushing to "scrap" the treaty.

He goes on to explain a number of reasons why continued adherence to the treaty is our interest, including the fact that the treaty establishes equal limits on bombers and missiles, freezes the number of allowed warheads per missile and restricts Soviet land-based missiles which are of most concern to the United States.

Representative HAMILTON reminds us that charges of Soviet noncompliance with the treaty are best dealt with through private diplomatic channels such as the Standing Consultative Commission [SCC] which was designed for this very purpose. Based on his analysis of the issue, Representative HAMILTON concludes that while the Soviets have pushed the SALT II Treaty to the limits, their actions "do not constitute massive violations that suggest a Soviet effort to break out of the treaty."

I would agree with my colleague that without SALT II we would face an accelerated arms race and increased tensions between the superpowers. We also are much more likely to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union in the ongoing arms control negotiations in Geneva if we maintain our adherence to SALT II and build off that important agreement.

The text of the letter from the Department of State and Representative HAMILTON's editorial follow.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC, January 28, 1986.

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing you as a follow-up to Mr. Oglesby's letter on SALT II of January 2, 1986. First let me add the Department's thanks for your support of the President's decision of last June. There is no question that the wise and constructive leadership you have demonstrated as Chairman is vital to the effective conduct of our country's foreign affairs, including our arms control policies.

As you know, the President determined last June that it is in our interest to work toward the establishment of an interim framework of truly mutual restraint on strategic offensive arms as we pursue at Geneva our goal of real reductions in nuclear arsenals. The United States will continue to refrain from undercutting existing strategic arms agreements to the extent that the Soviet Union exercises comparable restraint and provided that the Soviet Union actively pursues arms reduction agreements in Geneva. This remains our policy.

The United States cannot establish this framework alone. We have called upon the Soviet Union to take concrete, positive steps to correct their noncompliance with existing arms control agreements, and halt or substantially reduce their massive military buildup. We will reserve the right to take appropriate and proportionate responses to Soviet noncompliance as necessary in order to deny the military benefits of these viola-

tions to the Soviet Union and assure the national security of the U.S. and our Allies.

Our position on SALT II is that we have indicated we will live under its agreements and not violate them. Until we say differently, the policy remains the same. The December 31, 1985, date for the expiring of SALT II had no effect on this policy.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. BALL III,
Assistant Secretary, Legislative
and Intergovernmental Affairs.

WHY U.S. SHOULD CONTINUE TO ADHERE TO SALT II

(By Lee H. Hamilton)

The future of the unratified SALT II Treaty, which has limited United States and Soviet nuclear forces since 1979, is unclear. The Reagan administration is divided. Some officials want to scrap SALT II, but the President announced last June that the US would follow a "no undercut" policy of adhering to treaty limits so long as the Soviet Union "exercise comparable restraint." This is still official policy.

The President also said that the US would study "proportionate responses" to what it views as the military consequences of Soviet violations of arms agreements. With the expiration of SALT II on Dec. 31, 1985, the US may decide to pursue arms programs that breach treaty limits. Such a decision could end all restraints on US and Soviet nuclear forces.

There are several reasons the US should continue to adhere to the terms of SALT II. This conclusion is shared by a recent study by the Arms Control Association, "Countdown on SALT II."

First, SALT II establishes equal limits on bombers and missiles and freezes the number of allowed warheads per missile. It establishes restrictive sublimits on Soviet land-based missiles, which concern the US the most. Every time the Soviets introduce a new missile, they are obligated under SALT to retire one as well. According to the Arms Control Association, the Soviet Union removed 1,007 land-based missiles and 233 sea-based missiles from its active force and dismantled 13 submarines during 1972-85 to comply with SALT II limits. Past Soviet practices suggest that without SALT II much of this hardware would still be in operation.

Second, SALT II is in the US interests because Soviet missile production lines remain open. According to open testimony by the Central Intelligence Agency, the Soviets could add 12,000 new warheads by the mid-1990s—more than doubling their present force—if they broke out of SALT II. The Soviets could also put up to 20 or 30 warheads on each "heavy" missile, giving them a much greater capacity to attack US targets. It is unlikely that the US could keep pace without enormous spending increases.

Third, the end of SALT II and a renewed missile race would likely eliminate the possibility of developing a successful US space-based missile defense. This is the conclusion of the congressional Office of Technology Assessment. The Reagan administration implicitly acknowledges this in its proposal for deep missile cuts as part of its proposal for the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). Without missile limits, SDI cannot work; without SALT II there would be none.

Fourth, the end of SALT II would free the Soviets to adopt camouflage and deception techniques, now prohibited under SALT, to hide military activities.

Finally, serious political consequences are likely if SALT II is abandoned. The Geneva talks would suffer a big setback. So would the broader US-Soviet relationship. The end of SALT II would be deeply divisive in Congress and would lead to serious differences within NATO, strengthening Soviet efforts to split the alliance.

The crux of the argument against SALT II focuses on alleged Soviet violations of the treaty. First, the US contends that the Soviets have introduced two new types of land-based missiles, the SS-24 and SS-25, whereas SALT II permits only one. The Soviets declare that the SS-25 is a permitted modernization of the SS-13. The US disputes this, charging that the Soviets have violated SALT II by concealing SS-25 tests. This question is unresolved.

Second, the US accuses the Soviets of encoding missile test-flight data necessary for verification purposes. This charge is certainly true, but the US has refused to specify the missile test data it needs for verification, fearing possible compromise of intelligence sources and methods. This violation is, therefore, less than clear cut.

Third, a new US charge is that the Soviets have deployed launchers in excess of SALT II limits. Others question this, since the US has delayed working out agreed procedures under SALT II for dismantling Soviet bombers. A further US charge, concerning the banned SS-16 missile, has been downgraded in view of Soviet steps that seem to have resolved the issue.

It is my belief that the Soviets have pushed the SALT II Treaty to the limit. Charges of Soviet noncompliance are serious matters concerning gray areas of treaty interpretation, but they do not constitute massive violations that suggest a Soviet effort to break out of the treaty. Our response should not be to renounce SALT II but to draft more careful treaty language in the future and to press our present concerns through the private diplomatic channels of the Standing Consultative Commission created for this purpose. We should pursue our complaints in a manner that keeps the treaty intact. Compliance issues must be handled with accuracy and care, because, if exaggerated, they will destroy any prospects for a new agreement and undermine all existing agreements.

Sticking with SALT II serves US interests, as the current debate demonstrates. Without SALT II, we are likely to experience an accelerated arms race, greater uncertainty about Soviet intentions, and an escalation of tension between the superpowers. We will be less secure. With SALT II, we will be able to preserve important constraints on Soviet weapons, improve our ability to resolve questions about Soviet compliance, and increase prospects for future arms agreements at Geneva. Few choices are so clear cut.

A GOAL IS NOT A QUOTA

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, there has been much confusion of late with regard to the Federal Government's affirmative action policy. News reports indicate that Attorney General Meese is quarrelling with other high ranking administration officials over Executive Order 11246. Mr. Meese implies

that the Federal Government's current policy somehow involves the use of quotas when employing minority contractors and businesses doing work for the Government. Is Mr. Meese correct?

I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention an article by the Washington representative of the American Jewish Committee, Mr. Hyman Bookbinder. Mr. Bookbinder lays to rest some of the misconceptions surrounding Executive Order 11246. This article appeared in the January 27 Washington Times. Apparently the Washington Times is part of President Reagan's daily reading. Let's hope he did not miss this perceptive piece.

The article follows:

IS THE REAL ISSUE QUOTAS?

(By Hyman Bookbinder)

Confusion continues to surround the issue of affirmative action—especially the issue of goals and quotas. President Reagan soon may act on a proposal before him which could have a major impact on where this nation goes in its commitment to equal opportunity. His decision, if based on facts rather than fears and distortions, should be rejection of the proposal.

The proposal, urged by Attorney General Edwin Meese, is to change an executive order supported by every president and secretary of labor and attorney general in the past 25 years—and that includes Republican presidents Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford. The executive order was based on a simple but critical premise: federal contractors and federal agencies should set an example for all American society by taking appropriate action to assure equality of opportunity in employment regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin—and, subsequently, sex.

In 1971, Mr. Nixon's secretary of labor, George Shultz—currently Mr. Reagan's secretary of state—determined that among "appropriate" actions was the setting of "goals and timetables" for contractors doing business with the federal government. Because of the widespread misinterpretations and confusion about this concept—including the piece by Victor Riesel on Jan. 21—it is important to study carefully the precise language of the regulation issued under the executive order during the Nixon-Shultz administration:

"The goals and timetables developed by the contractor should be attainable in terms of the contractor's analysis of its deficiencies and its entire affirmative action program. . . . The contractor should consider the results which could reasonably be expected from its putting forth every good faith effort to make its overall affirmative action work. . . ."

And to make sure that contractors understand these requirements, the regulation goes on to state unambiguously:

"Goals may not be rigid and inflexible quotas which must be met, but must be targets reasonably attainable by means of applying every good faith effort. . . ."

In the years prior to this 1971 mandating of goals—not quotas—affirmative action had come to mean primarily programs directed at improved training and retraining, at more effective recruitment procedures, at evaluation of testing methods, and encouragement of nondiscriminatory policies. While these have brought about some positive results, a consensus developed in both government circles and in the civil rights community that more progress was both needed and

possible—and that such progress required the setting of reasonable, realistic targets.

Such targets would serve twin purposes: (1) as a measuring rod for goals set by the employer based upon careful analysis of the available labor market, and (2) thereby as a prod for recalcitrant or indifferent labor managers.

That this system of goals and timetables has not become a de facto quota system—i.e., one in which given numbers or percentages of workers of a given racial or other group *must* be hired—is perhaps most forcefully demonstrated in the fact that in the last five years only two cases have resulted in contractors being punished for failing to meet their goals. In the overwhelming majority of cases, in fact, the goals were not reached, but did serve to improve past performance. Good faith effort is the criterion for compliance.

There have been tens of thousands of "goals" programs administered by contractors and also by public agencies. It would be absurd to argue that never in all these cases has a goal been distorted into a de facto quota. I surely do not. Either out of ignorance or defiance or overzealousness, here and there a hiring officer will in effect be engaged in a quota operation. What major program—tax collection, defense costs, environmental laws—is entirely free of abuse?

The answer to such abuse is more rigid administration, and punishment of the abusers. The answer is not to throw the proverbial baby out with the bathwater.

I have testified on numerous occasions on this question before congressional bodies. Each time I have challenged critics of the goals program to cite reliable studies to sustain the charge that goals have generally become quotas. There is no such study.

There is a quota issue with which the courts are now dealing. There are some cases where the courts have made findings of conscious discrimination—primarily affecting employees of local jurisdictions—and have approved the use of quotas to correct such proved discrimination.

But the present argument over the attorney general's plans to change the executive order is not about quotas. That order now prohibits such quotas. The proposed change would ban goals, and thus set back the cause of affirmative action seriously.

Small wonder then that a most impressive array of opponents of Mr. Meese's proposal has developed. Small wonder that the White House has delayed action—given the size and the nature of the opposition:

Sixty-nine U.S. senators and more than 200 representatives have asked the president not to change the order—including Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole and House Minority Leader Robert H. Michel.

Labor Secretary William Brock and Secretary of State George Shultz, plus at least five other Cabinet members, say "no" to the proposed change.

The National Association of Manufacturers, the Business Roundtable, and the New York Chamber of Commerce are spearheading a business effort against the Meese proposal.

Finally, and closed to home, a word about the American Jewish community. Perhaps no other segment in American life is more opposed to quotas. We have suffered too much from them in the past. But despite the one organization cited by Victor Riesel, the Jewish community is overwhelmingly united in support of affirmative action, including the judicious and prudent use of goals and timetable—the present system.

WITH THE CONTRAS

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, even in the era of Gramm-Rudman, some would like to spend fresh millions to subsidize the depredations of the "Contras" in Nicaragua. Before we vote to appropriate another dollar for this purpose, we should take a hard look at what our funds have purchased so far. It is a grim record indeed, as Christopher Dickey's book, "With the Contras: A Reporter in the Wilds of Nicaragua," amply demonstrates.

Abraham Brumberg's review of Mr. Dickey's book was published in the New York Times Book Review for January 26, 1986. I commend it to the attention of all Members of the House.

CLIMATE OF AN UNDECLARED WAR

(By Abraham Brumberg)

The story of the anti-Sandinista guerrillas, the so-called contras, once a rag-tag band of 500 survivors of Anastasio Somoza's notorious National Guard of Nicaragua, now a force of more than 15,000 men—well-equipped, professionally trained and energetically looked after by its foreign patrons—is well worth telling. Until about two years ago the Sandinistas, keen on depriving their enemies of any claim to legitimacy, were apt to dismiss the contras as either mercenaries or diehard "Somocistas." Champions of the contras, on the other hand, above all President Reagan, often consider them lineal descendants of America's Founding Fathers, valiant freedom fighters determined to deliver their countrymen from the tyrannical reign of Communist totalitarianism. While few people give credence to the Sandinista version—and indeed while the Sandinistas themselves have become increasingly realistic in their assessment of the rebels—the far more extravagant claims for them of the Reagan Administration continue to flourish.

Christopher Dickey, a reporter who covered Central America for The Washington Post from January 1980 to September 1983, set out to provide an account of the contras that would steer clear of the tendentious images fostered by their friends and adversaries alike. For nearly six years he collected firsthand evidence from the insurgents in the jungles of Nicaragua, Honduras and Costa Rica, and from their spokesmen in Miami. He interviewed American officials, as well as representatives of the Sandinista National Liberation Front, Nicaragua's ruling party. And he spent several dangerous and grueling weeks in the spring of 1983 with one of the rebel groups in northern Nicaragua.

For some reason—I might as well register my objection at the outset—Mr. Dickey chose to present his findings in the form neither of a straightforward narrative nor of a thematically organized essay, but rather in the vein of a grade-B thriller, replete with the mannerisms characteristic of the genre—abrupt and bewildering cuts from one incident to another; lurid passages; far-fetched similes and metaphors ("He could strike chords of abandonment, tune her passion for revenge," and the like)—all of it odd for a writer whose prose I have always found lucid and elegant.

Yet it would be a mistake to dismiss the book because of its stylistic solecisms. With all its flaws, it succeeds better than any account I have seen in capturing the sordid climate of the undeclared war in which thus far nearly 12,000 Nicaraguans have lost their lives, and in tracing its bloody, convoluted history. (All of his sources are scrupulously listed, chapter by chapter.) Mr. Dickey's views will not necessarily please the Sandinistas, but they will also certainly provide no comfort to their foes, either in Central America or in the United States. The contra commanders, he writes—many of them former "Somocistas," others blood relations of former National Guardsmen—are men addicted to violence. Their brutality is indiscriminate—their victims include Government officials (health workers, agricultural specialists, teachers, all carefully selected targets for torture, rape and murder), rank-and-file soldiers in the Sandinista armed forces, few of them lucky enough to remain alive when taken prisoner, and local campesinos suspected of sympathizing with the Sandinistas. Though the rebel groups have been brought together into one organization (UNO, an acronym for United Nicaraguan Opposition), they remain for all intents and purposes semi-independent, each one headed by a minor caudillo bent on exacting total loyalty from his disciples (including many women) and prone to bouts of murderous fury at the slightest sign of insubordination.

Mr. Dickey's portraits of these men, "who loved to kill," many of them bearing grim noms de guerre ("Suicida," "Cancer," "El Muerto"), reveal a world where political commitment is indistinguishable from the need to flaunt one's *machismo*, and where personal jealousies among the various commanders often erupt into bloody vendettas. Many Nicaraguans, including former Sandinistas, have joined the contras—some under coercion, others out of conviction, some because of rumbling stomachs, other who feared the expropriation of their farms, and some who wanted to escape a political climate that increasingly blurs the distinction between counterrevolution and legitimate dissent. They soon find themselves swept into the "freedom fighters" vortex of mayhem and corruption. Many decide to stay. Yet those who want to leave find it nearly impossible: the penalties for attempted desertion are savage. Mr. Dickey's description of some of these incidents (including a particularly sickening description of El Muerto cutting the throat of a 13-year-old "deserter") is often based on the testimony of those few who have managed to escape, but it is altogether in keeping with the reports of various human rights organizations on the subject. (See, for instance, the Americas Watch Report, "Human Rights in Nicaragua," New York, July 1985.)

Are the leaders of the contras—in Honduras, Miami or Washington—aware of these atrocities? Mr. Dickey's book leaves no doubt about it. The manual "Psychological Operations in Guerrilla Warfare," prepared at the behest of the Central Intelligence Agency for use by the contras—to which Mr. Dickey devotes several pages—was produced, in Mr. Dickey's words, "to keep 'implicit and explicit terror' under control." Killings are discussed in the sections of the manual dealing with advice about the way the rebels can best "neutralize carefully selected and planned targets," which clearly refers to assassinations or executions of civilians, and in the section on the creation of "a 'martyr' for the cause" (in the English translation

published by Vintage Books, 1985). The most prominent contra military leader who openly proclaimed his revulsion for these practices, and who has refused to make common cause with the "Somocista" leaders of the Nicaraguan Democratic Force (F.D.N.—the largest of the contra groups) is Edén Pastora Gómez, one of the heroes of the 1979 uprising. Unfortunately, Mr. Pastora, for all his hatred of the former Guardsmen, emerges from Mr. Dickey's description as little better than his right-wing competitors—boastful, eager for personal power and glory, ready to be financed by the C.I.A., only to be abandoned by it when he could no longer provide the promised army to overthrow his former comrades and refused to merge his guerrillas with those of the Democratic Force. Mr. Dickey does not discuss extensively the role of Arturo Cruz, former Nicaraguan Ambassador to the United States under the Sandinistas. Mr. Cruz, whom he calls one of "the best minds of the revolution," once worked with Mr. Pastora and denounced the extreme behavior of the Democratic Force. Today, Mr. Cruz is one of the principal leaders and spokesmen of UNO, the rebel guerrillas' umbrella organization. On the other hand, as Mr. Dickey points out, a former contra leader, Edgar Chamorro, a member of the Democratic Force Directorate, has quit the contras in disgust over the atrocities and cynical manipulations of the C.I.A.

Mr. Dickey's book is most valuable on the American role in organizing, directing and selling the not-so-secret "secret war" to Congress and the American public. At first managed by a small collection of men drawn from several Government agencies and known as the Core Group (composed, as one of its members told Mr. Dickey with unconscious irony, exclusively of "hardliners" and "ideologues"), the war's handling was eventually turned over entirely to the C.I.A. Operatives of the C.I.A., with plenty of cash available, fanned out to Honduras and Costa Rica to train rebel forces in the use of sophisticated weapons (at first with the help of the Argentine military before the Falklands War) and to bribe scores of local newspaper reporters and radio broadcasters into praising the virtues of the contras and calling for the overthrow of the Nicaraguan Government. As Mr. Dickey shows, when the rebels proved unequal to the task, the C.I.A. began to stage its own operations, using Latin American employees known as "unilaterally controlled Latino assets." Once these operations—attacks on Nicaraguan ports and oil refineries, and the mining of several harbors in January 1984—had been executed, the Democratic Force would be "instructed" to claim responsibility, though it had not even been informed of the C.I.A.'s plans beforehand.

What emerges most starkly from Mr. Dickey's account is that, despite the reservations of some American officials, Mr. Reagan and his closest advisers (including the head of the C.I.A., William Casey) were from the very start determined to pursue policies aimed at overthrowing the Nicaraguan Government. Claims that the purpose of providing funds to the rebels was to interdict the flow of weapons to the Salvadoran insurgents (for which, as Mr. Dickey notes, no persuasive evidence has been produced since 1981) were unalloyed lies. So were the declarations, repeatedly made to Congress, that the contras were to be used merely to wrest political concessions from the Sandinistas. As one C.I.A. "briefer" told Mr. Dickey: "Nobody wanted to say they [the

contras] were going to overthrow them. But obviously that was the idea."

Now into its fifth year, the war goes on, and no end is in sight. Though the rebels have been unable to capture and hold a single slice of Nicaraguan territory—apparently much to the dismay of the C.I.A., whose scenario envisioned the establishment of a provisional government on Nicaraguan soil, which would be promptly recognized by the United States and openly provided with massive military aid—the Administration shows no sign of abandoning its long-term objective. And while some members of Congress would prefer to call a halt to the war and explore a diplomatic solution to the conflict, their views are stymied by most of their colleagues, who seem to want it both ways—not to provide the contras with lethal aid, but to keep them well supplied with food, clothing and medicine. It is a compromise that will clearly bring neither peace nor a military victory.

In the meantime, the Sandinista reign, as Mr. Dickey points out, is becoming "ever more onerous." The state of emergency, which—as he notes—was introduced in March 1982 only after the first serious attacks by the contras and which was noticeably relaxed on the eve of the November 1984 elections—has recently been strengthened again. A draft law passed in 1983 has driven many young men into the arms of the contras. The conflict with the Roman Catholic hierarchy (much of which openly sympathizes with the cause of the contras) is escalating. Tens of thousands of independent farmers in northern Nicaragua have been forcibly relocated. The country's economy is tottering and popular dissatisfaction is growing. Whether the Sandinistas would have become more oppressive anyway is a moot—and unanswerable—question. Like any other species of determinism—Hegelianism, Marxism, or the once fashionable domino theory—the assumption that the Sandinistas are bound to become totalitarian rests on ideological dogma than on verifiable evidence. What is undisputable, however, is that the Reagan Administration fully understands that its policy contributes to the spiral of repression and violence. Mr. Dickey paraphrases the mood of official Washington: "In Nicaragua, if the C.I.A.'s operations meant the Sandinistas became more radical, more oppressive and more Soviet-allied, that was all to the good."

GUATEMALA: THE WINDS OF CHANGE

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, on January 14, the Central American nation of Guatemala celebrated the inauguration of Vinicio Cerezo as its first democratically elected civilian President in almost 30 years.

This event should be welcomed by all Americans, in the broadest sense of that term, for it represents a triumph both of the democratic process and of the personal courage of one man.

Political moderation, the safest course in much of the world, has frequently proven fatal in Guatemala. In recent decades, violence has robbed hundreds of thousands of people of their homes and tens of thousands of their

lives. Social, economic, and political injustice led to the creation of a small armed opposition; which provoked, in turn, intense military terror; generating even greater desperation among Guatemala's poor majority; leading by the early 1980's to virtual civil war.

Guatemala's political extremes owe much to each other. They have provided the rationale for each other's violence; they respond to each other's rhetoric; and together they all but eliminated, geographically and politically, Guatemala's middle ground.

The election of Vinicio Cerezo is an indication that Guatemala can change, and demonstration, as well, that social and political reform can at least begin—even in Guatemala—through democratic means. Following several attempts on his life, Vinicio Cerezo had every excuse to leave Guatemala; he had every excuse to quit politics; he had every reason—out of desperation—to adopt violent means of inducing political change. Instead, Cerezo stayed; vowing with his party never to resort to violence, and never to be destroyed by violence.

Below is the English language text of the extraordinary address presented by President Cerezo on that most extraordinary of occasions, the inauguration in Guatemala of a civilian President. I urge all Members of Congress to read this speech, to consider what it has to say about past and present events, and to join with Cerezo in helping to make the democratic process in his country a success.

INAUGURAL SPEECH BY LICENCIADO MARCO VINICIO CEREZO AZREVALO, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF GUATEMALA

Fellow Guatemalans, the Honorable President of Congress, the Honorable Presidents of our fellow nations; Distinguished representatives of other allied countries; Distinguished representatives of International Organizations; Friends from around the world who visit us on this occasion. . . .

I address you today as a friend who is among his friends, as a brother among his brothers, as someone who shares the joy of those around him because today marks the day on which we Guatemalans have come home.

It is not Vinicio Cerezo who is being sworn into office as President of Guatemala. That is a technicality. The fundamental importance of this moment is that the citizenry of Guatemala as a whole is taking office and regaining control of its government.

We had been cast out of our own home as a result of painful and even absurd historical forces. Today is the occasion of our return to it.

For years we were forbidden free speech, and many of us were persecuted for speaking out. But now we have our freedom of speech again.

It became traditional for us to be told what to do and how to do it, and it never occurred to anyone in power to ask if we favored or opposed what the government decided—whether it was consistent with the culture of our community, our village, our region, our organizations, and compatible with our outlook and goals, our historic social traditions or our beliefs. Today we have recovered the right to be part of the political process.

Many of us came to feel like foreigners in our own nation. But now we can call this land ours once more.

Now that we have come home; now that we know that each group, each community, and each of us individually has recovered his rightful role in the political process; now that, as members of a democracy, we have again assumed our responsibility for taking part in shaping our national policies; now that each of us has become aware that he has recovered his right to influence events and be one more voice in a vibrant chorus of diverse opinions; to summarize, upon finding that each and every one of us is assuming, through the ballot box, a role in guiding the nation's future...

What do we find? What shape is our house in? In what condition is the land being returned to us? How is it reflected through the implacable yardstick of history? How should we tally—today, here and now—our sorrows and our hopes? What is the real face of our beloved Guatemala as it is being turned over once more to its people?

Undertaking together a thoughtful and sober analysis of the situation is essential, for an accurate understanding of our circumstances and our needs is a must, in order to develop and implement realistic solutions.

There are two aspects to the diagnosis we must develop. We must strive to understand Guatemala on the one hand with our heads and at the same time with our hearts.

Clearly we cannot dispense with a thorough technical analysis of what had been happening to us, what is happening to us now, and what could happen to us as a people, as a nation and as a region in the absence of drastic corrective steps.

Although the picture which the facts reveal is a painful one, making all Guatemalans understand exactly where we stand is important.

Our present crisis occurred in part because of general lack of information on the state of the country—a situation which, far from being coincidental, was the result of a carefully mounted campaign of deception and concealment.

There are other reasons we must share our information with all Guatemalans. One is that all of us have much to say to each other; there is much we have to learn from each other. And it is because of this that I say we also have to view and understand Guatemala with our hearts—because our only chance of overcoming this terrible crisis is by joining hands—by coming together with a spirit of optimism and a willingness to work, with mutual openness and respect, with a genuine desire to overcome the terrible legacy of distrust and fear burdening us now.

One thing is certain. No incoming head of state has ever had the country turned over to him in worse conditions.

With regard to the governmental process, we find that violence has become the accepted replacement for the traditional procedure of negotiation and compromise. Some Guatemalans, unable to resolve their differences through dialogue, mutual understanding and negotiated agreements, resorted to the absurd and primitive language of physical force and armed reprisal. On thousands of occasions our Guatemalan family found itself in mourning as a result of senseless and cruel violence coming from all sides of the political spectrum.

Some people's resource to violence was an individual decision to turn their backs on the legal process, for they argued that only in this way could they defend their ancestral privileges and prerogatives. Others took up violence because they could find no

other way to vindicate themselves and defend their rights. Others who joined in the violence did so arguing that it was necessary for purposes of maintaining security and order. Finally there were some in powerful positions who resorted to it because in their situation the abuse of power was temptingly easy. Thus they swelled the ranks of the criminals who never respected the right of Guatemalans of all persuasions to live peacefully side by side.

For one reason or another, thousands of Guatemalan lives have been lost in this terrible vortex of fratricidal violence, and hundreds of thousands of us have suffered in one way or another the effects of this general climate of abuse.

At this time, I want to pay tribute to all Guatemalans who became victims of the government policy based on intolerance, desperation and abuse. Our national conscience as a democratic nation owes a debt to those thousands who sacrificed their lives.

At the same time, at this moment when we are united as Guatemalans and look to the future with hope, I also want to render homage to the living, to the long-suffering citizens of Guatemala who have had to bear the principal brunt of the economic and social crisis.

There is no need to go into the international aspects of our crisis in this context. Other experts from both Guatemala and other Latin American countries have written excellent descriptions of the economic injustice from which countries such as ours suffer, and of the devastation caused to our weak economies by the international recession.

Our internal situation, however, we must describe. While the international crisis has indeed, and for reasons we are all aware of, hurt our economy badly, it is also true that the actions of certain Guatemalans have added to the scope of the disaster.

Our economy has suffered from short-sighted decisions, lack of progress, the absence of coherent policies and a clear legal framework. There have been actions motivated by selfishness rather than an interest in bringing the greatest benefits to the largest number of people. At the same time, the administration of government has suffered from the incompetence of some of the men responsible for it.

But these have not been the only problems. Lack of understanding and intolerance have also been present in significant doses. Above all, the absence of morals and principles appears to have become all-pervasive, bringing about wide-spread corruption and encouraging the habitual solution of problems through the abuse of power.

The treasury being turned over to us is empty as a consequence of the mishandling of the nation's finances by previous administrations, and of corruption.

What is being turned over to us is an economic disaster without precedent. Economic activity has fallen, causing a serious balance of payments problem and a significant budget deficit. Savings and investment have decreased, and we have few resources at our disposal to redress these imbalances and be able to adopt a correct economic policy.

No funds are available for developing new government projects, and indeed our revenues are inadequate even for covering the routine expenses of the government.

Our external debt is four times greater than our annual revenue from exports. The commitments we have undertaken in connection with the payment of this debt are

mortgaging the future of our children and grandchildren: already each Guatemalan citizen owes \$320 as his share of the debt.

Too many of our people are jobless. At the same time, Guatemalans with a regular income have watched with helpless anguish as its purchasing power has gradually decreased. Even salary increases have not changed the fact that Guatemalans are able to buy less every day because the value of the currency has progressively dropped and the price of goods increased.

A cold and cruel statistical analysis indicates that, if we divide our national earnings by the number of Guatemalan citizens, each Guatemalan has an average daily income of one Quetzal, with which he must take care of his nutritional, health and housing needs, and pay for education and transportation.

But in real life the situation is even harsher than this picture indicates, for we know that a few Guatemalans have a lot, and many others have nothing.

We are eight million people. Five million of our brothers live in poverty. Even today many of our children die at birth, and only one of every three survivors does not qualify as being legally undernourished. The other two are condemned to poor diet which will not allow their brain to develop to its full potential or their having the minimum strength required to hold a job and go to school. They will be unable to avoid the stigma of being called dumb and lazy by other Guatemalans later in life. Similarly they will be criticized for the lack of hygienic practices to which they never had access, and the standards of behavior and education by which they will be measured were never within their reach.

My fellow Guatemalans, let's look around us to see how many of our sons and daughters have had the opportunity to go to school for the first time this year, and how many of these have been lucky enough to leave their homes with a notebook and a pencil in their hands.

And if the majority of our people live under at best precarious conditions, crueler still is the fact that their right to organize, to express their concerns and defend jointly their rights has been denied to them in recent times. Both the freedom of citizens to come together and the organization which represented them were banned, and many leaders and spokesmen of our people met death or were forced into exile.

Guatemalans: this is the picture of the country being handed back to us today. Such is the home to which we return and which we must now put in order. We have become administrators of bankruptcy and misery.

Our recent history has been characterized by suffering and sacrifice; from it true heroes have emerged. These must be recognized if we are to pay due tribute to the memory of our dead and particularly to the spirit of self-denial of the survivors of the crisis. The heroes I refer to are the Guatemalans who live in poverty, forgotten and, although physically alive, suffering the slow death which neglect inexorably brings. I want to pay tribute, too, to the many citizens compelled by outside forces to leave their homes—some even to emigrate to foreign territories. Men and women who have suffered the inexpressible pain of seeing loved ones fall deserve special mention as well.

We feel the deepest respect and concern for those who have borne the brunt of the economic crisis, to those anonymous individuals who swell the statistics of hunger, mal-

nutrition, ignorance and unemployment. To that vast majority of our brothers, in summary, who have suffered the bulk of the sacrifices so that the rest of us could live better, and who have had to bear so much suffering in this country—as much theirs as ours—of such abundance.

That is the debt which, now that we have become a democracy, we must pay back. We can best acknowledge their heroism and integrity by pledging to change conditions so that each Guatemalan may have a genuine opportunity to participate in a democratic decision-making process, and above all so that he may have a claim to a share of the benefits of that development.

Today, when we come back to our home, we grab the challenge of this new opportunity; we see our country with our heads and with our hearts; we study our country with scientific tools as well as with our conscience; we gain insight into our country with admiration and love, we thank our country and we imagine our country rising with enthusiasm and without bitterness; we dream our country with hope and courage, elbow to elbow, all of us together in the free flight of our democratic choice, wanting to build rather than to destroy; to contribute rather than to demand; to give each other a chance rather than to call to judgment; to allow us the opportunity to rectify more than to resort to revenge.

We come back to our home to refurbish it, to improve it, to set it straight, to make sure that even if we have too many things to do, we will do it together.

That even if the efforts awaiting for us are enormous, we will face them together.

That however much austerity and sacrifice the road before us may exact, we will walk the road together.

Then, even if we have almost nothing, the little that we have will be truly for everyone to share.

And that those of us who have been favored with the privileges and advantages of our uneven growth, will be willing to accept as fair, the load that is ours.

This is the kind of development that we must foster: a joint effort aimed not merely at increasing the availability of goods and services and not only at increasing production. All that is necessary and will be properly encouraged, but is not enough. That may very well be economic growth but it is not development.

We must foster a kind of development that will improve the living conditions of the people, making it possible to earn the resources to provide for themselves and bringing this about through projects which show respect for the values and aspirations of the community. A kind of development whose cornerstone will be man, not as an isolated individual but as human being.

Let's not make the mistake of thinking that building our country means only filling it with roads, buildings, factories and houses. Building our country should also include the search for our unity in our diversity, the rediscovery and knowledge of our rich ethnic heritage, the strengthening of our character, the improvement of our moral values and our cultural level. For us, putting our house in order must necessarily include winning a war against poverty, providing dignified employment to men and women, and feeding our children; it must also include wiping out intolerance and establishing clear and precise rules for the path we are to follow. To summarize, it should mean viewing development from a social point of view, and sustaining above all

the principles of welfare of the whole and respect for human dignity.

WHICH IS OUR GREAT CHALLENGE?

Above all, we have a country to be built. The project before us is nothing less than the creation of a nation. And the magnitude and complexity of the problems, far from frightening us, stimulate us and increase our enthusiasm. Because there is much before us to be discovered, and much before us to do.

In this context, democracy means an effort of collective creativity. In this situation, all of us are actors and makers of this newness.

What can we count on? What resources are at our disposal as we go down this path? What are our chances for success? What is ahead of us?

There is a political project to undertake the developing of the country. A project that belongs to all and must count on all. There is a team of leaders selected by the people to represent them, but who will never be able to carry out the task alone. These leaders are taking office now to lead and supervise the work of all the people. We have selected among ourselves the men who must exercise the needed authority to lead the nation.

In this context, democracy means a collective exercise of responsibility. Because the authority of the government leaders does not carry over into areas outside the policies endorsed by the voters. Authority is not power; the two concepts are different. Power has to be subordinated to authority, because in the absence of responsible authority, it becomes tyranny. Precisely many of the men who have held this office before me appear not to have known or wanted to acknowledge the difference.

Because of the collective responsibility we must rightfully bear, and at the same time because of the deep crisis we are in, democracy, in this time and place, means a collective commitment to austerity. Only an effort by all sectors of the country, at all levels, with each trying to achieve much with as little as possible, and with all of us monitoring, as it is our civic responsibility to do, the use of public funds, will bring us prosperity.

This means as well an effort of generosity and self-sacrifice. But the burdens must be distributed among our citizens according to their means. We cannot ask those who have already given everything they had to increase their generosity in the future. Those of us who still have much and who have received much have the responsibility of sharing and contributing, even if the contribution be nothing more than complying honestly with what the law requires of us.

Democracy also implies an effort of collective justice, because of the serious unfairness of our national family. We will do everything possible to encourage that effort and create the proper legislative and administrative vehicles so that each Guatemalan will truly enjoy the protection of his constitutional rights, and justice will be accessible to all equally, rather than being determined by threats, bribes, or personal influence.

But today, more than ever, democracy should mean for us a deep effort of collective respect and affection because of the abandonment of so many for so long. Guatemala has a historic destiny before it, and a role to play both toward its own citizens and toward the community of nations. But the basis for such a role is achieving internal solidarity as a people, cherishing and respecting every community, every ethnic

group, and respecting deeply the human rights of all our people.

Examining the situation from this perspective helps us in identifying and maximizing the use of resources which, in addition to those already mentioned, are available to us.

The first of these is the broad-based popular support which exists for our policies; there is an embryonic organizational structure which we must encourage; communications structures, some shattered, others uneven, underutilized the most, which must come to play a role in participation and national conciliation.

There is a productive structure which can generate wealth for the country if it faces the task with willingness, creativity and a sense of responsibility, and is given clear and constant game rules.

There is a structure of military power which backs our policies, supports the government and backs the Guatemalan people whom the leaders stand for.

Willingness to help Guatemala exists on the international level as well.

At this time we must extend our gratitude as a nation to the friendly governments and international organizations, but above all, to the ordinary citizens of those foreign lands who with their work, their productivity and their taxes have made available to us resources which have done so much good in Guatemala.

We warmly acknowledge these gestures of generosity and solidarity, and we pledge in return that we will simultaneously strive to strengthen our democratic experience with work and self-sacrifice, so that the contributions of other nations, some of which face serious economic problems themselves, will have been worthwhile.

Being fully aware that the home to which we return has been devastated, we are quite conscious of the role we must play in the international community, in a region suffering from the most serious international political crisis in its history, when together with our own internal problems, we find the conflicts of the superpowers which have chosen to play out the proxy war that they do not dare play in their own.

We must take an energetic stand in advocating our commitment to peace through participatory democracy. We should reaffirm with vehemence our desire to achieve internal solidarity and our intention to defend the ingests of our nation and our region above all interests.

For that reason we reaffirm our complete support for Contadora and for any other sincere effort to bring peace to Central America.

But at the same time that we back these projects, and we are genuinely grateful for them, we are also conscious of our regional responsibilities, and we wish to make known that we announce our enthusiastic willingness, based on brotherly concerns, to serve as mediators, should events require it. At the same time, we reaffirm our desire to extend our hospitality to all Central American Heads of State. In our country you will always have a home. And we look forward to relieve you shortly in Esquipulas, a historic town whose sanctuary is a point of pilgrimage for Central Americans and which marks the convergence of the frontiers of three countries.

Our attitude and the suggestion we offer are nothing more than the direct reflection of our commitment to the democratic process internally, and of our dream of political unity existing someday in Central America.

That and only that has been our intention in suggesting the creation of a Central American Parliament where we can work jointly with our brothers in developing common rules for our peaceful coexistence and our socio-economic development.

Consistent with this, we also emphasize our willingness to give our strongest support to all organizations aimed at increasing Central American integration.

And while we are expressing our deep desire for peace and our gratitude for the solidarity of the international community, we would like to transmit a special message to the Caribbean, a region with which we hold so many ties. We hope that our ties of friendship will increase, and that the proper channels will be found so that our common desire to bring about peace and solidarity can foster greater understanding and permanent collaboration.

Fellow Guatemalans: Friends from around the world who are here sharing this moment with us.

As we take up the path of building a democracy, of creating a country—our nation—we need your help and your respect. In return, we offer you our generosity, and undertake a commitment to behave with dignity and modesty.

Our homecoming—a landmark in our history—makes me recall the story that the gods of our ancestors, after various unsuccessful attempts to find the best substance to put under the skin of man, CHOSE CORN.

I would like for us to see a reflection of ourselves in that vegetable—so simple and yet so marvelous. Each of its grains rests next to the other, and each row of kernels is linked to all the others in a web of interlocking nuggets which, as they develop on the plant, point to the sky. The individual kernels, linked by bonds as strong as granite, start near the ground but rise progressively, one over the other, aiming toward the heights and the light, and hoping to provide the nourishment out of the substances it extracts from the richness of the soil to the generous hands which nurtured its existence.

Guatemala—land of the men of corn, of poor hands but courageous hearts. We know that the greatness of civilizations, as one of our countrymen has said, is measured not only by its material output, but by the courage and stoicism with which its men face adversity.

Guatemalans: we have suffered so much. We have more than adequately prove that we can overcome adversity. Let us seize this opportunity to go forward together, united in a common effort like the corn which the gods put in our veins. Let us go down the road together, pausing only now and whenever it becomes necessary, to ask humbly and from the depth of our hearts, for the blessing of God our Lord.

MEDICARE BENEFICIARY PROTECTION ACT OF 1986

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce the "Medicare Beneficiary Protection Act of 1986." This bill will continue the current waiver of liability presumption for home health agencies and skilled nursing facilities

under the Medicare Program—a provision that the administration is proposing to eliminate.

The waiver of liability provision gives limited financial protection to health care providers who accept patients they have good reason to believe are eligible for Medicare coverage, but whose claims are subsequently denied.

The battle on the waiver issue began last February (1985). When draft regulations were issued by the Health Care Financing Administration [HCFA] revoking the waiver for nursing home and home health providers. HCFA's actions were strongly opposed by Members of the Congress and by provider groups on the grounds that what the administration says is a cut for providers will, in fact, be passed directly on to the beneficiary. Nursing home providers themselves admit that it is the beneficiary, not the provider, who will feel the sting if the waiver is dropped. Hence, the title of this bill, "The Medicare Beneficiary Protection Act."

How will beneficiaries be hurt if the waiver is dropped? In the case of most nursing home providers, for example, Medicare is a very small portion of their revenues. Removing the small amount of protection that the waiver of liability affords will only encourage these providers to pull out of the Medicare Program altogether. For both nursing home and home health care, putting providers at total financial risk will also result in more and more elderly patients being turned away whenever there is a question of Medicare coverage—even if they are rightfully eligible. This is not a provider issue. This is an issue of whether or not people who are in need and rightly eligible for continuing care services under Medicare will be able to get that care.

Both of these effects—providers dropping out of the Medicare Program and turning questionable beneficiaries away—will seriously limit the elderly's access to needed nursing home and home health care. It is this very type of care that the elderly need now more than ever with the move toward earlier discharges—the "sooner and sicker" phenomenon—under DRG's. The soundness of this argument was confirmed through testimony presented to the House Select Committee on Aging, which I chair, at its July hearing on long-term care cost containment.

In response to widespread opposition, then Health and Human Services [HHS] Secretary Margaret Heckler convened an internal task force to reconsider their proposal to drop the waiver. While we have yet to learn the results of task force deliberations, we understand that final regulations are currently being drafted that would eliminate the waiver provision—despite the sense of the Congress to the contrary.

The "Sense" of Congress is explicit in the language on the waiver issue agreed to by House and Senate conferees in the "Consolidated Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1985" that has yet to be passed by the Congress. The conference agreement extends the 2.5-percent waiver of liability policy for home health agencies from enactment until 12 months after the consolidation of claims processing for home health agencies. Similarly, the agreement extends the 5-percent favorable presumption for skilled nursing facilities until 30 months after enactment.

The language in the bill I am introducing today is identical to that of the conference agreement. My intention in offering a separate bill should not be misread as doubt about whether the reconciliation bill will be passed this year. To the contrary, as expressed in my joint letter as chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging with FORTNEY H. (PETE STARK), chairman of the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee, to HHS Secretary Otis Bowen and OMB Director James Miller, there is every indication that a reconciliation bill will be passed this year with the waiver of liability provision intact.

Rather, the intent in introducing the "Medicare Beneficiary Protection Act of 1986" today is to send a clear and timely message to the administration that the Congress will not permit the Medicare waiver of liability to be dropped. I urge the Congress to demonstrate its commitment to protecting beneficiaries from unreasonable cost containment measures by supporting this legislation. While we all agree that spiraling health care costs must be controlled, the Congress must remain true to its resolve that program cuts not be at the expense of the elderly's rightful access to quality care.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the "Medicare Beneficiary Protection Act of 1986" and the letters cosigned by the Honorable FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK and myself to Otis Bowen and James Miller be printed in the RECORD.

NICK CENAICO: BIG-TIME PROMOTER AND SOFT TOUCH

HON. GERRY SIKORSKI

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, this recent story by Ellen Foley in the Minneapolis Star and Tribune eloquently illustrates the many fine qualities of Anoka County Commissioner Nick Cenaiko, whose generosity and hard work are helping to transform the northern suburbs of the Twin Cities. America is a Nation of immigrants, and the sixth district of Minnesota has benefited, as has the rest of the country, from the energy and industry of men like Nick Cenaiko.

COON RAPIDS' CENAICO: A BIG-TIME PROMOTER AND A SOFT TOUCH

(By Ellen Foley)

Anoka County Commissioner Nick Cenaiko has trouble sitting still.

He calls it nervous energy. Friends call it drive.

Whatever it is, it brought him to Anoka County 20 years ago. And he hopes that during the next 20 years it will help him transform the developing county into the best place to live and work in the metro area.

Cenaiko, 53, is a promoter. During the past 25 years he has sold vacuum cleaners door to door and worked concessions at county fairs. Now he produces big-city shows such as the Sportsmen's Boat, Camping and Vacation Show and the Minnesota Home Improvement and Patio Show, both held at the St. Paul Civic Center.

He is a wheeler-dealer, but friends say that everyone in Coon Rapids knows that if you're in trouble, Nick Cenaiko will give you a loan or find you a job.

"I know that he has given money to those who were down and out. He has given jobs to people when he had to look around for a job. When something needs to be done, he'll find a way to do it. And he doesn't brag about it," said Bob Lewis, Cenaiko's good friend and the mayor of Coon Rapids.

He is the son of Ukrainian immigrants who settled on a farm in Canada. Cenaiko immigrated to the United States in the 1950s with little more than a mortgaged car to his name.

He speaks with a thick accent and his conversations are accompanied by effusive gestures. His speech is punctuated with an infectious laugh and the phrase, "Put it 'dis way."

He puts a large, knotted hand over his mouth and then throws it in the air.

"Put it 'dis way. When someone says it can't be done, I like to prove them wrong."

Cenaiko started his own business in the 1960s. He and his wife traveled to 140 county fairs a year in the Midwest with a computerized handwriting analysis concession. Money was so tight that they often had to sleep in a pup tent, he said.

In 1964 he decided to try producing a show and secured the backing of a fraternal group in the area of Fargo, N.D. for his first sportsmen's show.

He netted only \$300, but it launched his career in promotion.

This year he will produce eight shows in six states, including sportsmen's shows to Fargo, South Sioux City, Neb.; Sioux Falls, S.D.; Grand Forks, N.D.; Rock Island, Ill., and St. Paul.

He oversees five companies, Cenaiko Productions, which runs the sportsmen's shows; CEI Displays, a convention services firm; Nicholas C. Properties, a real estate firm; Chase Limousine Service, and Chase Securities Corp.

Cenaiko said that he has little to worry about financially these days, but that he will never forget the old days. The memory of a poor childhood and his days on the road keeps his purse open to those less fortunate.

"I think you have to have been broke," he said. "When you've lived in a tent because you couldn't afford a motel room, when you've eaten pork until you can't stand it because you can't afford beef, you understand."

Cenaiko, who became a citizen in 1980, said he likes hard work because he knows that in the United States he will have the opportunity to succeed even if he has failures along the way.

Carolyn Voss, a Coon Rapids City Council member, said many feel that Cenaiko's immigrant past motivated him to run for office.

"I think he's appreciative of the country (in which) he's made such a success of himself," she said. "He's paying it back."

Cenaiko's public involvement began in the early 1970s when he teamed with the late Henry Hammer on the Anoka County Fair Board to revamp the fair. Under their leadership it became one of the largest in the state.

Cenaiko said his County Board career began at the breakfast table in a Coon Rapids restaurant where friends meet several times a week to talk politics. A friendly argument about county politics ended with the statement, "Why don't you run for county commissioner?"

So Cenaiko did. He was elected in 1982 and reelected in 1984. Now he's vice chairman of the board.

"Nick loves people and people love him," said Al Kordiak, the chairman. "There's just no beating Nick Cenaiko."

Cenaiko said he'll never retire. In fact, the fast-talking, chain-smoking promoter is looking for new frontiers. He said that there may be a movie in his future and that he's learning the secrets of videotape production.

He said his restlessness won't move him away from Coon Rapids. How could he leave the area that he considers to be the next boom town of the metro area?

"It's starting to come right now!" he said, waving his hands around his head.

Residents of the fast-growing southern suburbs might not agree. But if Anoka County isn't the metro areas's next hot spot, it won't be because Cenaiko didn't try.

TEXAS WILL MISS SAM WHITTEN

HON. JOHN BRYANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago—early in the Lone Star State's sesquicentennial year—a student of Texas, its literature, its people, and its politics in the broadest and best sense died.

Sam Whitten, a remarkable Texan, is gone and will be sorely missed not only by his family, but also by all those who discovered through him the wonder of books and whose lives he touched in other ways.

He read, he thought, he taught, he loved and collected books. He and his wife Virginia and their children for many years hosted "First Friday," lively monthly gatherings of some of Texas' most interesting thinkers and doers.

Sam Whitten is eloquently and fondly remembered in a tribute by Dallas Times Herald columnist Molly Ivins that I would like to share with my colleagues.

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Jan. 23, 1986]

WHITTEN WOULD HAVE LOVED PFORZHEIMER COLLECTION (By Molly Ivins)

AUSTIN.—Two things happened Tuesday involving books and book people.

The University of Texas announced its acquisition of a stunning collection of early English literature. The Pforzheimer Collection, which is a staggering group of rare books and manuscripts, was acquired for the university by H. Ross Perot for \$15 million. The school now will raise the money to repay Perot, who will charge no interest. It was one of those deals where the collection came on the market and the university did not have the cash, so Perot stepped in and bought it for UT on a loan basis.

We are talking about the earliest books ever printed in English, first editions of Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Jonson, Bacon, Donne, Milton, Bunyan, Izaak Walton, Hobbes, Locke. There are eight Caxtons in the collection—William Caxton having been the first English printer—as well as a Coverdale Bible, the first complete English Bible. There are manuscript letters

from Donne and others. Perot correctly described the collection as "top of the tree."

The university held a press conference to announce this coup, and I wish you could have been there. Among the scholars and intellectuals expressing their pleasure over this landmark bibliographical event were Gov. Mark White, the pride of Baylor U., and House Speaker Gibson D. Lewis, a man who has perpetrated innumerable atrocities upon the English language.

I must confess that the prospect of Lewis commenting on this motherlode of English literature filled me with unholy glee, but I am proud to report that, as the speaker himself would put it, he extinguished himself just fine. We were once more grateful for Bill Hobby's sense of brevity: The man had the taste to acquit himself gracefully in a single sentence. Hobby is known to read—for pleasure. This is a habit shared by about .0013 percent of all other Texas politicians.

Perot is rather endearing on these occasions. He described how he first had been called in the course of a busy day and told that the Pforzheimer Collection was for sale: He asked how much it cost, said, "It's too much," and hung up. Later that day, he reports, he thought he should find out what was in the collection. He was persuaded to buy it when Decherd Turner, the director of the Humanities Research Center, told Perot that he would consider it "the epitome of my career just to be allowed to look at the Pforzheimer Collection."

The other thing that happened Tuesday was that Sam Whitten died. He was by title associate professor in the Graduate School of Library and Information Science at UT, but to my way of thinking, Sam Whitten was just about the perfect Texas bookman. He was not only a librarian and teacher of librarians but a true bibliophile, a book lover. He collected books—in a way, just like Ross Perot.

Whitten's collection of Texana is not exhaustive, but it is notable. He collected fiction with a Texas setting and had some real jewels—for example, books about Texas by Brits who never had been here and caused their Texans to flee across the prairie wearing plimsolls. Whitten, unlike some collectors, had read all the books in his collection. He spent his savings—what others would have put into a retirement home—on his own library, a small converted garage in the backyard where he had installed a book preservation system with the correct temperature controls and all.

I think Whitten's two most distinguishing characteristics were his extraordinary intelligence and his cussedness. He was a crotchety man and little inclined to put up with much of the world's nonsense. For example, he never became a full professor because he refused to get a Ph.D. In his opinion, a Ph.D. in library science would have been a waste of time and he was not responsible for the stupid rules for advancement others made up.

Whitten became a book lover by way of a poor background in Bogata, Texas (that's another one you neo-natives need to learn to pronounce), a couple of gifted English teachers and the U.S. Navy. This route seems to yield a crustier variety of book lover than normally comes from a middle-class home and Ivy League Schools. The only books in the Whitten home in Bogata were an old set of the Book of Knowledge, and he could still tell you stuff from it 50 years later.

He remembered the name of every English teacher who ever read aloud to his class

and what she read. So here, once more, is a salute to all the Enid Bagwells in all the improbable towns in this state, still trying to read Keats to a class filled with know-nothing kids.

The Navy did its share in World War II by boring a 17-year-old Whitten into the embrace of the Modern Library, then \$1.25 for a hardback book of just about everything important that ever has been written. He read them all. It denigrates no one to suggest that Whitten believed the Modern Library was a more significant contribution to learning than the Pforzheimer Collection. It makes me happy to think of all the librarians around this state trained by Sam Whitten—don't be surprised if one up and tells you some time to quit wasting your time on the trash you are about to check out and gives you a book you really will love.

I got to thinking about this wonderful collection of books at UT and about Whitten's life—all those books and all those words. In the end, there was one word. Sam Whitten was blessed with a wonderful family, and they all hung around during his last illness. He woke up after several days in a coma: He could not talk because the doctors had all these tubes down his throat, but he wanted to communicate. He gestured for paper and pencil, and the kids rushed to get them.

He tried to write, but he was so weak all that came out was little chicken scratches. So his son Jeff stayed up that night and made a big alphabet chart so that Sam could pick out letters. First thing he asked the next day was, "Who is this doctor?" They "talked" with him some through the chart, but then he got weaker and tired, and finally his hand shook as he picked out a last word. He found the L and then the O. And then the V and then the E.

A CONCERNED FARMER'S SUGGESTIONS

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, on December 20, 1985, the House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on General Oversight and Investigations, which I chair, convened in my hometown of Mayfield, KY, to hear testimony relative to the farm credit crisis and the problems of farmers.

Our subcommittee heard from nearly 40 witnesses including farmers, bankers, government officials, and representatives from the Farm Credit System. However, one of the highlights of our hearing was the impromptu testimony of Laura Anderson of Route 2, Mayfield. Laura and her husband Tom are both 1971 graduates from the University of Kentucky College of Engineering. This outstanding couple has chosen farming as a livelihood, yet it continues to be necessary for Laura to work in management for South Central Bell in order to complement their farming income.

Laura recently sent me a letter which further details her thoughts about possible solutions to the problems facing the agricultural sector.

I encourage my colleagues to read and consider Laura Anderson's concerns and suggestions. Her excellent letter follows:

MAYFIELD, KY.
December 30, 1985.

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We certainly appreciate your public hearing in Mayfield. It is difficult to testify at such a hearing without emotion. I do not know if you are aware of at least one farm debt related suicide locally. In spring, 1985, Bobby Knight, a farmer in north Graves County, shot himself. This fall his home, farm and machinery were sold at auction.

I spoke at the hearing, totally unprepared, but emotionally driven to add to the record. I spoke of the tools we use to aid our marketing decisions. Enclosed is some of the information my husband and I gather and study throughout the year. You will note one thought about the farm bill stands out clearly in all the reports. The market prices for the 1986 new crop will be lower than the current prices, worsening our situation. Like other American businessmen we want to raise our crops and sell our products in an open market. We do not want government subsidies, deficiency payments or loan programs.

We have all thought about solutions to the farm crisis. I offer three solutions to the three most troublesome areas.

1. INCREASED EXPORTS

We will have a very difficult time recovering from Carter's grain embargo. Argentina, Brazil, and other countries had idle land cleared and planted with crops by entrepreneurs from all over the world. A real surplus of grain exists. Why don't we send foreign aid in food rather than dollars? The Federal Government could buy the food on an open market. Our dollars, (that we don't have?) are used for weapons, and more likely than not fall into the hands of a few for their own personal use.

2. LOWERED INTEREST RATES

The banks and savings and loans across the country seemed to have made great profits in the past few years. New elaborate buildings, consolidation, buy outs, advertising all point to profitable times. Please note the enclosed AP news article. Farmers have checkoffs to support the American Soybean Association and also participate in holding funds for insurance against failure of grain elevators. Why can't the banks and savings and loans participate in a checkoff plan whereby a percentage (one-fourth, 1 percent) of profits establishes a fund for the PCA's and Federal Land Banks to draw upon for farm loans. The PCA's and FLB's could borrow money from this fund at a low interest rate and in return provide a low interest rate to the farm crop producers. Within time the banks would see loans repaid and even farmer savings accounts!

3. RESPECTABLE MARKETING SYSTEM

The management of the Chicago Board of Trade is the main culprit here. Most of the grain bought and sold is by people, corporations who never put out a crop, never take delivery or know much about the agribusiness. They sell when the market makes them a profit and buy when grain is cheap, driving prices lower. These moneychangers manipulate the market on their terms while the farmer must plant in the spring and harvest in the fall. Can we not restrict the manipulation of the market by registering farm producers and legitimate grain buyers as the participants in this game? The crop producers are easily identifiable through ASCS, PCA, FLB. The grain buyers must

have taken delivery of grain either a specified number of times or a percentage of the grain they bought.

My answers are simplistic, I know. However, often we justify not trying by saying it can't be done. While the new farm bill sends a glimmer of light from Washington, it is not the answer. For one who wants to till the soil, the prospect of setting aside good productive land and accepting money for doing nothing is unacceptable. No, I don't want to spend federal tax dollars to support the farmer.

Again, thank you for your effort. I do hope Congress continues to look for ways to save the American farmer. Allowing farmers to retain investment credit will help!

Yours truly,

LAURA ANDERSON.

DISMANTLING THE MILITARY-CONGRESSIONAL COMPLEX: THE FIRST LEGISLATIVE STEPS

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the wry saying: "Everybody complains about the weather but nobody does anything about it." The same might be said for military reform. Many Senators and Congressmen, including myself, have been working hard in this area for several years now, but I still have a nagging sense that we have failed to get to the root causes of many of our military difficulties.

I am today introducing two bills which, in my view, represent the first steps toward the eventual dismantlement of what has been called the "military-congressional complex"; that is, the collection of interconnected executive branch and congressional national security entities which, to a large extent, dictates how America will be defended. The following is an overview of the problems caused by the "complex" and an explanation of how my legislation would attack the problem.

Over the last two decades, we have witnessed a well-intentioned series of efforts to reform our military apparatus and increase its combat effectiveness and peacetime efficiency. Some of these reforms have succeeded; others have not. The cumulative result, however, has been the creation of a huge bureaucracy that is slow, cumbersome, inefficient, and frequently unaccountable to political control. In the realm of defense procurement, the disturbing examples of overpriced items result not from perturbations in the procurement system, but, paradoxically, from the system functioning according to plan. When simple procurement decisions are made by dozens of Government officials in different agencies, we should not be surprised when long delays and exorbitant costs are the common result.

The bureaucratic proliferation has occurred on both sides of the Potomac. For its part, the Congress has vastly expanded its Pentagon oversight activities since shortly after the Vietnam war. Congressional military oversight panels have ballooned from four committees

and their subcommittees in 1975 to more than 40 such bodies today. These entities and the relevant personal staffs conduct over 400 hearings, request over 400 reports, and generate more than 120,000 letters and 600,000 phone calls to the Pentagon in a typical year.

While all this oversight activity is not a priori undesirable, we need to understand that this level of involvement in defense matters contributes to difficulties in military procurement and deployment decisions. In the case of procurement, Congress frequently alters weapons systems production rates rather than terminating the programs outright. For example, Tomahawk cruise missile production rates dropped from 1,082 to 251 units in 1 year. As any businessman in your district will tell you, this can lead to uneconomical production rates and unnecessary costs for even relatively simple weapons systems. In the force deployment area, Congress recently attempted to block the strategic homeporting naval fleet dispersal plans, largely out of parochial concern for the present naval port areas.

In addition to the sheer volume of congressional military oversight, there is the inordinate amount of time required to complete these activities. Since the consideration of the fiscal year 1947 defense budget, the Congress has managed on only two occasions to have its Defense Appropriation bill on the President's desk prior to the beginning of the new fiscal year. Since 1977, defense Appropriations bills have been an average of 45 days late and, more often than not, we must resort to continuing resolutions to keep the Defense Department running. There is no reason for all matters military to be considered and debated more than once in a given fiscal year, particularly when congressional history shows that the Appropriations Committees were only created to hold the line on spending and were not intended to revisit every issue that had already been settled by the authorizing committees. Duplication of this kind increases production costs and times, clogs up the funding mechanism in the Congress, and impedes rapid decisionmaking which is necessary for national security.

In the Defense Department, the root causes of many of our procurement problems are overlooked, in favor of Band-Aid solutions which are simple, appealing, and ineffective. In my view, many of these causes are structural. The Congress, with the passage of the 1958 Defense Reorganization Act, permitted the Secretary of Defense to create centralized Defense agencies to handle many requirements which appeared to be common to all the military Services. This approach to defense management was very much in vogue in the 1960's under former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. But the Defense agencies now have grown to at least 11 in number, and they employ almost 135,000 servicemen and approximately 85,000 civil servants. Unfortunately, because they are headed by senior civil servants or military officers, these agencies are not directly accountable to the politically appointed, congressionally confirmed service Secretaries and the Secretary of Defense.

The largest such agency, the Defense Logistics Agency, employs 50,000 people and was responsible for the \$700 toilet seat, the

\$110 diodes, and the \$200 ejector seat straps. The Defense Contract Audit Agency, the central audit body, generally takes anywhere from 60 to 100 days to complete more than 40 percent of its audits of weapons systems and other military procurement contracts.

Perhaps most disturbing is the fact that both Agencies were created to handle functions performed by the military services, and these functions are still being performed by the services. In my view, it would be preferable for the politically accountable service Secretaries to be responsible for all the procurement actions and contract audits for their departments. Under such an arrangement, heads would roll as punishment for outrageous defense expenditures; right now, it is virtually unheard of for a senior civil servant or military officer to take the heat for errors of this kind.

I have only illuminated a small number of congressional and Defense Department problems which require attention, but we need to start now and take bold steps to enact structural reforms on both sides of the Potomac. Accordingly, one of my bills would merge the House defense authorization and appropriations responsibilities into the House Armed Services Committee and restrict House defense oversight functions to the Armed Services Committee and the Budget Committee. This action would greatly reduce the time and effort required to draft and pass defense funding legislation in the Congress, and it would reduce by about seven the number of committees and subcommittees exercising oversight responsibilities for the Defense Department. The net result would be more efficient legislative activity and less congressional micromanagement of the Pentagon.

My second bill would eliminate the Defense Logistics Agency and the Defense Contract Audit Agency and return their functions to the military services, from which they originated. As a practical matter, civil service "bumping" privileges will permit many of the DLA and DCAA personnel to burrow into other DOD offices, but we still will have achieved the dismantlement of two centralized bureaucracies and the elimination of a large number of high salary civil service billets. Most importantly, we will have improved the accountability and efficiency of the defense procurement bureaucracy, and provided insurance against future procurement scandals.

I recognize that these bills are strong medicine. But we face grave challenges from the enormous budget deficit and a centrally planned Soviet military machine which is able to turn out large numbers of advanced weapons systems like sausages. I hope to be able to do more in this area in the months ahead, but for how we should take these first steps toward creating a defense establishment free of the bureaucratic tangles which have called our most important military capabilities into question.

TELEPHONE DEREGULATION: CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, January 29, 1986 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TELEPHONE DEREGULATION: CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES

It has been two years since a court decision ended American Telephone and Telegraph's (AT&T) eroding monopoly on long-distance telephone service. The decision, and the economic forces behind it, began a new era in telecommunications. Although economists and consumers are still unsure if divesting AT&T of its local companies was wise, the breakup brought about changes that are here to stay. For consumers, owning a phone is a more complicated and expensive proposition.

Complexity: Each part of telephone service is now a separate industry. Long distance service is supplied by competing companies, equipment by competing manufacturers. Local service remains a regulated utility. Once handled by one bill, these services now require up to three separate bills, or three parts of the same bill.

Long distance: AT&T is still preeminent in long distance. Until recently, competitors like GTE Sprint and MCI had to make do with inferior hookups to local customers while AT&T enjoyed clear connections. As more areas offer equal access to all long distance companies, consumers will be able to choose their long distance carrier. Users can then dial long distance calls direct, without extra numbers and with any type of phone, no matter which carrier is used.

Local service: The court divided AT&T's 22 local operating companies among seven regional companies. These companies began with no product other than a dial tone. Their main business is local service, beginning at the wall outlet and ending where long distance begins.

Equipment: The biggest savings for consumers is in equipment. Though consumers are now responsible for repairs on their phones, buying rather than renting a phone is one way they can save money in the new telephone market.

Cost: Rates are also changing. Before the breakup, part of the price of long distance calls helped pay for local service, making it affordable to more families. With long distance separate from local service, the price of each must begin to match its cost. Increased competition brought long-distance rates down, but for most people the drop has not been enough to offset increased local rates. Phone companies and state regulators are experimenting with new billing schemes that trade cuts in service for cost savings. "Measured service", one such plan, charges by frequency and length of calls, time of day, and distance covered. For example, Continental Telephone has asked the Public Service Commission to permit measured service in Corydon and Huntingburg.

There are also new charges for two services that were once free: access to long distance and operator assistance. "Access fees" are not really a cost of access to long dis-

tance. Their purpose is to bring the price of local service up to equal its cost. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC), a government regulator, added these fees to local rates nationwide. People who use no long distance service and do not need access still have to pay for it.

Another new fee is for operator assistance. When local companies know that a directory call usually accompanied a money-making long-distance call, they gladly footed the bill. With long distance and local service separate, the cost falls to the consumer. In most areas two directory calls are free, with a small charge for each subsequent call.

Many in Congress fear that high costs may push people off the telephone system. Of special concern are the disabled, the elderly, and others who rely on the telephone for companionship and help in emergencies. One proposal in Congress would require state agencies to set an adjusted "lifeline" rate for low-income persons.

Outlook: Current trends give a glimpse of the future telephone industry. One trend is the decline in the number of long distance companies. Once filled with small companies, the long distance market is becoming a place where only the large survive. The merger of U.S. Telecom and GTE Sprint put the lion's share of the market in the hands of just three companies; GTE, MCI, and AT&T.

Another trend is diversification. Though local service is still 95 percent of their trade, the seven regional companies are quickly diversifying. Ameritech, the parent company of Indiana Bell, has invested in computers, radio telephones, Tailand's yellow pages, and others. Some state regulators worry that an investment failure could mean higher rates. Though no action is being considered, state regulators will keep a close eye on local telephone companies as they diversify.

Perhaps the most ominous trend is "bypass." Large companies are increasingly setting up their own telephone networks, costing local companies a large share of their most profitable business. A 1984 study showed that if Indiana Bell's top 40 customers bypassed local systems, \$33 million would be lost, meaning higher rates for remaining customers. Local companies are asking regulators for a freer hand to compete with bypassers by offering cheaper rates to large business users, but this problem is likely to persist.

U.S. equipment makers will face competition from foreign manufacturers. Divestiture opened the telephone equipment market and allowed the entry of foreign phones and equipment. Other countries, however, have closed telecommunications markets. U.S. firms have shown they can compete when allowed to: a U.S. company will supply the phone system for the 1988 Seoul Olympics.

My judgment is that government will have less say in the management of the telephone industry. Congress has taken few steps to change the result of the court's decision. The FCC will probably play a less important role in future actions than state public service commissions. Under present circumstances, my chief concern is to maintain "universal service", the principle of providing basic affordable telephone service to everyone. In the shuffle of changing technologies, this founding principle should not be lost.

CHICAGO MAYOR HAROLD WASHINGTON AND GRAMM-RUDMAN

HON. CHARLES A. HAYES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 22, city of Chicago Mayor Harold Washington appeared as a witness before the House Budget Committee. At that time Mayor Washington made two predictions. The first was of a humorous nature and concerned sports; he predicted that the city of Chicago would be home of the soon-to-be-crowned Super Bowl champions, those Monsters of the Midway, the Chicago Bears. His second prediction was as dire as the first was pleasant; he spoke regarding the budget-cutting methods of the Federal Government on the city of Chicago. He said, "The President's recommendations and Gramm-Rudman would tear the guts out of our local government." He lists many services and programs which would have to be eliminated due to budget reductions.

The great cities of our Nation have contributed—and continue to contribute—much to the history, culture, vitality, and tax revenues of our Nation. We must deal with the Federal deficit, but we must deal with it in a way that is equitable, fair, and ensures the survival of our Nation's cities. I would like to enter the entire text of the mayor's remarks into the record. If his second prophecy is as accurate as his first, and many of us expect that it will be, perhaps we should reconsider Gramm-Rudman, and instead institute deficit-reduction methods that are as equitable as they are meaningful.

The statement follows:

MAYOR HAROLD WASHINGTON'S STATEMENT BEFORE HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE—JANUARY 22, 1986

Distinguished Congressman: The City of Chicago budget office has calculated that Chicago stands to lose as much as \$155 million in federal funding in 1986, as a result of specific program cuts and the across-the-board cutbacks mandated by Gramm-Rudman.

Such a loss, amounting to nearly 8 percent of the city's budget, would be devastating, particularly when combined with cutbacks we have undergone in the past several years.

And the impact would be far larger than appear by numbers alone. What would have to be eliminated first is the creative, life-giving, forward-looking piece of city government—the programs that cost relatively little and train our youth, feed our hungry, build low-income housing for our underemployed, and encourage our teenage mothers to feed their babies properly.

We are talking about our programs that take relatively small amounts of dollars and leverage them with private dollars, and with community sweat and commitment.

We are talking about the \$2.6 million spent on our new anti-gang program in 1985—dollars that funded 81 community-based non-profit agencies to run youth programs with volunteer help from the community. In 1985 this anti-gang program served over 12,000 youth and helped us reduce gang-related murders by 20%.

We can only estimate what the much larger Gramm-Rudman cuts expected in 1987 and further would do to the fabric of city life.

The President's recommendations and Gramm-Rudman would tear the guts out of local government. In Chicago, we would be left with essential services only: Police, Fire, Sanitation, Health and bare social services. Our development agencies—Housing, Economic Development and Planning—would face elimination.

The elimination of Revenue Sharing alone, which provided us \$87 million last year, would mean that a dozen city departments would lose about one-third of their funding—severely affecting health care, garbage pick-up, emergency services, services to the elderly, and consumer programs.

The one-third cut of \$37 million we anticipate in the Community Development Block Grant program this year will force cuts in literally dozens of programs, including elimination of a major neighborhood health center, the end to our home-delivered meal program for seniors, cuts in day care centers, food packages, and so on.

We estimate that \$100 million in private sector funds and as many as 7,400 jobs will be lost with the elimination of UDAG.

Elimination of \$24 million in housing funds will devastate our creative housing programs, which are beginning to turn around the decline of Chicago's older housing stock. Elimination of the Rental Rehab program alone will result in the loss of \$20 million in private funding and a loss of 550 rehabilitated housing units.

The list goes on and on. You know the general framework. Between 1981 and 1986, the Community Development Block Grant budget has dropped 20 percent, while the defense budget has more than doubled. This does not constitute equity to me.

Less than 10 percent of the federal budget goes to programs assisting low-income people. Yet one-third of the budget cuts come from programs that serve these people. That also is not equity.

Another way to underscore the inequities in federal policy is to consider this startling comparison: in 1977, for every dollar that was committed to defense, twenty-six cents was committed to low-income housing; in 1980, that housing figure dropped to 19 cents; in 1984, it was one and one-half cents. In the President's FY '86 budget, the President's latest proposal, it was less than one cent.

We all recognize the need for a balanced federal budget—but it must not be balanced on the backs of our urban centers.

In Chicago we have worked hard over the past two and a half years to eliminate our city's budget deficit. We have cut our workforce by one-seventh, or 6,500 employees. We have done our utmost to cut waste and improve services. But we cannot cut much further without damaging the quality of life in Chicago.

The federal funding cuts would not only be hard on Chicago. They would also be unfair.

Already Illinois ranks 48th among states in the amount of money returned to this area from tax dollars sent to Washington.

The great, older cities of America have contributed much to its history and its culture, as well as in federal tax dollars. But the cities cannot continue to give and give and continue to get back less and less in return.

What is at stake here is not just federal programs, but the future of our cities. It is

imperative that those of us who cherish our cities, and value the people that live within them, do everything we can to ensure the survival of our great urban centers.

ANDREI SAKHAROV

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1986

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in commemorating the sixth anniversary of the exile of Dr. Andrei Sakharov. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. FRANK, for calling attention, once again, to the tragic situation that continues to find Dr. Sakharov and Dr. Yelena Bonner banished to the isolated city of Gorky. This unjust treatment of Dr. Sakharov and Dr. Bonner violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Helsinki Final Act, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and other Soviet-endorsed international agreements.

Before their exile, Andrei Sakharov and Yelena Bonner were clear voices in the struggle for global peace and human rights. Now, in exile, they have been silenced through physical isolation, but they continue to lead the struggle, for the world knows and respects their thoughts, their efforts, and their spirit. Their rights have clearly been violated, and as we must speak out wherever there is injustice, we must call upon the Soviet Union to end its wrongful treatment of Dr. Sakharov and Dr. Bonner.

While we can be pleased and encouraged by the Soviet extension of a temporary visa to Dr. Bonner for medical reasons, it would be naive of us to view this gesture as the long-awaited promise of improved human rights in the Soviet Union. As soon as Dr. Bonner's medical treatment is over, she will return to exile in Gorky. She will return to the restricted, oppressive life common to so many independent thinkers, Jews, Baptists, and others who have been irrationally and inhumanely persecuted by the Soviet Government.

I am pleased to cosponsor and lend my full support to House Concurrent Resolution 269, which specifically calls upon the Soviet Union to allow Dr. Sakharov and Dr. Bonner to exercise their rights of movement and expression. As Dr. Sakharov begins his 6th year in exile, it is appropriate for us to express our support for these courageous individuals. It is also fitting that we take this opportunity to show our support for all Soviet citizens suffering political, intellectual, and religious persecution.

H.R. 3521 HARMFUL TO
COPYRIGHT

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the harmful impact on our copyright system of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

legislation which has recently been introduced regarding music and syndicated television programs. This bill, H.R. 3521, would seriously harm creators of music, program producers, and those who look to the royalty system for their livelihood. The following article from the December 28, 1985, issue of TV Guide provides excellent arguments in opposition to the bill.

SONGWRITERS HEAR A SOUR NOTE FROM TV

(By Walter H. Annenberg)

The men and women who write the music that moves and inspires us, bringing so much joy to our lives, deserve our admiration and respect. That is why we deplore current efforts to deny these gifted people the fruits of their labor.

Broadcasters seem determined to end the present agreements that cover the way they pay for the music that is an essential element in all television programs. The courts have ruled these agreements are enforceable despite the fact that broadcasters have tried and failed, in repeated lengthy and expensive court procedures, to change the method and amount of payment. Now they have turned to Congress. A bill they have caused to be introduced would upset the carefully negotiated system of payments for music rights that has been working smoothly for the past 40 years. This bill, which bears the names of Rep. Frederick C. Boucher (D-Va.) and Rep. Henry J. Hyde (R-Ill.), could reduce payments to songwriters for use of their music on television to a pittance. And if past experience is any criterion, we can now expect the full force of the powerful broadcasting lobby to be brought to bear on members of Congress to persuade them to pass the bill and help the television stations at the expense of songwriters and program producers.

The present arrangement provides for a "blanket" performance-license fee to be paid by each station for access to virtually all copyrighted music. This music performance fee amounts to something less than one per cent of a station's gross revenue. Aside from the stations, producers of programs pay a one-time "synchronization" fee for recording the music, and the three commercial networks pay a blanket yearly fee that is negotiated. These blanket fees are turned over to the performance-rights organizations that represent nearly all songwriters and publishers: ASCAP (American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers) and BMI (Broadcast Music Inc.). The organizations also collect all performance royalties for American music played throughout the world and distribute the money to songwriters and their publishers according to the number of times their music was performed.

Stations that do not wish to pay blanket license fees have a number of alternatives available to them:

1. A station can obtain "per program" licenses from ASCAP or BMI, paying a music royalty for each individual broadcast.

2. The agreements ASCAP and BMI have with their members are nonexclusive, leaving stations free to negotiate license fees directly with the composers and publishers instead of with their performance-rights organizations.

3. Since some songwriters do not belong to ASCAP or BMI, the stations can buy rights directly from these composers.

4. Broadcasters can require producers of the programs they broadcast to pay the per-

formance-rights fees, thereby relieving stations of that responsibility. The Boucher-Hyde bill makes this mandatory for their syndicated programs.

While stations obviously would prefer having producers assume performance-license fee payments, the producers have so far rejected that option and the stations have paid the blanket fee. This is certainly the most cost-efficient and easily administered system, and it permits the stations to broadcast just about any music they choose without keeping records.

It has proved to be a fair and inexpensive way to compensate the artists who write the music that is so vital to television and adds so much to its audience appeal. The courts have ruled that the blanket license is legal. The amount of the blanket fee, incidentally, has been negotiated downward from 2.5 per cent of a station's revenue in 1949 to the present less than one per cent.

Under the Boucher-Hyde bill the stations would not be required to pay performance-license fees for the music in the syndicated programs and commercials they buy and that payment would have to be assumed by the producers of programs. As for the background music in their news shows and local originations, the stations would negotiate with the composers and publishers to arrive at a license fee. Certainly administering such a system would be a nightmare. It also would be unfair to producers of syndicated shows, who are among the biggest risk-takers in the television business and can hardly stand the additional burden of paying for performance rights on programs that might or might not succeed. They feel they should continue paying their relatively small one-time "synchronization" fees because they are not "performing" the music, merely "recording" it.

What the stations were unable to win via the courts, they now seek to win from Congress with a bill that could be disastrous for the songwriters.

In the opinion of Hal David, president of ASCAP (and, ironically, the lyricist who wrote "What the World Needs Now is Love, Sweet Love"): "Passage of the bill would end a basic right that authors and composers have always had—the right to have continuous payment for continuous use of our music. The producers would simply buy the music on a one-time basis." Adds David: "That would be like buying a new car, filling it with gasoline and never having to buy gas again."

Last year ASCAP distributed some \$169 million and BMI about \$115 million to their songwriters and composers. According to ASCAP, the royalties under the proposed legislation would be considerably lower. Actually, they could be negligible since the producers now pay their one-time recording fee before the true value of the music is established. The producers of M*A*S*H, for example, paid the standard one-time recording fee for the music in each episode. The value of M*A*S*H skyrocketed when the show went into syndication, but the required one-time fee had been paid. If the stations had not been responsible for performance-rights fees—and under the Boucher-Hyde bill they would not have been—the songwriters would have been denied the increased royalties enjoyed by nearly everyone else connected with the show.

It is evident that the proposed unwarranted and unfair legislation would harm those who write the music heard on television and

the producers who invest in programs in the hope that they will succeed. It would be unconscionable for the Congress to go along with this attempt to exploit the talents of some of the most creative members of our society.

THE "CHALLENGER" TRAGEDY

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, words fail us at times like these as we contemplate the tragic and unexpected loss of life from the *Challenger* mishap. We have come to take for granted the magic of the American Space Program—moments like these make us realize our humanity.

After our shock subsides, we in Congress will no doubt do some soul-searching about the direction and purpose of the Space Program. Indeed, our first responsibility to the American people is to see that this awful accident is thoroughly explained and a repeat avoided.

What took place 10 miles above the Earth yesterday may never be fully explained, and it may be some time before we are clear on how this accident will affect our ongoing exploration of space. However, I am hopeful that our mission to explore our universe will not be a permanent victim.

Most of us admittedly lack the technical knowledge to solve problems like these as blithely as we offer our insight into more earthly matters. We must not lack the vision, however, that has compelled us since the days of Sputnik to reach out to space.

As we grieve for those lost yesterday, let us pause for a moment to consider the safety record of the Space Program in general and the Shuttle Program in particular. Before today, 24 missions were flown by U.S. space shuttles without a mishap, including 9 by *Challenger*. Before the shuttle, 10 Apollo crews safely returned from space, as did 3 Skylab crews. Even in the Space Program's infancy, 14 manned Mercury and Gemini Missions were flown without a loss.

The only other time that our Nation has faced a tragedy of this sort was on a January day 19 years and 1 day ago when fire took the lives of three astronauts on the launch pad. The ill-fated Apollo 1 mission led to a long delay and complete redesign of the Apollo Program, and I would expect the Shuttle Program to be similarly reassessed now.

The shuttle's fate will soon rest on arguments over lost payload, whether future flights should be unmanned, and what role the military will play. I hope such questions, as crucial as they are, do not obscure our vision of all that we have yet to learn in space.

One thing is certain, however: Our next step in space, whether it is taken in a shuttle or some other craft, will not be taken for granted.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS HEARING SCHEDULE

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

FISCAL YEAR 1986 HEARING SCHEDULE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

FEBRUARY 1986

Wed., Feb. 4: 10:00 Navajo-Hopi Relocation Comm., 1:30 Same as above.

Tues., Feb. 18: 1:00 Synthetic Fuels Corporation, 2:00 Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corp.

Wed., Feb. 19: 10:00 Secretary of the Interior, 1:30 Same as above.

Thurs., Feb. 20: 10:00 Secretary of Energy, 1:30 Same as above.

Mon., Feb. 24: 1:00 FDR Memorial Commission, 1:15 Commission of Fine Arts, 1:45 National Gallery of Art, 2:45 Nat'l Capital Planning Comm.

Tues., Feb. 25: 10:00 Outside Witnesses: DOE; GS; OSM; MMS; BOM, 1:30 Same as above.

Wed., Feb. 26: 10:00 Indian Health Service, 1:30 Same as above.

Thurs., Feb. 27: 10:00 Outside Witnesses: Natural Resources (NPS; F&WS; BLM; Smithsonian; and Forest Service), 1:30 Same as above.

Fri., Feb. 28: 10:00 Outside Witnesses: Natural Resources, (If Necessary).

MARCH 1986

Mon., Mar. 3: 1:00 Energy Information Admin., 2:00 Economic Regulatory Admin., 3:00 Emergency Preparedness.

Tues., Mar. 4: 10:00 National Endowment for the Arts, 1:30 Same as above.

Wed., Mar. 5: 10:00 Office of Surface Mining, 1:30 Same as above.

Thurs., Mar. 6: 10:00 Outside Witnesses: Indian programs, 1:30 Same as above.

Fri., Mar. 7: 10:00 Outside Witnesses: Indian programs, (If Necessary).

Mon., Mar. 10: 1:00 Strategic Petroleum Reserve; Naval Petroleum Reserve; and Federal Inspector for the Alaska Gas Pipeline.

Tues., Mar. 11: 10:00 Fossil Energy, 1:30 Same as above.

Wed., Mar. 12: 10:00 National Park Service, 1:30 Same as above.

Thurs., Mar. 13: 10:00 National Park Service, 1:30 Same as above.

Mon., Mar. 17: 1:00 Bureau of Mines.

Tues., Mar. 18: 10:00 Energy Conservation, 1:30 Same as above.

Wed., Mar. 19: 10:00 Outside Witnesses: NEA; NEH; and IMS, 1:30 Same as above.

Thurs., Mar. 20: 10:00 Smithsonian Institution, 1:30 Same as above.

Fri., Mar. 21: 10:00 Smithsonian Institution (If Necessary).

Mon., Mar. 24: 1:00 Holocaust Council, 2:00 Woodrow Wilson, 3:00 Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

APRIL 1986

Mon., Apr. 7: 1:00 Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Tues., Apr. 8: 10:00 Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1:30 Same as above.

Wed., Apr. 9: 10:00 Fish and Wildlife Service, 1:30 Same as above.

Thurs., Apr. 10: 10:00 Geological Survey, 1:30 Same as above.

Mon., Apr. 14: 1:00 Institute of Museum Services, 2:00 Indian Education.

Tues., Apr. 15: 10:00 Minerals Management Service, 1:30 Same as above.

Wed., Apr. 16: 10:00 National Endowment for the Humanities, 1:30 Same as above.

Thurs., Apr. 17: 10:00 Members of Congress, 1:30 Same as above.

Mon., Apr. 21: 1:00 Forest Service.

Tues., Apr. 22: 10:00 Forest Service 1:30 Same as above.

Wed., Apr. 23: 10:00 Navajo-Hopi Relocation Commission.

Mon., Apr. 28: 1:00 Office of the Secretary/Inspector General/Office of the Solicitor.

Tues., Apr. 29: 10:00 Office of Territorial Affairs (Agency & territorial witnesses), 1:30 Same as above.

Wed., Apr. 30: 10:00 Same as above.

MAY 1986

Thurs., May 1: 10:00 Bureau of Land Management, 1:30 Same as above.

TODAY'S HOLOCAUST

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the leading editorial which appeared in yesterday's Wall Street Journal entitled "Today's Holocaust." Finally one newspaper has the courage to apply the appropriate terminology to describe the horror of what is happening in Ethiopia. The Ethiopian Government is incarcerating in excess of 1.8 million people in what only can be described as concentration camps. Mortality rates are horrifying—10 times greater than was witnessed during the height of Ethiopia's famine.

This week I will be introducing a comprehensive sanctions bill against Ethiopia's Mengistu regime. The Western public has an urgent responsibility to do something now. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 27, 1986]

TODAY'S HOLOCAUST

The word is finally out that the second government-organized group murder in a decade is under way, this time in Ethiopia. The Western public response is showing that the pattern of denial that greeted first reports of the Nazi Holocaust wasn't a fluke. A widespread refusal to believe that the worst could actually happen clears the way for its realization.

French relief workers were touring Washington last week with awful news that had already been reported by eyewitnesses from the U.S. Agency for International Development. The Ethiopian government's year-old "relocation program," now greatly stepped up the military Dergue, or junta, and its Russian patrons, has already claimed the lives of 20 percent of its targets, a death toll of some 100,000. It shapes up as a mass extermination on the order of the Khmer Rouge killing fields and the deportation of Armenians in 1915, with the added horror that it wouldn't have been possible without the aid and silence of Western famine relief.

Now, however, the big relief agencies have to explain why they have been holding their

tongues. Administration critics like U.S. Rep. Howard Wolpe who have been whitewashing the Dergue may have to admit that President Reagan's officials haven't just been making anti-Marxist propaganda. Warnings from people like AID administrator M. Peter McPherson have indeed been the awful truth.

The extracts alongside show how ghastly things have really been. They come from a summary of interviews Swiss citizen Peter Niggli conducted with escapees from the Ethiopian relocation camps. Refugee interviews have been available for a long time. (See our editorial "Death in Asosa," Feb. 20, 1985). But the West has hardly listened, let alone reacted.

Indeed, the Addis Ababa regime has found the famine and the Western response to be a stroke of great fortune. Contrary to the government's lies to gullible, or cynical, Westerners, the relocations have nothing to do with fighting hunger. They are part of Ethiopia's civil war with at least five ethnically based guerrilla groups. They were planned as early as 1981, a former Ethiopian general told the head of a Swiss humanitarian group, after the failure of Lt. Col. Mengistu's "Red Star" offensive in the rebel-dominated northeastern provinces of Eritrea and Tigre. According to the government's own maps, the bulk of the conscripts for resettlement come from the strategic corridor connecting Addis Ababa to the coast. The program is directed, not by the regime's Relief and Rehabilitation Commission, but by its "Office for the Nationality Problem," complete with 25 Russian advisers.

To the Tigre and Wollo rebel movements, whose constituents bear the brunt of the relocations, the Mengistu regime's ultimate aim is simply to exterminate their rural base. There is nothing in the conditions of the forced move or the ultimate site to contradict these fears. The "empty fertile lowland" that the Dergue claims to be developing is relatively empty because it is infested by malaria, water parasites and even, at some relocation sites, the deadly tsetse fly. The relocated northerners come from temperate highlands and lack the immunities of the indigenous peoples (who themselves are being forced from their lands). AID's Mr. McPherson began his public condemnations last month after several of his staff managed an unescorted visit to the Pawe relocation camp in the northwest and discovered a continuing death rate from disease of seven to 15 people per 10,000 a day.

Famine relief has helped support "relocation." Its trucks have been diverted to move people, while grain rots at the ports. The roundups have disrupted harvests and forced abandonment of whole herds of livestock. Grain has been taken from famine areas and sent south to maintain the concentration camps. In the meantime, Lt. Col. Mengistu's army has launched its biggest offensive ever into the heart of the famine regions, drawing logistical support from the relief stockpiles while burning the rebels' crops.

The U.S. government deserves credit for its diplomatic resistance to the relocation program, but Western allies have been breaking a previously united front. Italy, with its own memories of Ethiopia, has promised \$190 million for a particularly harebrained project at the headwaters of the Blue Nile. Canada and Australia are said to be letting their food aid be diverted. The United Nations World Food Program has buried internal reports that confirm the high death rate.

Denial of the holocaust by Westerners is symptomatic of the larger problem, an unwillingness to do the hard things necessary to stop it. Relief workers kept quiet too long but perhaps can be excused considering the lack of any hard-fisted political action by the governments they represent. At the very least and based on what is now known, relief should be suspended. Then it will be time for the U.S. and Europe to look at what further steps should be taken against Lt. Col. Mengistu and his friends for having so cynically and grossly abused the world's humanitarian impulses.

HELPING FARMERS WITH DEBT

HON. VIN WEBER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that will help farmers who face foreclosure or debt restructuring, situations that have become increasingly prevalent as the rural economy has continued to deteriorate. I am pleased to have COOPER EVANS, BERKLEY BEDELL, TOM COLEMAN, TOM TAUKE, and ARLAN STANGELAND join me as original cosponsors of this bill.

The tax treatments of capital gains and debt forgiveness have made it very difficult for farmers to deal with their debt situation. In the case of capital gains, it has often added a cruel irony to the pain of foreclosure. As a farmer is forced to leave a farm or home that may have been in his family for generations, he often leaves with a big tax bill from the government.

This anomaly stems from the rapid rise and fall of land values over the last 10 years. A farmer who has to sell his farm may face a big tax bill on his capital gains, which is based largely on depreciated machinery and land he owned before the inflation of the 1970's. But if he bought some land just before the recent and drastic drop in rural land values, the present value of his entire farm may not be enough to secure his loans at the bank. In other words, he could face both foreclosure and a large tax liability.

For those who still have the opportunity to stay on their farms, another tax contingency has made it difficult to negotiate any kind of debt restructuring with their banks. Many bankers are willing to forgive part of a loan as an element of a "workout" plan. The move is in the banker's interest, because it prevents the loss that comes with a foreclosure and often keeps a good farmer on the land. For the farmer, it puts him in a position where he's better able to manage his debt.

However, the IRS treats any loan forgiveness as straight income. As a result, many workout plans leave a farmer with an unmanageable tax liability. Because the resulting taxes would be so high, we will often forgo the whole restructuring package. As a result, many farmers have not been able to restructure their debt and have had to continue their slide toward foreclosure.

My bill brings some flexibility to these situations by giving farmers tax relief in carefully circumscribed areas. First, a farmer would be able to exclude from gross income any capital

again, which is often only a "paper" gain, that comes from a foreclosure sale. The exclusion would only apply to farmers who are insolvent and are selling off at least 80 percent of the fair market value of their assets.

Second, my bill would bring greater flexibility to farmers who face a debt restructuring situation. Farmers who are able to negotiate a discharge of indebtedness from their lender would not have to declare it as income. This exemption would be limited to farmers who have a debt to asset ratio of a least 70 percent before debt restructuring.

The unmanageable debt burden of rural America threatens not only agriculture but the rest of the economy as well. This bill will give farmers greater flexibility in dealing with their debt burden, and it will facilitate the process of debt restructuring that must take place.

FAIR TRADE FOR THE FILM TRADE

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, our trade deficit and unfair trade practices by foreign governments are extremely serious issues.

Jack Valenti, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, has written an outstanding article elucidating this serious problem in his industry.

I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From The Los Angeles Times, Jan. 19, 1986]

FAIR TRADE FOR THE FILM TRADE

(By Jack Valenti)

Congressional issues blow in and out of the capital, and few of them leave an impression on the life of the nation more durable than the tracings of dry leaves in the wind. But there is one issue that has a legitimate claim to both longevity and urgency: "fair trade"—or, rather, the lack of it.

During the last session of Congress, there were more than 300 trade bills pending. Many of them were wrapped in generalities, and many of them will likely re-emerge next session to ricochet noisily in the congressional corridors. But some go to the anxious heart of the problem, which is the maintenance of a fair trading level for those American products that want to compete in the world market but are faced with unscalable walls of non-tariff trade barriers.

One need not go into the details of the bleak state of our trading position, which can best be described as miserable. Our trade deficit is like a rampant tumor that may be incurable unless we tend to first priorities: shrinking the value of the dollar, increasing American productivity and demolishing trade barriers in other lands.

The first two of the priorities are difficult and long-term goals. The third is attainable now. This means throwing down a spiked gauntlet to all nations that roam our marketplace with freedom and profit but construct the most ingenious hedgerows barring their marketplace to Americans who want to trade there. Unless these obstacles are dismantled, Americans will be feebly

and imperfectly represented in foreign markets, no matter how emaciated the dollar becomes.

By no means does this define "protectionism." Protectionism throws up sandbags of tariffs and quotas to protect native industries.

"Fair trade" is different. Fair trade affirms that the hospitality and lack of restrictions that foreign business interests find so seductive in our country should be visible and active in theirs.

The American film and television industry is a prime example of a home-grown enterprise that asks for no special privileges—no tariffs, no quotas, no barriers in this country—and wants no more than the right to compete fairly and energetically in those countries that are afforded a notably attractive welcome here.

The American film and television industry has a global reach. We return to this country more than \$1 billion in surplus balance of trade each year. By whatever gauge you use, this is an asset of considerable worth. It ought to be preserved. That is, it ought not be barred or constructed or diminished in foreign countries for reasons other than lack of customers.

If movies and television programs are the U.S.A.'s most-wanted exports, it is not because of government subsidy, or because we have a secret that we yearn to shield, or because our product is cheaper to make (in fact, our movie and television production costs are the highest in the world). We have succeeded because we create a special magic that citizens in other lands find bewitching. The stories that we tell on film or tape are sought-after because we tell stories better than most.

Because of our success, a number of friendly nations are affronted. They believe that if they can restrict American films, their film industries will spring up full-blown, flourish and spread. That the theory is spurious makes it no less alluring to government officials.

In Taiwan, for instance, there are no effective copyright laws. Pirates who steal our creative material have full and free rein. Bulky restrictions are inflicted on our films in the form of import quotas, stern limits on the number of films that we can re-release in the country, a large and discriminatory fee imposed on each film, a squeeze on our distribution offices to force us to move our films through Taiwanese distributors, and a hefty box-office tax that is levied only on foreign films. All this from a country with an anticipated trade surplus in 1985 of \$13 billion.

In Columbia, we are saddled with onerous taxes and burdened with quotas of all kinds. In Canada, U.S. television programs are snatched from the air by Canadian cable systems with zero payment to those who own the programs. In Quebec, regulations are pending that would effectively seal off the theatrical marketplace to U.S. film distributors in that province. In Spain, in Indonesia, in India, barriers stand guard against us. And the list goes on and on.

In short, one of America's most precious trade assets is endangered. However, if we demonstrate, without hesitation, that our country will insist on fair trading principles, "competitive marketplace" will become more than a phrase; it will be a reality.

LT. COL. ELLISON S. ONIZUKA

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, today the National Air and Space Museum of the Smithsonian Institution honored the crew members who perished in the horrible tragedy which destroyed the space shuttle *Challenger* on January 28, 1986. A plaque was unveiled at the National Air and Space Museum by several Senators and Members of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of Education. The plaque has been placed in front of the Museum's model of the space shuttle and will serve as a reminder to all who come to celebrate the marvels of air and space that men and women have given their lives so that the quest for knowledge may go on for the benefit of all mankind.

I would like to have my own comments on this sad occasion printed for the record.

My comments follow:

As a Regent of the Smithsonian Institution, which has captured, in its Air and Space Museum, the excitement of the exploration of space, I am proud to be at this solemn ceremony.

We are here to salute seven brave Americans. We will miss them not only because they were talented experts, but because they touched our hearts.

One of these brave Americans, Ellison Onizuka, was a personal friend of my wife May, my children, and myself. We met with him many times and have come to care for him a great deal.

As the first American of Japanese ancestry to become an astronaut, he was a hero to the Japanese American community. He attained a dream that many thought was once out of the realm of possibility.

Even to Ellison Onizuka, it sometimes seemed impossible. He told me that though he dreamed all his life of being a pilot, he still found it hard to believe that he achieved—and surpassed—that dream.

Because if him, such achievements seem impossible no more.

He and I share this feeling as Americans of Japanese ancestry; the excitement and disbelief of reaching a goal our parents never thought attainable.

He is an outstanding example of how far Americans of Asian ancestry have progressed, and how they are recognized for their many scientific contributions.

He is a genuine American hero.

We were so very proud of him when he was selected as the first Asian-American astronaut. And he was proud to be a part of such a fine crew.

We are here today to honor this crew in this building which records so many brave deeds and heroic acts.

These seven will always be remembered as pioneers. It is fitting that out salute to them is here, surrounded by their companions in discovery—people like the Wrights, Lindbergh, Earhart, and others who have given their lives in the quest for reaching the sky.

A TRIBUTE TO LOUISE GRAHAM

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the people of St. Petersburg, FL, suffered a great loss Saturday night with the death of Louise Graham.

Mrs. Graham moved to St. Petersburg in 1927 and in the following 59 years became a very close friend to many people in our community. Throughout her life, she gave freely of her time through thousands of hours of volunteer work.

Much of her time was spent working with handicapped and retarded children and adults. She founded the St. Petersburg's Florence Nightingale Circle more than 30 years ago. During the early 1960's she opened the Louise Graham Shelter workshop in her garage. The workshop, which provided help and care to learning disabled children, moved to several different locations throughout the years before arriving at its permanent site in the former Glenoak Elementary School.

Providing tender loving care was Mrs. Graham's secret to success during her 83 years. In return, she received the love and respect of her friends and neighbors in recognition of her selfless service to better the lives of countless children and adults over her lifetime.

Louise Graham was a long-time friend and I share with her family the loss of this wonderful woman, as well as a great American, whose love was felt by so many people. I am fortunate to have been one of those who was touched by the warmth of her abundant love. We will miss Louise Graham.

BUDGET LAW IS CRUEL
CHARADE

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, communities throughout the west central Illinois district I represent are taking strong local action to promote economic development and new jobs. These efforts deserve continued Federal encouragement and support. The irresponsible Gramm-Rudman approach to budget cutting will severely reduce or eliminate these valuable Federal programs, doing further damage to our hard-pressed Farm Belt communities.

Mark W. Schwiebert, a member of the Rock Island City Council, expressed his justifiable outrage over the local effects of Gramm-Rudman in the following column from the January 10, 1986 issue of the Quad City (Davenport) Times. I commend his clear-eyed view of the folly of Gramm-Rudman to all of its reluctant supporters.

The article follows:

BUDGET LAW IS CRUEL CHARADE

(By Mark W. Schwiebert)

Congress has passed and President Reagan has signed the Gramm-Rudman act. This legislation, which even its chief sponsor called "a substitute for guts," is our current national government's way of dealing with the grave problem of our national deficit.

The president and Congress, having given us a deficit in the last five years greater than the one accumulated in the prior 200, has whipsawed in the opposite direction by approving what one of Reagan's senior economists labeled "one of the most irresponsible bills ever considered by Congress."

What this sample of national folly will do is radical and dangerous. While protecting a few select programs that consume most of the national budget—such as defense contract spending and entitlement programs—Gramm-Rudman requires that the budget be cut radically in each of the next five years. The effect will be to eliminate virtually every other federal domestic program within the next 24 months.

As someone involved in local government for the last half decade, I have seen firsthand the hardship and severe problems caused by the farm economy depression. Massive unemployment, dwindling benefits, frustration and its byproducts of domestic violence and despair have all reared their ugly heads in these times.

Conscious of these hardships, we have tried to hold the line on local taxes to prevent an added burden on those already hard hit. As a result, virtually all of our local tax dollars are committed to basic services that the city must provide—services like police, fire, water, and sewer and a few amenities such as library and parks that make an area livable.

This means that we have had to look elsewhere for money to pay for critical economic development efforts to create new jobs. Thus, such programs as the Rock Island Economic Growth Corp. and City Revolving Loan Fund, which allow us to promote our area to new industries and provide incentives to businesses to locate here, have all been funded with dollars received from Washington.

Without these efforts we are without the tools we need to compete with Sunbelt communities already prospering from the benefits of warmer climates, lower tax rates and lucrative defense contract handouts from the federal government.

Those of us who live here should be aware of these things. And we should be outraged. For what Washington has one with Gramm-Rudman is either to increase our state and local property and other taxes or to eliminate nearly all of the programs we have to create new jobs and reduce suffering. Neither alternative is acceptable.

In a day when \$600 toilet seats and \$50 bolts are commonplace in certain parts of Washington and when Illinois already ranks at the bottom of the list in federal tax dollars that return here, this new proposal to the struggling and historic breadbasket of America is obscene.

Let cuts be made in federal spending, but let them be made intelligently and not expensively. We should ask no less of any of our elected leaders than imagination and courage. Both are urgently needed in the nation's capital now.

A LIVING LEGEND

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for the record an article that appeared recently in the Washington Post, about Mr. Ahmet Ertegun who is regarded by many in the music industry as a "legend in his own time."

As founder and CEO of Atlantic Records, Ahmet Ertegun has continued to play a leadership role in the creation, development, and promotion of the American recording industry.

Approximately 40 years ago, Ahmet Ertegun began a small independent company motivated by his own love of music, particularly black music, and by his personal ideals of fairness and equal opportunity for all persons with musical talents, regardless of their racial or ethnic backgrounds.

Throughout the years Ahmet Ertegun has been in the forefront of a movement to promote rock and roll, rhythm and blues, and jazz throughout the world as our true American art forms.

Today, Mr. Speaker, American rock and roll is the most popular and most emulated art form in the world. The impact of the music industry has been felt not only in the music we hear on the radio, but in what we wear, and in helping to shape our social conscience.

Mr. Speaker on January 23, 1986, Mr. Ahmet Ertegun, as chairman of the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame Foundation, and other pillars of the recording industry inducted 13 people into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. Among those inducted were the following legendary recording artists whose music has entertained millions since the 1950's: Chuck Berry, Elvis Presley, Jerry Lee Lewis, James Brown, Fats Domino, Ray Charles, Sam Cooke, Buddy Holly, Little Richard, and the Everly Brothers. Also honored were two men whose contributions to the industry were production, promotion, and playing of those records: Sun Records founder, Sam Phillips, and the late broadcaster Alan Freed from Cleveland, OH, my own district where rock and roll was born.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to pay tribute to Mr. John Hammond who received a special lifetime achievement award. Mr. Hammond's production and talent scouting credits include, Billie Holiday, Count Basie, Bob Dylan and Bruce Springsteen. John Hammond, like Ahmet Ertegun, has made historic musical and civil rights contributions to the music industry.

I would again like to commend Ahmet Ertegun for his important contributions to the American recording industry.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE ROCK OF ATLANTIC

(By Richard Harrington)

NEW YORK.—The long halls leading to Ahmet Ertegun's office are lined with gold and platinum albums, but the office itself is spared that brashness. What dominates is the music; a long row of unplated (and therefore playable) records, piles of demo tapes with dreams attached, pictures of art-

ists, pictures from artists, the occasional awards plaque and a stereo system capable of blasting out the sounds that define Atlantic Records' past, present and future.

On this weekday afternoon, Ertegun is fielding the tapes that come to him as chairman of the board of Atlantic. Over four decades, he has transformed this once-tiny rhythm and blues label into a major link in the conglomerate chain known as Warner/Elektra/Atlantic. Fueled by the success of such artists as Phil Collins, Stevie Nicks, Twisted Sister, Pete Townshend and several monster sound tracks, Atlantic is having its best year ever for sales volume. W/E/A will do close to \$600 million worth of business, with Atlantic probably accounting for a third of that.

Trim, dapper, debonair, his graying goatee anchoring a head that has been bald since he was 17, Ertegun is the quintessential CEO. He and his wife Mica, a well-known decorator, are fixtures at the ritziest social events and parties on several continents. Ertegun is a lender of Russian Constructivist and American abstract paintings to some of the world's most prestigious museums, a one-time president of the New York Cosmos soccer team, a multimillionaire mover and shaker.

"I'm an old-timer, I still call them sides," Ertegun says in the clipped aristocratic cadence that reveals his cosmopolitan roots. His father, Mehmet Munir Ertegun, was Turkey's ambassador in Washington from 1934 until 1944.

Ahmet Ertegun is no stranger to recorded revelations. The music sought out back in the late '40s and early '50s was rhythm and blues, and the Atlantic Sound—in the form of Joe Turner, Ruth Brown, Ray Charles, the Coasters, Clovers and Drifters, LaVern Baker and others—was as popular and influential as the Motown Sound would be a decade later. It also helped set the stage for rock 'n' roll.

Ertegun is very much in the mold of the old movie men such as Louis B. Mayer and Sam Goldwyn, self-made tycoons. There were others like him—Marshall Chess, Lew Chudd at Imperial, Art Rupe at Specialty—tough entrepreneurs who tapped into the emerging black pop music known as rhythm and blues. They all came up in the late '40s and early '50s. By the '60s, they'd either folded or curtailed their activities.

Only Atlantic survived and prospered, and only Ertegun managed to turn a minor label into a major. Not bad for a man who used to have to go to the bank before every recording session to see if he could afford it. In 1967, the Ertegun brothers and Jerry Wexler, the company's principal stockholder, sold control of Atlantic to Warner Bros.—Seven Arts in exchange for \$17 million in stock. His older brother Nesuhi, who has been with the company since 1955, is president of W/E/A International. Ahmet Ertegun, 61, has remained as chairman of the board at Atlantic, a position with such historical impact that he's been dubbed "The Greatest Rock 'n' Roll Mogul in the World."

How Ahmet Ertegun came to his mogul-dom may be the most unusual story in American music.

"I was born in Istanbul, but left at 2, and I never really spent any time there," he says. His father had ambassadorial stints in Bern, Geneva, Paris and London, but "if anybody asks me where I'm from, my first inclination is to say Washington, because that's where I grew up meaningfully."

Like his older brother Nesuhi, Ahmet Ertegun went to local schools. He prepped,

first at St. Albans and then at Landon, went to college in Annapolis (at St. John's, graduating at 20 near the top of his class).

His father was the senior ambassador in Washington during World War II, an immensely popular and powerful figure. When he died in 1944, President Roosevelt dispatched his body home aboard the USS Missouri. Had the father lived, it's probable the son wouldn't have entered the record business.

"He would have pushed us to return to Turkey and go into civil service," Ertegun says. "My father's father was a judge, and my mother's father was an admiral in the navy and my father was a diplomat and public servant. It was a tradition. . . . My brother and I decided to stay in America because we wanted to live in America, and we chose the business that we love because we loved American music."

The Erteguns loved the music made by the black Americans in particular, a passion that had been instilled when Ahmet was still in short pants.

"The first time I heard a black orchestra was Cab Calloway at the Palladium in London," he says fondly. "I must have been around 9 or 10 years old. There was just the dazzling presence of these black gentlemen—I hadn't seen many black people at that time—in their white, shining suits. . . . the brass instruments shining. . . . the rhythm and the excitement of the music."

By the time the brothers came to Washington in 1934, they were already inveterate jazz collectors. "We had to go hunting in used-record shops and also go from house to house in the black sections of not only Washington but neighboring towns in Virginia and Maryland, asking people if they had old records for sale. Most of those jazz records were released as part of what they used to call 'race' series and that was the only place you could find them. In those days, there were no reissues, so you had to look for the originals."

Eventually the Erteguns amassed 25,000 blues and jazz records, all catalogued and indexed, with personnel written on jacket sleeves. "I realize now we must have had one of the biggest collections in the world," Ertegun says ruefully. When they left the embassy, they had to sell off most of it.

The young Erteguns' passion for the music wasn't confined to 78s, either. They promoted some of the earliest jazz concerts in Washington during the '30s, at the Jewish Community Center, the National Press Club, Turner's Arena. And on Sundays, they turned the Turkish Embassy into an open house for visiting jazz musicians.

"We'd invite people to have lunch at the embassy—Ellington, the Basie Band, Lester Young—and then there were informal jam sessions in the afternoon. It was fun for them, there was no obligation for them to do anything but come and have a good time."

And of course there was the Howard Theatre, the mecca for black entertainment. "I went there almost every week, because every week there was a great band there and I didn't want to miss any of them. I got my education in music at the Howard."

After his father's death, Ertegun's family returned to Turkey, while he remained in graduate school at Georgetown studying philosophy. "But I loved the music, and I knew many of the musicians and singers personally," he says, "so I thought it would be really fun to make some records."

Ertegun had been a regular at Max Silverman's Quality Music Shop at Seventh and T

streets, and it was there that Atlantic was previewed.

"Aside from the fact that I bought records there many years before when it was a used-record business, we'd become very good friends. It was the hot record shop in Washington, so I used to just hang around there a lot in the afternoon. At one point we formed a label, Quality Records, and recorded two or three sessions, which turned out quite well but did not do well. That somehow folded right away."

"But I was intent on going on with it. I had a friend, my dentist in Washington, who decided he would invest \$10,000, and Herb Abramson [a fellow record collector and executive with National Records] came in and put up a little money, and we started Atlantic Records."

Atlantic started in New York, even though Ertegun's move there was gradual. He was still going to school at Georgetown, living on Q Street and "coming to New York on long week-ends. I slept more hours on the train between Washington and New York than I did in my own bed."

For the first few years, Atlantic had only minor hits. Ironically, for a label that would eventually be lauded for its stable of great singers, those first records tended to be instrumentals. But Ertegun wasn't worried.

"For me it was so much fun just to go up to Harlem and hang out at the various clubs' amateur shows where you could hear new talent. Frankly, I never thought we were going to have a big record company. I thought we were just passing a little time, doing this to add a little bit of money to my student allowance, which wasn't very big."

Neither was Atlantic, but like a number of other small, independent labels, it was tuned in to the new currents in popular music emerging after World War II. Rhythm and blues was at first a catchall phrase encompassing black swing bands, harmony groups, blues shouters, funky jazz combos, boogie-woogie pianists—all kinds of music that the major record companies despised.

"In the early days there was a great camaraderie between the various independent record companies," Ertegun recalls. "We made records that the majors would not make, and we made music that the majors actually fought against. Variety and RCA started a big campaign against the product of independent labels, records with 'obscene' lyrics—until they signed up Elvis Presley. Then suddenly the campaign against this kind of music and those kind of lyrics stopped."

One thing that set Atlantic apart from many of its competitors was its reputation for paying its artists the royalties they deserved. Unlike some of the independent bosses, opportunists who had little interest in the music or the musicians, Ertegun was a genuine fan, not just an entrepreneur.

"Frankly it never occurred to me not to pay royalties to artists," Ertegun says. "We treated our artists as stars because we were all fans. . . . I think that's what made Atlantic survive where some of the others didn't. We kept our artists for many years. They developed and became stars and stayed with us."

Atlantic prospered also because Ertegun and his partners (notably Wexler) began, as producers, to fuse a northern sophistication with a gutsy southern blues sensibility, achieving a cleaner, brighter sound than rhythm and blues had known.

"What we were trying to do was to make rhythm and blues records that would sell to

a black audience but also had the potential of crossing over. A lot of our records did cross over, successfully enough to make big white artists cover them."

Ertegun suggests a context of radio in the '50s that sounds remarkably like radio in the '80s. "There was a definite Jim Crow attitude on the part of the broadcasting industry, and there were very few disc jockeys on white stations who would play any black music except for pop singers like Nat King Cole or the Mills Brothers. They wouldn't play Joe Turner or Ruth Brown or Ray Charles. As a result, when their songs started to have some white sales based on white audiences listening to black stations, white artists would cover the song, use our arrangements and immediately get on radio. That happened many times, but the worst was the Chords' 'Sh-Boom,' which the Crewcuts covered. If they hadn't we would have sold a couple of million. As it was we sold six or seven hundred thousand."

At that point, Ertegun and Wexler were producing all of Atlantic's releases, even singing backup when it was needed (that's Ertegun on the chorus of Joe Turner's "Shake, Rattle and Roll"). And then there was the sudden emergence of a new songwriter on such raucous hits as Joe Turner's "Sweet Sixteen," Ray Charles' "Mess Around," the Drifters' "Watcha Gonna Do?," Ruth Brown's "Wild Wild Young Men" and a half dozen hits by the Clovers. His name was A. Nugetre, which looked suspiciously like Ertegun spelled backwards.

"We had a tough time finding good material," Ertegun explains with a smile. "The publishers were not sending us material to record. They never sent companies our size good material."

"So there was only one thing to do. I tried to write very funky songs because we had to sell records in the South—that was our biggest market—and to do that we had to have really funky music. The artists we had were sophisticated, urban artists who looked down on the blues, so I had to write songs that were so funky that there was no other way for them to sing it than to get down with it. I never considered myself a great songwriter but I had to get some hits to survive."

Ertegun's Washington connection is more than just an emotional one. Among the first acts signed to Atlantic were two discovered here: Ruth Brown and the Clovers. The process would be repeated in the early '70s with Roberta Flack and Donny Hathaway and in the early '80s with Stacy Lattisaw and Johnny Gill. Earlier this year, Ertegun made a quick trip to Washington to check out local recording studios, and some felt, to check out the go-go scene. Critics pointed out that Atlantic, which had once been on the cutting edge of black pop, had totally missed the rap and hip hop explosions and might be seeking to reestablish its connections to black currents.

From the '60s on, the history of Atlantic is that of an extremely successful company. It can be told in terms of sales figures and critical successes and special moments and special relationships. Or it can be defined in the great distance between the first cramped offices at 56th and Broadway and the current ones at 75 Rockefeller Plaza.

Thirty years ago, Ahmet Ertegun considered letting the company go on while he went to Turkey for a couple of years. "But I couldn't leave it for two weeks because we had so much competition, and we had to keep the thing going. I still don't feel like we're anywhere safe because you don't know

when your 10 top artists are going to suddenly stop selling records. So you've got to have 20 new ones coming up to take their place."

As 1985 comes to a close, Ertegun seems to be coming to terms with his company's place in the history of American popular culture. Atlantic has just released a 14-record collection that confirms the label's eminence in the pop field, particularly in the '50s, and again in the mid-'60s with such soul stylists as Aretha Franklin, Otis Redding, Wilson Pickett and the Stax-Volt stable.

Ertegun has also been spearheading the drive to establish a legitimate Rock 'n Roll Hall of Fame (the first 10 inductees will be honored at a New York dinner in early January, though a permanent site for the museum has not yet been chosen).

Our aim is to, in a dignified manner, recognize the people who created the music which has become the most popular music of all time in the world," he explains. "Rock 'n' roll is a form of music which has been vilified and looked down on; however, it's a very vibrant and important American music."

You can't help feeling that, without Atlantic, the music might have been vibrant, but it wouldn't have been the same. The new collection certainly reinforces that.

"We did a thorough search on which were the bestselling records, the historically important records of various artists, records which, if they weren't big sellers, were an influence on other records that were made after that," Ertegun says.

"I'm very proud of that collection because it is the history of this company and of many years of my life."

Clearly, the man who built Atlantic Records has every right to be proud. But later, watching him listen to the rough playback of Charelle, his eyes closed in concentration, the barest hint of a satisfied smile edging from his mouth, you suspect Ahmet Ertegun is still a fan—and that he wouldn't have it any other way.

ISSUES BEHIND TERRORISM

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from my hometown newspaper, the Register/Herald of Beckley, WV, January 13, 1986. In it, Walter Massey, the editor, provides a thoughtful insight into the underlying issues of the Middle East controversy. While I have always contended that there are more sides to the dispute in the Middle East than are on a Rubik's Cube, I feel that Mr. Massey takes a good look at the underlying causes of terrorism and some possible steps that might be taken to prevent such heinous acts in the future. I urge all of my colleagues to read it.

ISSUES BEHIND TERRORISM

America would be better able to settle Palestinian grievances if the blame, as Palestinians see it, were against America directly. But it is not. It is against Israel.

Israel has a case for occupying the area which now is the Jewish state. After all, the area is the ancient homeland of the Jewish people, who were driven out centuries ago

by ancestors of those who now call themselves Palestinians.

World War II, with its holocaust, brought into sharp focus for the Jewish people their longing to reclaim for themselves the territory of their ancestors. Thus, accomplished by the Zionist movement, Jews did return, following World War II, to the Mideast and did reclaim their land.

However, in the process of reestablishing the state of Israel, the Jews drove out of Palestine people who had lived there for centuries.

Since then, many Palestinians have chosen to live as permanent refugees rather than to settle in any other land and concede to Israel territory which they owned until some 40 years ago.

The current terrorism stems from a quarrel that has not been settled, despite several wars and countless acts of violence.

The Arab states are virtually united in opposition to Israel. The Arabs, whose religious roots are intertwined with those of Israel, share the Semitic heritage of the Jews. But they do not recognize the Jewish claim to Israel based on the holy scriptures of the Jewish faith.

If one reads the Old Testament, it's evident that the people of Israel quarreled with their neighbors beginning as long ago as 10,000 years. The modern Mideast quarrel is but a blinking of the eye compared to the duration of the hostilities in what often is called the Holy Land.

Can this quarrel be settled? Is it within the powers of human reason to render decisions which all will recognize as just?

America in modern times has attempted to serve as a broker for peace, even while guaranteeing the survival of Israel. Some in the Arab world might argue that America cannot do both, but that's another story.

The real question is whether American leaders or anyone else can satisfy the Palestinian people, as columnist Mary McGrory suggests should be done, while Israel continues to exist in security.

Some Palestinians are absolutists. They will settle for nothing less than the destruction of Israel. Thus, America cannot oblige them.

Other Palestinians are more moderate. Some wish accommodation with Israel which exchanges their recognition of the Jewish state for territory, perhaps the captured West Bank of the Jordan River.

But some Israelis can be just as intransigent as some Palestinians. Hard-line Israeli leaders have refused even to talk to Palestinian leaders. To the Israeli hard-liners, all Palestinians are terrorists.

Trust is mutually lacking. Hatreds are rampant, both on the part of many Israelis and many Arabs.

When two peoples both believe they legitimately own the same land, and when these peoples hate and distrust each other, obviously this is not a quarrel easily solved. Negotiations could take generations.

The effort to achieve peace should be ceaseless, and America should do what it can to further the process.

But America cannot unilaterally devise a solution and impose it on any of the parties involved. The parties must come to accord of their choosing.

A starting point would be face-to-face talks between Israel and leaders of the Palestinians and contiguous Arab states.

The U.S. should pressure Israel to agree in principle to such talks.

Meanwhile, however, America must protect itself from Islamic terrorism. Despite

McGrory's good intentions, our country can't depend on negotiations which may take a lifetime to protect Americans in European airports today.

The problem is more immediate. There may be no substitute for force.

A TRIBUTE TO MARYANNE LEHRER

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to bring to the attention of my colleagues that on Sunday, February 2, 1986, Mrs. Maryanne Lehrer will be honored as the Oceanside Free School District's "Woman of the Year" at the annual brotherhood breakfast sponsored by the Rocky Marciano Lodge No. 2226 O.S.I.A. and the Trophy Lodge No. 2059 B'nai B'rith. Maryanne is a constituent of mine from Oceanside, NY, and has worked with diligence and love for the betterment of the children of her community.

A member of the Oceanside Board of Education since 1977, Maryanne was selected by her fellow board members to serve two terms as vice president and two terms as president of the board. In addition, she serves as chairman of the Board's legislative committee.

Maryanne has widened the scope of her activities on behalf of education beyond the Oceanside School District through her participation as a member of the executive board and legislative committee of the Nassau/Suffolk School Board Association. She also serves as liaison from the Fourth Congressional District to the Federal Relations Network of the National School Board Association. Her active involvement with countywide and national organizations has allowed Maryanne to provide insights into State and Federal legislation to her colleagues on the board of education and better serve the parents and children of the Oceanside School District.

A leader in many civil and youth-oriented programs, Maryanne has received much-deserved praise for her activities. She has been elected to Kappa Delta Phi and is a lifetime member not only of the New York Parent Teachers Association, but the national PTA as well. She is the founder of the Long Island Food and Hunger Awareness Program, and is active in the Nassau/Suffolk Autistic Society, the Epilepsy Foundation, the Women's American ORT, and the American Cancer Society.

I would like to offer my warmest congratulations to Maryanne on being selected as Woman of the Year, and on behalf of the people of the Fourth Congressional District, I'd like to extend my best wishes for her continued efforts benefiting the children and the entire Oceanside community.

A TRIBUTE TO THE MARSHALL PHILHARMONIC ORCHESTRA

HON. E. THOMAS COLEMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Marshall Philharmonic Orchestra has brought great pride and pleasure to North Missourians for the past 23 years. On December 30, the symphony played to its largest audience to date—nearly 20 million people nationwide tuned in to NBC's "American Almanac" which featured the symphony and its founder/director, Harold Lickey of Marshall, MO.

The Marshall Philharmonic performs all the classics from Bach to Beethoven, as well as the modern classics. Its sound has been compared to the National Symphony Orchestra and other renowned orchestras in America, yet the Marshall Philharmonic has a distinguished feature: the conductor and his orchestra are not musicians by trade; they are, simply, members of the community who love music and bringing its joy to their family, friends and neighbors who attend the symphony's concerts each year.

Harold Lickey cofounded the symphony 23 years ago when he was chairman of the Marshall High School music department. Today, people from across North Missouri belong to the orchestra. They range from all ages and positions in life, from a sixth-grade cellist to an 83-year-old bassoonist. They meet for rehearsals on Sunday afternoons at the high school and hold three or four performances a year at Bueker Middle School. Most of the support for the orchestra comes from voluntary contributions. To further help the group, the town established an endowment fund this year.

I'm proud to represent in Congress these talented Americans who have brought enrichment to their communities, and to bring to your attention the town of Marshall, MO which has received the national acclaim it has earned for being the smallest town in the United States to have a symphony orchestra.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OFFERS TO BUY THE U.S. JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, Washington is a town of political fads, and one of the most popular fads of the Reagan administration is the selling of public agencies to the private sector. Even a new word, "privatization," has been created to describe the phenomenon, which is underpinned by the belief that Government management is cumbersome and wasteful, while private sector management is smooth and efficient.

True to its doctrine that all Federal agencies, except for the Defense Department, are grossly mismanaged, the Reagan administration's Department of Justice has been working

tirelessly to obstruct the cause of justice and equality in America. Recognizing that the Department is fast approaching bankruptcy, on December 17 the American Civil Liberties Union [ACLU] made a formal offer to Attorney General Edwin Meese to purchase the entire Justice Department, or alternately, its Civil Rights Division. It is an offer that I hope Attorney General Meese, along with my colleagues in the House and Senate, will think about carefully.

The text of the ACLU press release follows:

ACLU OFFERS TO BUY THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

The American Civil Liberties Union, in a move unanticipated on Wall Street, today offered to buy the United States Justice Department.

The offer came in a letter to Attorney General Edwin Meese only days after President Reagan had proposed to sell the Federal Housing Administration to private interests, on the ground that they could do a better job than the government.

"We think the same the same can be said about the Justice Department," said Ira Glasser, ACLU Executive Director. "Civil rights and civil liberties organizations are already doing much of the work that should be done by the Justice Department, and particularly by its Civil Rights Division," Glasser said. "Civil rights lawyers are increasingly functioning as 'private attorneys-general,' enforcing laws that the Justice Department is failing to enforce," he said. "We might as well go all the way."

Just as President Reagan proposed to sell the Federal Housing Administration, including all its assets and liabilities, Glasser said the ACLU was "prepared to take over the entire Justice Department, including its assets and liabilities, which are many."

The leveraged buyout of the Justice Department, Wall Street insiders said, would be the largest in history, dwarfing the recent purchase by General Electric of RCA. But Glasser said that it wouldn't cost as much as anticipated because "the net worth of the Department has plummeted since Mr. Meese became Attorney General, and investors have lost confidence in top management."

"Indeed," said Glasser, "those with a long-term investment in justice believe that the Department is now nearly bankrupt. An examination by our auditors of the balance sheet of its key unit, the Civil Rights Division, shows liabilities exceeding assets to an alarming degree."

It was not immediately clear how the offer would be received in Washington, but Mr. Meese was undoubtedly consulting the Federalist Papers in an attempt to find what the framers' original intentions were with respect to such an offer.

Meanwhile, Glasser said the ACLU would be willing to consider purchasing only the Civil Rights Division, if Mr. Meese found that offer more acceptable. "That part of the company is potentially its most valuable asset," said Glasser, "and the one that the government seems the least interested in developing."

ADMIRAL FARRAGUT ACADEMY CELEBRATES 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Admiral Farragut Academy, which has become a St. Petersburg, FL, landmark, celebrates its 40th anniversary this year.

With almost 300 students, the school is one of only 52 preparatory military academies left in the United States. Capt. Richard Wheeler has been the academy's headmaster for the past 10 years and has continued the school's reputation of providing an outstanding education to students planning to continue their studies at colleges and universities throughout our Nation.

Admiral Farragut students have earned the respect and are a welcome part of the St. Petersburg community. I have had the opportunity to participate in their commencement exercises and have watched with pride their full dress parades and drills.

Millie Moyer, whose husband was an early executive director of the school, dedicated 35 years to the academy in many roles, including social director. She and her husband lived on campus and their son was a academy graduate. The Moyers are representative of the hundreds of faculty members and students who have contributed to the history of the Admiral Farragut Academy. They are a part of a St. Petersburg tradition that has instilled discipline, enhanced the education, and touched the lives of students for the past four decades.

THE DRUG PROBLEM HITS ALL AREAS OF SOCIETY

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday America watched yet another Super Bowl. As we watched the Chicago Bears rout the New England Patriots, in what has become a national tradition, heroes were created and new legends were born. Professional athletes hold a special place in our society—they are respected and loved by fans and admired by young children.

While we all sat back and enjoyed the game and watched as the Bears celebrated their victory, another story—an ugly, disturbing story surfaced. Today it has been revealed that the New England Patriots have a serious drug problem and they have become the first team in the National Football League to agree to undergo voluntary drug testing.

This unfortunate incident simply underscores the alarming pervasiveness of the drug problem in this country. In my view, it is a national tragedy when our sports heroes openly admit that they have serious problems with drug abuse. First it was baseball this past

summer. Now this scandal in the wake of our cherished Super Bowl and all the tradition surrounding football. As a former drug counselor, I am all too well aware of the enormous dangers of substance abuse and how substance abuse can ruin a person's life and tear apart families.

A nation is shocked over the pronouncements by the New England Patriots—but let us not be fooled. Drug abuse is a problem, not of the rich, not of the privileged, but of society as a whole. Recent polls have shown that many Americans rank drug abuse as one of this Nation's greatest problems. I agree. While many people are concerned over the drug problem, they do not know how to adequately confront it.

As a former drug counselor I recognize the vital importance of educating our young people—and their parents—about the whole spectrum of substance abuse. Such education should begin at an early age and should continue through high school. Many schools across the country have already undertaken excellent programs in substance abuse. But, unfortunately, many have not. Parents need to get more involved and informed about substance abuse. Substance abuse education programs are not uniform and vary greatly from school to school, and State to State.

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 3769, the "National Substance Abuse Education Act," that I feel would be an important first step in getting all school districts to adopt sound substance abuse education programs for students and parents. The bill would establish a wide range of guidelines for State educational agencies to follow in developing a substance abuse education program to become a mandatory part of the curriculum for grades 4 through 12. States that do not, after 2 years, develop a program satisfactory to the Secretary of Education, would lose 30 percent of the Federal funds provided under chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981. States financially unable to meet the requirements set forth in the bill could adopt an alternative program that does not require that substance abuse education courses become a mandatory part of the curriculum.

Both programs under the bill emphasize both student and parent education about the full range of topics involving substance abuse. The important thing to note is that the bill sets clear and uniform guidelines for State educational agencies to follow in developing education programs in substance abuse. Of course States would have the leeway to develop programs tailored to existing needs. Schools that already have in place substance abuse education programs can use the guidelines to build upon and improve their programs. Other schools that have yet to make substance abuse education priority, would have an excellent guide in developing a viable program.

The recent drug problem announced by the New England Patriots is a national tragedy. It underlines the need for America to face up to its problem with drugs—as the Patriots have done. We must recognize this problem as one that affects all of our lives. Aggressive education efforts can make a difference. Enactment of H.R. 3769 would be an important first step in addressing this national problem.

SCIENTIFIC INNOVATIONS AT BATTLE

HON. SID MORRISON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the recognition that has recently been extended to Battelle's Pacific Northwest Laboratories and several of its scientists for scientific innovations.

Science Digest surveyed over 1,200 corporations, universities, colleges, science and engineering associations, nonprofit institutions, and government agencies for nominations of significant innovations in science. I am pleased to report that of the 100 scientific accomplishments, 2 had their springboard at Battelle. According to Science Digest, the men and women whose innovations are recognized as the top 100 in the United States are the vanguard of America's scientific revolution. "They are the inventors and innovators, responsible for creating our vision of the future. They deserve recognition."

Dr. Richard Smith of Battelle was recognized for developing a process for forming fine powder substances of uniform particle size. The powders are finer than those made by grinding. Fine coatings can be sprayed on delicate surfaces such as optical lenses and microelectric components.

Science Digest also recognized Dr. Richard Douthart and a team of Battelle researchers for the development of a computer aided design system for genetic engineering. This system uses genetic information and DNA sequence information to produce hypothetical designs of genetic structures that have many potential biotechnological applications including food and agriculture, petroleum, pharmaceuticals, and the chemical engineering industries.

Mr. Speaker, these scientists at Battelle, as well as the other individuals who were recognized by Science Digest, deserve our recognition. If this country is to regain its former position as being the world's leading practitioner of using science to preserve our position in the world's competitive marketplace, we must create an environment where scientific accomplishments are applauded.

As a member of the Science and Technology Committee I have a deep sense of appreciation of what our science and engineering resources can do to solve technical problems and create new products and processes. I would like to recognize just two examples of scientific progress, conducted by my constituents, that will continue to help the United States maintain its role in the technology marketplace. My congratulations to Battelle for doing its part.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES CROWLEY

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, Jim Crowley, a resident of my congressional district and a legend of the sports world, died recently. His football expertise and his ability to lead and serve will be greatly missed. Jim was a mentor to many young people who later went on to successful careers, and they will miss his counsel and guidance as well.

Jim was the last living member of the famous Four Horsemen of Notre Dame. In 1924, the Four Horsemen pushed Knute Rockne's team to a 9-0 regular-season record and 17-10 Rose Bowl upset over Stanford.

It was during that successful 1924 season that Jim Crowley and Don Miller, covering the halfback positions, Harry Stuhldreher, the fearless quarterback, and Elmer Layden, fullback, were nicknamed the Four Horsemen.

Grantland Rice, sportswriter for the New York Times, holds the honor for naming the Notre Dame backfield the Four Horsemen. He wrote, after Notre Dame's 13-7 victory over Army on October 18, 1924:

Outlined against a blue, gray October sky the Four Horsemen rode again. In dramatic lore they are known as famine, pestilence, destruction and death. These are only aliases. Their real names are: Stuhldreher, Miller, Crowley and Layden. They formed the crest of the South Bend cyclone before which another fighting Army team was swept over the precipice at the Polo Grounds this afternoon as 55,000 spectators peered down upon the bewildering panorama spread out upon the green plain below.

As a Notre Dame alumnus, I remember the aura of the Four Horsemen and I am sure it will live on forever throughout the halls of the fighting Irish.

Jim was a member of the National Football Foundation Hall of Fame, and the 1924 All-American Team. After graduation from Notre Dame in 1925, Jim went on to briefly play football for the Green Bay Packers and the Providence Steam Rollers.

Jim was also well known for his coaching abilities at the University of Georgia, Michigan State University, and Fordham University. He took Fordham to two bowl games.

Jim's mark on college football will be felt for many years. He was instrumental in the design of the Heisman Trophy, awarded annually to college football's most outstanding player.

Jim will be missed by many, but the legend that he created lives on to inspire countless others.

TO A NEW LEADER, BISHOP
EDMOND BROWNING

HON. DANIEL K. AKAKA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to joining with my colleagues in celebration of a great new leader, Edmond Lee Browning.

On January 11, here in Washington, DC, the Most Reverend Edmond Browning was installed as the 24th presiding bishop of the American Episcopal Church. Having served with distinction as the bishop of my home State of Hawaii for the past 11 years, Bishop Browning now looks forward to serving a 12-year term as head of the American church. He is a singularly distinguished choice. In Bishop Browning, Hawaii's loss is truly the whole country's gain. For, in Bishop Browning, we have a man with a spirit of compassion, honor, and justice.

Bishop Browning has wasted no time in making clear to us his very real knowledge and understanding of our modern world in his address on the occasion of his installation. Recognizing the elements which alarm many, if not all of us, Bishop Browning spoke of the pain which exists around us. "There are tears of despair which we refuse to see," he said. "There are cries for help which we do not hear. There are those reaching out to be embraced whom we will not touch," he stressed.

In a world where "super powers posture over arms agreements while the lives of our children hang in the balance"; where "unjust governments deny basic human rights while inflicting torture and suffering upon millions of its citizens"; while "we live in an age where we have the technology to feed the world, and instead, millions are hungry and thousands die every day," Bishop Browning calls upon us, the "faithful politicians," to speak out against injustice such as the evil of apartheid and to stand up for the principles we value as people.

Bishop Browning further reminds us of the words of a great leader, John Kennedy, who called us to a vision 25 years ago, a vision where the "strong are just, the weak are secure and the peace preserved."

In Bishop Browning, I am certain that words such as these shall lose neither their significance, nor their direction. I extend my most sincere good wishes to this wonderful new leader.

TERRI FRANCIS JACKSON:
SONGSTRESS AND HUMANITARIAN

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues the outstanding career and personal journey of Terri Francis Jackson.

Ms. Jackson was born 60 years ago in New York City, but was raised in Hillburn, NY, in

Rockland County. She began singing in church choirs when she was only 4, and became a professional blues artist as a protégé of the late great tenor saxophonist, Gene Ammons. Throughout her career as a jazz/blues singer, she had worked in 42 States and made USO tours in Europe and Asia. She was particularly appreciated by resort audiences in southeastern New York, who compared her unique voice to Della Reese and Carmen McRae.

Tragedy struck Terri Francis Jackson in 1974, by way of a massive heart attack. A year later, she was declared legally blind. She subsequently became crippled by arthritis and has fought an ongoing battle against cancer and diabetes. Terri Francis Jackson suffered blows of fate which would have justly led others to withdraw from life.

Such was not the case with Terri Francis Jackson. Declaring, "I am not handicapped, I am handicapped," Ms. Jackson devoted her beautiful voice and her life to helping others. She has performed in and sponsored many benefit concerts to raise funds for scholarships for minority and handicapped students, for the Easter Seals Society, and the Handi-Van and Horton Memorial Hospital in Middletown, NY.

Not only did Terri not allow her physical problems to interfere with her work for others, she pursued her own educational goals, obtaining an associate of applied science degree in human services from Schenectady County Community College at the age of 55, and completing the requirements for a bachelors degree from Empire State College.

A reporter once wrote:

At the drop of a hat, Terri will manage to get herself and her wheelchair anywhere she can make music for the benefit of others. She will sing to raise money, she sings to bring pleasure to hospital patients, she sings for the joy of singing.

Mr. Speaker, on February 9, John Moultrie Productions Co., with the cooperation of the Arts Council of Orange County, NY, will present a benefit concert honoring Terri Francis Jackson. Some of the leading figures of show business and in public life in the mid-Hudson region will come together to pay tribute to this unique, distinguished individual, whose life and accomplishments have been an inspiration to us all.

Mr. Speaker, I invite our colleagues to join in paying tribute to the remarkable Terri Francis Jackson.

A TRIBUTE TO RAUL VELASCO

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and pay tribute to Mr. Raul Velasco, host of the "Siempre en Domingo" television show, for his efforts in promoting Charro Days activities and his leadership in the Hispanic community.

Charro Days, which originated as a pre-lenten festival, is a 4-day celebration in which the United States and Mexico are joined in celebration of the cultures of these neighbor-

ing countries. During this time, there are a series of parades, dances, and parties to demonstrate the goodwill of both countries. It is a well-planned, major function which is enjoyed and eagerly anticipated by south Texans as well as our winter visitors.

Every year the city of Brownsville, represented by the Mr. Amigo Association, travels to Mexico City to select a new Mr. Amigo to serve as honored guest of Charro Days. This person is selected on the basis of his contribution to international friendship and development of mutual understanding and cooperation between the two nations.

Mr. Velasco was honored with the Mr. Amigo Award 13 years ago. He has since demonstrated his support for the Charro Days Association and the city of Brownsville by televising and promoting Charro Days activities on his television program "Siempre en Domingo." His program is viewed by over 130 million viewers weekly in such faraway countries as France, Italy, Holland, Japan, Korea, Panama, Venezuela, Ecuador, and Chile to name a few. Mr. Velasco strives to use his television show as an effective vehicle to educate and acquaint his viewing audience with the history and diversity of the Mexican culture. His presentation of the cross section of the many Hispanic cultures, which includes singers and movie stars and various talent acts, is viewed by Latin American countries all over the world.

Mr. Velasco has given so much of his time and effort on behalf of the Charro Days Association, and the Mr. Amigo Association as well. It is only befitting to pay such a high tribute to him for all his contributions to the Hispanic society. Without Mr. Velasco's contributions, in the way of his time, energy, and enthusiasm that he has given to promoting the Charro Days festivities, the yearly celebration would not be as widely known and enjoyed. I would like to express my deep appreciation for all he has contributed to making Charro Days a truly international event.

SUPERVISOR ROBERT O. TOWNSEND
RETIRES FROM BOARD
JANUARY 29, 1986

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a long-time friend and colleague, Mr. Robert O. Townsend. Since 1974, Bob Townsend has served on the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors and has had the honor of chairing the board for 4 of those 11 years. Upon his retirement, the board, and the county, will lose a dedicated servant.

Bob demonstrates all that a public official can hope to be. He is a man of integrity; his first priority being the citizens of San Bernardino County. His administrative talents are many, reflected in his terms as chairman of the board. Bob's dedication to the county is far reaching; his involvement in public affairs extends much further than the board of supervisors.

Through the years, Bob Townsend has been a driving force in the county. His leadership has manifested itself in various appointments to community groups. He was the project leader for San Bernardino County and commissioner of the California Public/Private Partnership Commission. Bob has served on the mayor's and President's Policy Committee, the San Bernardino County Public Improvements Authority, and the San Bernardino County Building Authority, to name just a few.

Bob has proven himself invaluable to the county on issues such as transportation, flood control, and power. His concern for the citizens of this valley have been demonstrated countless times through his involvement in organizations such as the Tri-County Council on Criminal Justice, the County Emergency Medical Authority, the Inland Manpower Association, the County Disaster Council, and the Air Pollution Control District Board.

I have always been able to rely on Bob during my years in Sacramento and in our Nation's capital. He is a warm, receptive man, and my respect for him as a public servant is immense. Together, the members of the board of supervisors provide a positive government for the county of San Bernardino. It has been both an honor and a privilege to work with the board, and especially Bob Townsend, in providing effective representation to the citizens of San Bernardino County.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues here in the House of Representatives, to join with me, family, and friends in wishing Supervisor Bob Townsend a healthy happy retirement. We'll miss you, Bob.

SUPPORT FOR A STRONG SYNTHETIC FUELS PROGRAM

HON. KEN KRAMER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have long been a supporter of a strong synthetic fuels program. During my first term in Congress, I was honored to be the only Republican Representative from the Rocky Mountain States asked to serve on the joint House-Senate Energy Committee, which developed the legislation that set up the Synthetic Fuels Corporation.

Following a commitment from the Federal Government, western Colorado invested substantial time and money in an infrastructure which would support the needs of the Union and Cathedral Bluffs oil shale projects.

Last month, the Government broke its promise to these Coloradans.

I would like to share with you an article from the Dallas Morning News which accurately reflects my sentiment in support of synthetic fuels and the hard work of the SFC Chairman Ed Noble. I ask that this information be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Jan. 15, 1986]

SYNTHETIC FUELS ENDEAVOR LEAVES UNDETERMINED LEGACY (By Jim Landers)

WASHINGTON.—Like a great elephant repeatedly wounded by hunters, Synthetic

Fuel Corp. stayed on its feet for a long time before a final javelin blow from Congress last month brought it down.

The corporation was born in the 1980 Iranian oil crisis and killed five years later by a Congress more worried by budget deficits than oil imports. It may take another five years to discover how much of a contribution the corporation made to the country's energy security by backing four projects with about \$1.5 billion in federal funds, because that contribution is dependent on the future course of oil prices.

If oil prices keep falling, the synthetic fuels campaign of the 1980s will seem like a waste of taxpayer money. The Reagan administration under the urging of Energy Secretary James Herrington, adopted this view at a December Cabinet meeting.

"The administration no longer believes continued funding of the Synthetic Fuels Corp. serves any useful purpose," Budget Director James Miller wrote Congress on Dec. 12. The letter doomed the efforts of some senators to keep the corporation alive.

If oil prices soar, then the four projects backed by the corporation could provide energy companies with a quick means of developing plants that turn coal and shale into oil and gas. Project sponsors and the outgoing directors of the corporation have taken this view and expect the country's gratitude will be apparent in another 10 years.

Together, the four projects backed by the corporation are designed to add the equivalent of 22,000 barrels a day of oil production (current domestic production is 8.9 million barrels a day) to the nation's energy base.

The corporation spent far less money and backed far fewer projects than its supporters envisioned. Six years ago, Congress and the Carter administration talked of an \$88 billion synthetic fuels effort. About \$19 billion actually was appropriated by Congress, and the corporation was given \$15.3 billion of that.

Synthetic Fuels Corp. chairman Edward Noble acknowledged that falling prices undermined the corporation, particularly the initial congressional mandate to finance 500,000 barrels per day of synthetic fuels production by 1987 and 2 million barrels per day by 1992.

But Noble said the corporation was able to provide the country with a "national security insurance policy" by fostering synthetic fuels technologies.

One of those technologies is coal gasification. When Synthetic Fuels Corp. was started, gas derived from coal was attractive because of pessimism about U.S. natural gas reserves. Now that the pessimism about gas reserves has dissipated, the technology used in coal gasification is being viewed as a possible solution for acid rain.

And after Congress and the Reagan administration last month decided the federal government had no business spending billions of dollars on synthetic fuels, a top presidential adviser last week recommended a \$5 billion, five-year federal effort to develop technologies to reduce acid rain that have many similarities to the synthetic fuels effort.

Former Transportation Secretary Drew Lewis, President Reagan's special representative on acid rain, made the recommendation on Jan. 9 at the conclusion of a year-long U.S.-Canadian study of the problem.

Two of the four projects funded by Synthetic Fuels Corp. are designed to transform coal into energy-rich gas that can be burned with a fraction of the air pollution generated by coal-fired boilers.

Dow Chemical Co. in Louisiana and a collection of firms in California led by Southern California Edison Co. received \$740 million in Synthetic Fuels Corp. price guarantees for two coal gasification projects. The Dow Syngas project is expected to start operation in 1987, while Southern California Edison's Cool Water project has been turning coal into gas—and then gas into electricity—for 18 months.

"Cool Water is demonstrating the cleanest way yet devised for burning coal," Noble said. Several utilities have approached the Cool Water consortium about licensing their technology for other plants, he noted.

In the bill that killed Synthetic Fuels Corp., Congress saved \$400 million for clean coal technologies development by the Energy Department while eliminating nearly \$7 billion in spending authority.

"We got about two-thirds of the job done," Noble said. "We still lack projects to show us how to use Eastern coals and tar sands, and we could have done more on shale oil. If we'd had those other two or three plants, we could have added all our coal and oil shale to the nation's petroleum reserves—five times the oil reserves of the Middle East. As it is, we should be able to add two or three times all the reserves in the Middle East."

John Howard, President of Greenwich Oil Co. of Dallas, said the \$60 million in loan and price guarantees awarded to his company by Synthetic Fuels Corp. in September could add 10 billion barrels of thick, tarry oil to the nation's useful oil reserves.

Greenwich Oil injects oxygen into a deep, sandy oil formation in Wood County, Texas, to produce an underground "fire flood" that makes the oil fluid enough to pump to the surface. The company hopes to produce about 1,600 barrels a day of useful crude oil extracted with fire flooding.

Synthetic Fuels Corp. agreed to guarantee Greenwich \$40 per barrel for the first half million barrels of oil lifted from the field by fire flooding. The price guarantee is \$22 per barrel more than the current market price for such heavy oil. But without the financial assistance, Howard said, Greenwich's Forest Hill heavy oil project probably would limp along for several years, waiting for prices to rise, without ever demonstrating the commercial feasibility of fire flooding.

"I believe the day will come in the not-too-distant future when we'll be back in a similar situation to what we went through in the 1970s and 1980," Howard said. "By 1990 or so, the United States once again will find itself a massive importer of crude oil, vulnerable to offshore disruptions. Our technology will be available then to anybody who wants it."

Noble and Cantrell Exploration Co., a Dallas oil firm competing with Greenwich for heavy oil development, wrote Synthetic Fuels Corp. objecting to the Greenwich's use of federal finances, but Howard called Forest Hill "the best project ever brought to the Synthetic Fuels Corp."

"This is an insurance policy and nothing else," Noble said. "If we don't need it, we didn't spend that much money on it."

NATIONAL READING IS FUN
WEEK

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased yesterday to introduce a joint resolution designating the week of April 20 as "National Reading Is Fun Week." It is my hope that enactment of this resolution will call attention to the problems of illiteracy in our Nation while at the same time pointing out to America that reading is fun.

Mr. Speaker, 1986 marks the 20th anniversary of the founding of Reading is Fundamental, popularly known as RIF, a nationwide, nonprofit program which successfully motivates millions of children and young adults to read. RIF works for a literate America while preventing illiteracy—a problem that affects far too many of our citizens. As a nation, we all pay the price of illiteracy.

It is difficult to determine the exact number of Americans who are illiterate—a problem made more difficult because of the lack of a precise definition of the word. Generally, literacy studies use two definitions: functional illiteracy and the conventional definition. Functional illiteracy is generally used to describe persons who are incapable of understanding written instructions necessary to accomplish specific tasks or functions needed to lead a productive life. In the early 1970's, the University of Texas studied reading and writing competencies that were related to adult economic and educational success in contemporary American society. This adult performance level [APL] study estimated that 20 percent of Americans function as below a marginal level.

Other literacy studies—often conducted by the Census Bureau—have used a standard of conventional literacy: Individuals aged 14 years or over who are unable to read and write English at all. In 1985, the Census Bureau published an estimate of adult illiteracy for 1980, showing a rate of 0.5 percent.

Regardless of what studies are used, our Nation has made great strides to improve literacy in America. In 1870, the illiteracy rate using the conventional definition was 20 percent. As noted, it is now just 0.5 percent. Still, more needs to be done, and public-private partnerships can fill that role.

As the senior Republican on the House Appropriations Committee and its Subcommittee on Labor/Health and Human Services/Education, I worked to insure a funding level of \$102 million for the Adult Education Act [AEA] for fiscal year 1986. The AEA is currently the major Federal program that provides basic education and literacy skills for adults. In addition, the subcommittee provided \$5 million for library literacy programs—a new program never before funded.

Reading is Fundamental, is an outstanding example of private initiatives to combat illiteracy. The organization reaches young people early, helping them to become readers. In the last 20 years, RIF has brought more than 70 million books into American homes, opening up a world of reading to millions of children.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. Speaker, reading is fun, and I am pleased to introduce this joint resolution commemorating Reading Is Fun Week, April 20 to 26, 1986. During this week, most of RIF's 100,000 volunteers, in every State in the Nation, will reach young people with activities to motivate reading and the opportunity to choose and keep books that speak to their interests and their dreams. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this resolution.

THE ABORTION DEBATE

HON. DENNY SMITH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1986, marked the 13th anniversary of the Supreme Court decisions legalizing abortion-on-demand in the United States. In solemn observance of these decisions, tens of thousands of concerned citizens gathered in Washington, DC, to express their support for the right to life for all in our Nation. Many of the marchers came great distances at their own expense, and should be commended for their dedication.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my opposition to abortion.

In 1973, the Supreme Court went far beyond its constitutional role of judicial review, and began establishing—in effect legislating—the Government's policy on abortion. The controversial Supreme Court decisions, *Roe versus Wade* and *Doe versus Bolton*, overturned antiabortion statutes in all 50 States. In the 13 years since these decisions, no legislature—State or Federal—has affirmed the right to an abortion.

Many constitutional scholars claim that the Justices first had to find—some say fabricate—the right to privacy in the 14th amendment in order to justify legalized abortion.

I would like to point out some of the obvious flaws in their argument justifying abortion. First, the right of privacy does not extend to all acts committed in private. Parents who abuse their children usually do so in private, but no one would argue that they have a constitutional right to carry out such assaults.

Second, the freedom of choice doesn't apply to all choices made. Someone may choose to rob a bank, but he certainly doesn't have a right to that choice.

The Constitution states that our Government was established, among other reasons, to ensure justice. Therefore, the Government must move to secure and protect the rights of minorities, at times in the face of opposition from the majority. Proabortionists claim that polls show a majority of Americans favor legalized abortion. Without debating the accuracy of these polls, I would like to point out that during other eras in our Nation's history and majority have favored such things as slavery and racial segregation, which we now view as abhorrent.

As a Member of Congress, I have a constitutional obligation to protect the right of life for all Americans, regardless of their age or condition of dependency. I hold this view in light of the overwhelming medical evidence that

the fetus is indeed a living human being. After all, the fetus is most assuredly alive, or an abortion wouldn't be necessary to kill it. And if it isn't human, what is it? A dog? A cow?

By resorting to Orwellian double-speak, proabortionists have tried to discredit the humanity of the unborn child. Referring to the unborn as "tissue" or the "products of conception," they hope to hide the fact that abortion involves the taking of another human life.

The 16 million unborn children aborted since 1973 aren't the only victims of abortion, however. Women themselves have been victimized by this multibillion dollar industry. Witness the establishment of groups such as Women Exploited by Abortion [WEBA], an organization whose membership grew by over 10,000 in less than 2 years. All the members are women who have been traumatized as a result of having had an abortion.

The handicapped have also been the Court's victims. In the 1973 decision *Roe versus Wade*, Justice Blackmun set forth the dangerous "meaningful life" argument. Increased infanticide has been the result. Just as tragic, those who espouse this utilitarian, quality-of-life argument are telling the handicapped, the aged, and the infirm in our society that they are an inconvenience to others and are leading a life not really worth living. We should, instead, uphold the dignity of all individuals in our society.

Abortion is not a women's issue, but an issue of great concern for all Americans. That is why I support efforts to adopt a human life constitutional amendment, to affirm the right to life for all of us.

Unless the right to life is secure for all—born and unborn—it is secure for none. After all, in order to have the unalienable rights of liberty and the pursuit of happiness, one must first have life.

A TRIBUTE TO CARL WALKER

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an outstanding public servant, Mr. Carl Walker, who retired on January 3 from the Social Security Administration after nearly 42 years of dedicated service.

Mr. Walker joined the Social Security Administration in 1945 soon after it was established by the Congress and was assigned to its Nashville office. His career as a public servant took him throughout the United States—he served in branch offices in South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, Tennessee, and Georgia. He was always known as the man you could count on to get the job done, whether it was unraveling bureaucratic red-tape to get a check for a retired person or reinstating someone's disability pension.

His expertise within the Social Security Administration was well recognized by his superiors and in 1973 he was assigned the task of opening a branch office in Gallatin where he served as its manager until his retirement. Mr. Walker has become a symbol of effective Government service in Gallatin. Many times

my staff and I have called upon him for guidance in resolving my constituents' problems.

All of us in Tennessee will miss his guidance, but we wish him and his family many rewarding years ahead. Carl is married to Novice Houchen and they have three children and six grandchildren.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY AID AND MASS TRANSIT AID

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to oppose a Department of Treasury proposal that would have a catastrophic effect on our Nation's mass transit system. This legislation, House Concurrent Resolution 271, expresses opposition to the Department of Transportation proposal to consolidate Federal highway aid and mass transit aid into a single urban mobility block grant.

Our Nation's public transit system currently serves over 8 billion riders per year in 733 urbanized areas. This transportation system is used by citizens in all 50 States. A consolidation of funding would result in a 40-percent reduction in the approximately \$4 billion provided in mass transit aid. A reduction of this magnitude would begin a massive and unavoidable decline in public transit. It is estimated that 15 percent of our mass transit services would experience an immediate shutdown.

I believe this represents a gross injustice to our Nation's communities and many citizens who depend so heavily upon our mass transit system. Mass transit is essential to any effective inter-city and inner-city transportation system and these cuts would severely limit, and in many cases curtail, travel opportunities. In addition, it is important to remember that public transportation provides the most accessibility to the elderly, the disabled, and the young.

A consolidation of funding for Federal highway and mass transit aid would have a debilitating effect on employees and businesses affiliated with our mass transit system. More than 137,600 jobs and \$5,056,000,000 in business revenues would be lost as a result of this reduction in funding. It is clear that these proposed cuts would be counterproductive in terms of national economic stability and growth.

While deficit reduction certainly deserves our serious and immediate attention, the two most basic principles that should guide this effort are equity and fairness. Mass transit has already made a substantial contribution—nearly \$1 billion directly and \$2 billion indirectly since 1981. It is imperative that we maintain and preserve a strong and balanced Federal commitment to public transportation and oppose any efforts to further reduce funding for mass transit. At this time, I wish to insert the full text of my resolution into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues. In addition, I wish to call to your attention a recent article that appeared in the New York Times addressing this very issue.

TEXT OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 271

To express opposition to the Department of Transportation proposal to consolidate federal highway aid and mass transit aid into a single urban mobility block grant.

Whereas draft legislation proposed by the Department of Transportation would consolidate federal highway aid and mass transit aid into a single urban mobility block grant;

Whereas this consolidation would be accompanied by a 40 percent reduction in the approximately \$4 billion provided in mass transit aid;

Whereas mass transit now serves over 8 billion riders per year in 733 urbanized areas in all 50 States;

Whereas a 40 percent reduction in mass transit funding would result in a loss of support for more than 137,600 jobs and \$5,056,000,000 in business revenues;

Whereas a 40 percent reduction in public transit funding would result in an unavoidable, catastrophic and massive decline which could result in an immediate shutdown of 15% of mass transit services;

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses its opposition to this urban mobility block grant proposal and urges that federal highway and mass transit funding remain separate and adequately funded to ensure the continued effectiveness of each program.

REAGAN SEEKS CUT OF 40 PERCENT IN FUNDS FOR MASS TRANSIT

SINGLE GRANT PROPOSED—DRAFT PLAN COMBINES AID FOR ROADS, SUBWAYS AND BUSES BUT TOTAL IS SMALLER

(By Robert Pear)

WASHINGTON, January 4.—Transportation officials say President Reagan, as part of his budget for the fiscal year 1987, will propose combining Federal aid to highways and mass transit in a single grant with reduced funds.

Under the proposal, city and state officials could use the money for highways, subways or buses, depending on local needs, but the total amount of Federal money available for mass transit—\$4.1 billion last year—would be reduced by 40 percent or more.

The proposal, which is subject to approval by Congress, is set forth in a "concept paper" and in draft legislation prepared by the Department of Transportation. Administration officials gave additional details in interviews this week, saying the new consolidated grant would be the major source of Federal aid to mass transit. But there would still be other sources of highway funds, probably more than \$9 billion, independent of the block grant, the officials added.

PROSPECTS IN CONGRESS

Congress has rebuffed many of President Reagan's earlier efforts to reduce spending for transportation, including his proposal to eliminate Federal operating assistance for local mass transit systems. Congressional aides said Congress was more likely to cut mass transit funds this year, though not as much as Mr. Reagan wanted.

In a recent speech to transit officials, Ralph L. Stanley head of the Federal Urban Mass Transportation Administration, said: "We are proposing an urban mobility block grant that would combine Federal highway and transit capital funds in large urban areas. The funds could be used for any highway or transit capital project."

Capital expenses include the construction, purchase and improvement of transit facilities and equipment such as subway cars, tracks, signal systems, buses and bus depots.

DISTORTIONS AND FIASCOES

Mr. Stanley's deputy, Alfred A. Delli-Bovi, said the current Federal programs "distort the priorities" of local officials, who often design transportation projects simply to get Federal money, not to meet genuine local needs. As a result, he said, "we have had fiascoes such as tunnels to nowhere in New York and People Movers in Detroit."

The long-delayed 63d Street subway tunnel in New York City was to have included a second, lower level for Long Island Rail Road trains, but the project has never been completed because of financial constraints. The People Mover, an elevated transit line under construction in Detroit, faces far higher costs than originally projected.

Officials in New York and other cities said the additional flexibility of a block grant was desirable, but they expressed concern about the possible cuts in funds.

Preliminary Federal calculations show that aid to the New York Metropolitan Transportation Authority, about \$550 million this year, would be cut roughly in half under the proposal.

President Reagan's budget for the fiscal year 1987, which begins Oct. 1, is to be sent to Congress early next month. White House officials said the cuts in mass transit assistance were part of a package of \$50 billion in savings that must be achieved in 1987 to comply with a new Federal law that seeks to balance the budget by 1991.

Leonard S. Simon, assistant executive director of the United States Conference of Mayors, said mayors "would welcome the additional flexibility, but would be extremely concerned about any major cuts" in Federal support for mass transit.

The Federal Government provided \$4.1 billion in aid for mass transit in the last fiscal year, and Congress has appropriated \$3.7 billion in the current fiscal year, 1986. In each of the two years, about \$1.1 billion comes from the Federal Highway Trust Fund; the rest comes from general revenue.

Administration officials said Mr. Reagan would propose slashing, or perhaps eliminating, the general revenue contribution, which now accounts for 70 percent of all mass transit aid. Some, but not all, of this loss could be made up by switching Federal funds from highway programs to mass transit. That decision would be up to local officials under the block-grant proposal.

IDEAL PLACE TO CUT

Bonnie B. Whyte, a spokesman for the Federal Urban Mass Transportation Administration, said Federal officials regarded mass transit as "an ideal place to cut" because it was "primarily a local function." In addition, she said, the officials believe that mass transit should have "a dedicated source of revenue" earmarked for the purpose.

There is a specific source of revenue for the \$1.1 billion in mass transit assistance derived from the Highway Trust Fund. That represents one penny of the 9-cent-a-gallon Federal excise tax on gasoline. But there is no special source of revenue for the other Federal aid to mass transit. The general revenue contribution is more likely to be cut because it is not earmarked for transportation, officials said.

Officials at the Transportation Department said Ray A. Barnhart, head of the Federal Highway Administration, had insisted

ed that Federal money for the construction, repair and maintenance of interstate highways be kept out of the new block grant. Such highways have long been a concern of the Federal Government because of their role in interstate commerce and national defense.

Federal aid for highways totals \$12.8 billion this year. Of this, Congress has authorized \$4 billion for construction and \$3.1 billion for resurfacing and major repairs on interstate highways.

Originally, in the proposal submitted to the Office of Management and Budget by Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Hanford Dole, only a portion of Federal mass transit money was to be merged into the block grant. But budget officials said they had decided to pare Federal aid to mass transit and put most of the remaining funds into the block grant.

The block grant account, they said, would consist of roughly \$1.1 billion in mass transit money and \$1 billion to \$2 billion in highway money. The exact amounts have not yet been determined.

A document prepared for submission to Congress with the President's budget says: "The Administration believes that urban mobility issues should be addressed at the local level, and that local officials should determine whether to make highway or transit investments based on local transportation needs rather than the source of Federal funds."

ROSEMONT, ILLINOIS' 30TH BIRTHDAY

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 20, 1986, the village of Rosemont, IL, officially observed 30 years of incorporation as a village: three decades of phenomenal growth and progress that has helped Illinois become an important center of business and tourism.

The village of Rosemont is a textbook example of a spirited community working together to create a town run like our country's most successful businesses: efficient operation, steady growth, team effort toward clearly delineated goals.

Rosemont's wide variety of operations run efficiently and profitably because of the total involvement of village residents. Through the years, each resident has contributed his or her own time and talents to the continued progress of the village.

We salute Mayor Donald E. Stephens and the people of village hall: Trustees Lorraine Clemmensen, Anthony D. Esposito, Hubert Langer, Emmett Michaels, Steven Minale, and Leslie Scott, and Village Clerk Irene Kolaski. Other dedicated personnel at Rosemont Village Hall include Deputy Mayor Donald E. Stephens II, Finance Officer Ray Gold, Deputy Clerk Frances Stevens, Finance Clerk Lee Daberton, Purchasing Coordinator August Sansone, Health and License Officer Joe Rizzo, Executive Secretary Gail Stephens, Clerk Rosalie Lennstrom and Receptionist Isabelle Seib.

At Rosemont/O'Hare Exposition Center, Managing Director James Freeman and Peter

Lombardi, executive director of the Rosemont/O'Hare Convention Bureau, bring important, income-producing trade shows to Rosemont. With the help of Jeff Mahnke of Rosemont Catering Services, and David Houston, president/general manager of Rosemont Exposition Services, exposition managers and business travelers receive top-drawer attention.

Rosemont's Public Safety Department helps maintain order and safety for the 18,000 business people and tourists who visit Rosemont each day. Jack Hasselberger, director and chief of patrol; Gary Hopkins, deputy director and fire chief; and Mel Ramones, captain in charge of special services, coordinate these efforts. Tom Clinger, captain in charge of patrol division and Lt. Roy Evans of the services division, lend their talents. Rosemont's considerable traffic and crowds are controlled by the Rosemont Public Safety Auxiliary Department, under Lt. Jack Green. Vito Corriero directs a public works department that keeps Rosemont streets clean and clear for visitors.

In serving its visitors, Rosemont does not forget its residents. Rosemont is a town that reveres its senior citizens and school children. Residents enjoy a park district that provides activities for young and old throughout the year, under the leadership of Robert Thompson and Robert Koehler. Dr. Frank Tavano, superintendent of Rosemont Elementary School, heads a staff of dedicated professionals who provide Rosemont school children with the tools for tomorrow.

But Rosemont refuses to sit on its laurels. Not content with already outstanding accomplishments in business, tourism and civics, the village of Rosemont presses on in realizing the potential of this tiny parcel of land adjacent to the world's busiest airport, O'Hare International.

Late last year, Mayor Donald Stephens and the Village trustees announced a half-billion dollar, 100-acre redevelopment project for Rosemont.

The program includes 10 major construction projects scheduled for completion in 1987. Among these projects are nine office buildings—comprising 9 million square feet—four world-class hotels; a unique 7,000 linear-foot Skybridge System, which will be the first of its kind in the Nation to connect a major exposition center with fine hotels and parking facilities; a performing arts theater; a 4,458-car parking garage; a new church; a new 12,000 square-foot fire station; and a 100,000 square-foot addition to the Rosemont/O'Hare Exposition Center. This addition will bring the Expo Center's total square footage to 450,000 square-feet on two levels, making the center the 11th largest exposition facility in the Nation.

This construction further solidifies Rosemont's position as the premier location for business, meetings and conventions, and travel. Rosemont already is home to nine of the world's most prestigious hotels; the Rosemont Horizon, a 19,000-seat sports, music and entertainment venue; the spacious Rosemont/O'Hare Exposition Center; and the versatile meeting facility, the Rosemont/O'Hare Conference Center.

Mr. Speaker, it is not often that we can point to a community so alive with dreams and the vitality to reach them. We commend

Mayor Donald E. Stephens and the residents of Rosemont. Their self-sufficiency and creativity is a symbol of America at its most industrious. We of the House of Representatives congratulate Rosemont for 30 years of success, and we wish them a bright future.

NICHOLAS JOHN LOUNTZIS

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor today to recognize the outstanding accomplishments of my good friend, Mr. Nicholas John Lountzis. Nick, best known in the Reading, PA, area, as owner of Nick's Chat-a-While Inn, will be celebrating his 92d birthday on February 17, 1986. Nick's accomplishments form a real-life Horatio Alger "rags-to-riches" story and his success personifies the American dream for countless immigrants who have become a part of our great Nation.

Nick was born in Voudre, Greece. He spent his early years as a shepherd, and at the age of 17, he emigrated to the United States with \$25 in his pocket and knowing only one word of English—"Boston." He spent the next few years working in several businesses in Boston, Maine, Detroit, and Chicago. In 1918, Nick joined the infantry, nearly arriving in France for the armistice. He was stationed in Texas where he earned the rank of corporal.

The early 1920's were a time of hardship for Nick, but, through much dedicated hard work and perseverance, he was able to get back on his feet and eventually bought a luncheonette—the Alps—in New York City. After several years in New York, he returned to Chicago where he met his future wife, Anna Allushuski, a coal miner's daughter from Girardville, PA. They married in 1930 and had a son, Nicholas, Jr., in 1932. Nick and his family came to Reading, PA, in 1934 and permanently settled in the area.

Nick started out in Reading at the historic Crystal Restaurant where he was a highly acclaimed and popular mixmaster. At this time, Nick and Anna were blessed with the birth of their second son, William. Nick was instrumental in many innovations which helped make the Crystal into Reading's most popular restaurant. After years of success at the Crystal, he was ready to operate his own establishment and purchased the Chat-a-While Inn on February 17, 1947—his wedding anniversary. His past achievements were repeated at the Chat-a-While as it became established as one of the finest restaurants in the area. Nick used his entrepreneurial skill to help set up two other restaurants—the Riveredge and the Valley Inn. He still greets guests at the Chat-a-While with the congeniality and friendliness for which he has been known for years. His two sons and grandson have continued this fine tradition.

In addition to his business activities, Nick has been involved in a number of community organizations. He has arranged for more than a half-dozen family members and friends to come to the United States from Greece. He

also remains active in St. Matthew's Greek Orthodox Church where he has served a 5-year term as president. Nick has also served as treasurer of AHEPA and has been involved with the Masonic Blue Lodge, the Shriners, the American Legion, the National Restaurant Association and the Greek Democratic Club.

Nick's career forms a shining example of what can be accomplished in this Nation through hard work, dedication and perseverance. Nick Lountzis has made a significant contribution to this country and the Reading area and has brought countless joy into the lives of his family and his many friends and admirers. For my own part, I feel honored to count Nick as a friend and it gives me great pleasure to recognize him on this occasion. I know that my colleagues will join me in wishing Nick Lountzis a very happy 92d birthday and continued success in the years to come.

**H.R. 4057 WILL REACTIVATE
COLA'S**

HON. ROBERT W. DAVIS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to correct an injustice. Is it fair that not all senior citizens will receive their COLA's this year? In the push to pass Gramm-Rudman, many Members may not have realized that all COLA's for senior citizens were not protected. Sure we granted the COLA for veterans and for Social Security recipients, but there is a significant population of senior citizens who will not get a COLA—yet their incomes are just as fixed.

As you know, Federal retirees, military retirees, and a number of other groups lost their 1986 COLA under Gramm-Rudman. H.R. 4057 would restore those COLA's without jeopardizing the effort to meet Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction targets.

The key word in the title is "fairness." Congress has decided that Social Security and veterans compensation programs should receive COLAS's. These other retirement programs should too. One Federal retiree who recently wrote me put it best, "I am a senior citizen, too."

While I have just begun the process of briefing the appropriate organizations on this legislation, I am pleased to report that the initial response has been good. Already two groups—the Non-Commissioned Officers Association and the Association for Retirement Equity—have lent their support, and I expect many more will follow in the days ahead.

Reinstating the COLA's to all of the below mentioned retirement programs will cost \$994 million. To insure revenue neutrality, each agency or department will be asked to absorb a proportional share of the \$994 million. That share will be determined by the size of the agency's budget in relation to the total Federal budget. Each agency will have the discretion to make its own internal reductions. Estimates of two agency shares are \$4 million for the Department of State and \$145,000 for the FCC. These examples show that each agency will not have an unreasonable share to absorb.

The following retirement programs would receive COLA's—retroactive to January 1—with this legislation:

- (1) Civil service retirement and disability fund.
- (2) Military retirement fund.
- (3) Coast Guard retirement pay.
- (4) Railroad retirement (Tier II).
- (5) Comptroller General retirement system.
- (6) NOAA retirement.
- (7) CIA retirement and disability fund.
- (8) Retirement pay for commissioned PHS officers.
- (9) Foreign Service retirement and disability fund.
- (10) Special benefits, FECA.

Certainly some would argue for a permanent change to avoid fighting the COLA battle every year. However, in light of current fall out over Gramm-Rudman, it is unlikely that Congress would agree to a permanent guarantee of these COLA's. I see this 1-year change as a compromise that will buy time to negotiate a long-term solution to this inequity.

I urge my colleagues to join me in correcting this injustice by cosponsoring H.R. 4057.

SKIP SHINES FOR GUAM

HON. BEN GARRIDO BLAZ

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. BLAZ. Mr. Speaker, a large part of our effort here is to inform and enlighten our colleagues and the public about the communities we represent. I am pleased to report I recently had spirited help with that responsibility from a group of young ambassadors of goodwill.

A group of talented children from the territory of Guam made a national tour in December to help better acquaint our fellow Americans on the mainland with the people and culture of our community and the role we play in the American family. Led by Mrs. Teri Lee Knapp, the organization—the Sunshine Kids in Production [SKIP]—presented several shows, culminating with a performance at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts during the Christmas holidays.

SKIP is an experienced and entertaining troupe of singers, dancers, actors, and actresses, made up of about 20 children, ranging in age from 5 to 14. The youngsters have been performing for several years and have made a significant contribution through charity performances within the territory as well as educational and artistic exchanges outside Guam.

Their performance at the Holiday Festival, a special Christmas presentation composed of groups from around the Nation, capped a very successful tour across the Nation. They provided Washington and audiences across the country with an entertaining introduction to Guam.

I was pleased to be able to provide a tour of the Capitol for SKIP and cohost with the Guam Society a reception for the group which was well attended by members of the Guam community and their friends in the Washington area.

The children, their sponsors and leaders should be commended for their fine effort in

behalf of Guam. Through their dance and song, they conducted their own version of the People-to-People Program in a truly enjoyable and meaningful way.

**COMMEMORATION OF THE COMMUNITY
BROTHERHOOD
AWARDS BANQUET DAY**

HON. DOUGLAS APPLEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged today to bring to the attention of my esteemed colleagues in the Congress the First Annual Community Brotherhood Awards Banquet Day, which will take place on February 22, 1986, and will be hosted by the Quinn Memorial A.M.E. Church in Steubenville, OH. Since 1926, Brotherhood has been a traditional theme of the month of February and February 22, 1986 has been proclaimed as Brotherhood Day by Mayor Dave Hinderman of Steubenville, OH and by Mayor Frank Laymen of Winterville, OH.

This ecumenical celebration is being organized with the cooperation of all church denominations and is supported by the Inter Faith Ministerial Alliance to promote the idea of service to the community and to humanity. The banquet will recognize people who have made significant contributions in public, civic, and religious affairs and who have worked in some way toward better relations in their community. Five awards will be given to those people who have demonstrated brotherhood in a service area in their respective fields. By looking at these outstanding individuals as models to aspire to, the community can reflect upon the goals and objectives of brotherhood in their everyday living.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to express my support of the Quinn Memorial First Annual Community Brotherhood Awards Banquet, honoring the spirit, importance, and significance of brotherhood and to congratulate those exemplary individuals who have helped their community grow in a meaningful way. It takes committed community members, such as those who will receive awards at the banquet, to serve as examples of how we can work toward a more perfect and peaceful society.

**THE WORLD CHAMPION
CHICAGO BEARS**

HON. CHARLES A. HAYES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, after the most lopsided victory in Super Bowl history, there is no doubt about who is No. 1. The Chicago Bears are now the undisputed football champions of the world. But the way in which the Bears won this championship should not be misunderstood. By winning 18 games with just 1 loss, they have tied for the most victories ever by an NFL team. Along the way, they

created a video and a song, "The Super Bowl Shuffle," which is helping to raise thousands of dollars for the homeless and the hungry in the great city of Chicago. They have created great, memorable entertainment for millions around the world. They have put together a defensive team that should make the Pentagon take notice—no hammers for \$435 or toilet seats for \$554—just good, solid defense. And what a team. Not a team of superstars, but a team of characters that the entire city can identify with; from the irascible Jim McMahon to the immovable William "The Refrigerator" Perry; from Yale graduate Gary Fencik to Walter Payton "Sweetness" himself, the NFL's all-time leading running back.

Among all of the hoopla and victory celebrations, one of the moments that stood out most in my mind was watching the interview with Richard Dent immediately after the game. When the Super Bowl MVP was asked about his view of why the Bears did so well, he replied that he himself was especially inspired. "You know, Dr. King's Birthday was last week," he said. "That was pretty special to me."

Of course, Dr. King did not dream about Super Bowl championships for Chicago. But he did dream about results like those which the Super Bowl has produced. People all over the city of Chicago, from the northside to the southside, from the lakefront to the westside, from suburbia to the central city, all Chicagoans are proud of what the Bears have done, for themselves, and for their city.

PERHAPS KIDS MEETING KIDS CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an organization called Perhaps Kids Meeting Kids Can Make a Difference. Cofounded in 1982 by Mary and Marvin Sochet, residents of the 17th Congressional District of New York, which I am privileged to represent, Kids Meeting Kids seeks to cut through international tensions by developing friendship between American and Soviet children.

President Reagan's recent summit meeting in Geneva was deemed a success for its significant proposals for increased people-to-people contact between United States and U.S.S.R. During the last 3 years Kids Meeting Kids has been progressing quite successfully toward that very same goal.

Through Kids Meeting Kids, Mary and Marvin Sochet have organized correspondence between more than 40,000 American and 40,000 Soviet children. They also sponsored a "summit conference" held on December 11, 1985 by eight American and eight Soviet kids ages 7 to 14. The conference was one of the first unhindered exchanges between United States and Soviet children in the United States.

As their next project, the Sochets are organizing the first summer-camp exchanges of young students between the two countries.

The summertime exchanges are to be followed by school-year exchanges. The goal of Kids Meeting Kids is to organize the exchange of 250,000 American children in the U.S.S.R. and the same number in our country throughout the entire year.

I believe that the presence of thousands of children can help to reduce the suspicions and mistrust that have let us to acquire mountains of strategic weapons. The organized exchange of letters and the recent kids "summit conference" remind us that American youngsters and their Soviet counterparts recognize the urgency of achieving world peace. A summer exchange program would seem to be the logical extensions of their efforts.

I commend Mary and Marvin Sochet for their leadership in Kids Meeting Kids and applaud their efforts to further friendship and peace between the United States and the Soviet Union.

A TRIBUTE TO MAYOR MARGE BOON OF GRAND HAVEN

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you and our distinguished colleagues to join me in saluting a remarkable woman, an outstanding community leader and a dear, personal friend, Mayor Marge Boon of Grand Haven.

The Muskegon Sunday Chronicle recently ran a feature article on Mayor Boon's contributions and her efforts to make life better for all the people of Grand Haven. I'm not at all surprised by this recognition as Marge Boon deserves the praise that this article affords her for her exemplary record of exceptional accomplishments in public service. I am grateful for the opportunity to commend this article to my colleague's attention.

[From the Sunday Chronicle, Dec. 29, 1985]
SHE'S A BOON—NOT EVERYONE AGREES WITH HER, BUT SHE IS THE MAYOR OF GRAND HAVEN
(By Susan E. Harrison)

She is a woman in power.
That alone makes her subject to stereotype.

She also is first in her field.
Add that to the power she wields, and the combination assures her of public scrutiny at every turn.

And brings up the subject of double standards.

A woman doing a man's job: Can she be judged on her own merit?

Then there is the issue of her personality. This woman is strong, aggressive, competent, straightforward.

Or should that be hard, brash, brusque and pushy?

The description depends on the day, and the crowd.

Like many "firsts," Majorie A. Boon, has discovered the barometer that measures her public personality and political career is not always the same as the one used to assess her male counterparts.

But such discrepancies come with the territory of being the first woman mayor in the city of Grand Haven's 151-year history.

It is not easy ground to break.

If Mrs. Boon were a man doing the things she does, making the public impression she does, would she be described as brash? Or pushy?

"My answer is going to be no," says city manager Larry Deetjen.

Or are those words only used to describe women in power?

And are they shaded with negative implications?

"I think we are over the issue of gender," Deetjen says, "even in Grand Haven."

But Mrs. Boon, the woman who has hurdled political barriers and erased gender gaps in Grand Haven since the year 1970, knows all too well the trials of being the first woman in one of the last bastions of male dominance.

"Honey," she says, "I know how Jackie Robinson felt."

The list of credits behind Marge Boon's name goes on forever.

First woman appointed to Grand Haven's planning commission in 1970.

First woman elected to Grand Haven City Council in '71.

First woman to run for mayor of Grand Haven, in '79 (she was defeated).

First woman elected as mayor of Grand Haven in '81.

And that's just for starters.

In 1983, she ran unopposed for the mayor's office.

In September 1985, she was elected president of Michigan Municipal League—an organization representing the city managers, clerks, mayors, attorneys and staffs of 500 Michigan cities.

Mrs. Boon is only the second woman in the league's 90-year history to hold the position.

"I think they're finally seeing that I'm serious," Mrs. Boon says. "Today, I can call people up and have them believe what I'm saying. Is that power? I don't know. I do know it's respect."

But when the votes were tallied in Grand Haven on election night—Nov. 5, 1985—Mrs. Boon escaped defeat by only 126 votes over her opponent James Cook.

"When you've got a strong candidate who moves fast and gets things done, it's always easy for an opponent to criticize and be negative," says Deetjen. "When you take a stand, you're going to get more opposition. It's the name of the game."

At issue during the campaign, according to Cook, were a "communications" imbalance between city hall and city council—and a too-optimistic view of the last few years' economic recovery in Grand Haven.

Mrs. Boon doesn't talk much—as a matter of public record, at least—about her near-defeat in November.

She does, however, continue to sound the call for teamwork: a favorite rallying cry of hers during the election and throughout her term of office.

"I don't like arguments (among city council members), especially in public meetings," says Mrs. Boon. "I don't want anybody bad-mouthing anybody."

It is the council's job to "set policy," she says, not to "interfere with the administration of the city."

"It's so important for the council and city manager to work as a team and to move in one direction," she says.

The 55-year-old Mrs. Boon learned the value of teamwork—and a tight adherence to protocol—as a member of the Tri-Cities League of Women Voters long before she entered the political arena.

"The League was an outlet for my energies when I was diapering and taking care of my children," she says.

Those children—Cristine, Dennis and Amy—are all in their 20s now; and off on careers of their own, leaving their mother free to work in politics and their father, Maurice, extra time to give his job as a sixth-grade teacher in Grand Haven school system.

Mrs. Boon started her career as a science teacher in Grand Haven, right after graduation from Hope College. She married at age 26.

"In those days, you were basically told they'd see you after your last kid was out of high school," she says.

So Mrs. Boon settled down to the job of raising kids, and she joined the League of Women Voters.

It was the League, all those years ago, that taught her the most basic of rules that she's taken into politics—study the problem long and hard before speaking publicly.

"It's going to sound so trite, you know what they say about women: 'She does her homework.' I could kill 'em, wring men's necks when they say that," says Mrs. Boon. "But the League teaches you don't speak up until you know."

It was because of the League, indirectly, that she entered politics. In 1970, when Grand Haven City Council members cast about for new planning commissioners, they remembered the name of League member Marge Boon. The League—and Mrs. Boon—had impressed council members with their studies and programs.

Until then, Mrs. Boon and politics had been separate entities.

Having grown up in Grand Rapids, Mrs. Boon was breaking new ground in college during the 1950s as a woman majoring in sciences.

She always had been on the edge of tradition, she says—taller than most women at 5-feet, 9-inches; a female science teacher in the 1950s; married at 26—comparatively late, at the time; Grand Haven's first woman mayor even though she's not active in party-line politics, and even though she didn't have training in politics early on.

Mrs. Boon credits the league as the first place that taught her to be a team player.

"That was something women in my age group did not learn how to do. We did not have the arena for that process of learning," she says.

The spirit of teamwork is something she insists on projecting, even though she is the one most usually in the public spotlight—not the other council members or city staff.

"Very honestly, it's been wonderful, but I'm saying it's not just the mayor; it's the whole team—the council and the administration that does everything to get you successful," Mrs. Boon says.

Her focus since Day One of her administration, and the issue that has garnered her the greatest publicity, has been on economic recovery.

When she became mayor in 1981, Grand Haven had lost two of its biggest employers: Cooper Industries and Oldberg Manufacturing.

"And Eagle-Ottawa was very edgy," she says, "and we almost lost Bastian-Blessing."

Her Honor, the Mayor, took matters into her own hands.

"We came down on them like thunder to stay here," she says. "As the mayor, I had to step forward and let those people know we care about them and that we wanted them to stay in Grand Haven."

With that single move—taking the initiative, although there was no precedent for city politicians to call on industry—Mrs. Boon became one of Grand Haven's most public mayors.

"It was just a thrilling experience, no, that's too femmy of a word," she says, stopping herself. "It was a super experience to go into these factories and see what pride these blue collar workers have in their jobs."

Jobs—and more jobs—always have been Mrs. Boon's political focus.

"The council told Larry (Deetjen) that we'd back him up, we'd do anything he wants, as long as he's creating jobs," she says.

When she took office, Mrs. Boon says, Grand Haven had lost about 900 jobs with the closing of Cooper and Oldberg. Since that time, she says, 900-plus new industrial jobs and 400 new commercial and office jobs have been created.

But Mrs. Boon was criticized during the '85 election by opponents who asked for proof of that many jobs—and they questioned how well-paying the replacements are in comparison to the old ones.

"I'm sick and tired, dammit, of hearing how do I know we have this many new jobs," Mrs. Boon responds. "I went out and counted them."

Grand Haven's industry is more "diversified," she says, than it was in 1981—with new companies springing up, new companies that might have to start at a lower wage base than the older ones.

"Very honestly, it's none of my business what a CEO pays his people," she says.

The statement is typical Marge Boon.

"Look, I can't make things happen on my own," she says. "I can call people. I can work hard. I can talk to people, but that's all."

She lets the mistake slip by once. But she can't let it go a second time.

"May I correct the city clerk?" Mayor Boon asks mid-meeting.

All eyes turn toward the mayor.

Grand Haven City Council chambers are sparsely populated this evening, just two days before Christmas. The agenda is short and until now, the meeting has moved rather quickly, spurred on by holiday obligations and good cheer.

The meeting grinds to a halt.

Mrs. Boon turns to city clerk Lynne Oleszczuk who has twice called the roll call vote incorrectly.

"The mayor always votes last," advises Mrs. Boon.

The city clerk takes notice.

The roll call continues.

This time, Mrs. Boon's name is last.

As mayor, Marge Boon not only sits at the center of things at the council table; she is the center of Grand Haven council politics.

She runs a tight ship, allowing little room for inefficiency in the running of meetings, putting up with no slips of protocol in city business.

"I've sat too long at meetings that are run ineffectively," she says, "where they've lost their audience and the reason for them being there. We don't want that in Grand Haven."

That is Marge Boon, mayor behind the scenes.

But she doesn't stay there long.

Mrs. Boon keeps a high profile.

During her administration, she has played host to former President Gerald Ford during his 1984 visit to Grand Haven. She christened the Coast Guard Cutter Escanaba in Middletown, R.I., in August.

And just last week, she waited for—but was eventually stood up by—Vice President George Bush, who was to inspect the Grand Haven shoreline eaten away by erosion.

Her highly visible approach to the mayor's position—both on a local and state level—has earned her both criticism and compliments from her constituents.

But whether supporter or detractor of this mayor named Marge Boon, the people of Grand Haven know who she is.

"She was an outsider to the network when she came into politics, and that made it more difficult," says Deetjen. "She's had to be aggressive. And yet, she is also very personable, warm and loves her family. She is playing a role here in City Hall, just as I am. Here, I'm aggressive, but I also have a family and am human."

Since taking office, however, Mrs. Boon's public image—and personality—have become as much an issue in Grand Haven as her accomplishments in office.

"The thing I like least is being misunderstood," says Mrs. Boon. "My hide is not tough enough. I'm still a 'wuss' inside."

When she reads her political gaffes quoted on the front page of newspapers throughout western Michigan, or finds herself at odds with reporters or council members, she says "she dies a thousands deaths."

"I think: I've done it again," Mrs. Boon says. "I sound so hard and, and—so strong."

Her public image is a complex, intricate combination of events and personality quirks—which onlookers discover can be a contradiction in terms.

Her private side presumably is just as complicated.

She is a mayor who makes "whistlestop" visits to grocery stores to check out the public's mood because she doesn't "have time to coffee klatch," a mayor whose language can be earthy in private conversation, a mayor who still has lunch ready for a grown son and his wife most workdays because they are coming to the family home at noon.

She is a many-faceted public official.

On the one hand, it was Mrs. Boon's idea to give gifts to the families of the men serving on the Grand Haven-based Coast Guard cutter U.S.S. Acacia—in Sturgeon Bay, Wis., for repairs at Thanksgiving—because the men would not be home.

"We needed to do something for them to let them know we cared," she says.

On the other hand, when asked a question she doesn't like, she'll visibly bristle.

"Tell me," she challenges, "Why would you ask?"

And the conversation ends before it even begins.

She believes in being in control during council meetings as well as in private conversations. She has no tolerance for the games people sometimes have had to play.

"I'm old enough to be able to say, 'Hey, I don't need that tradition,'" Mrs. Boon says. "I am 55 years old. If I'm ever going to arrive, it's now."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the floor of the House of Representa-

tives on January 23, 1986, as I was back in the 23d Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following fashion:

Rollcall No. 2: Journal—the House approved the Journal of Wednesday, January 22, "yea";

Rollcall No. 3: H.R. 2443—Expedited Funds Availability, the House agreed to the rule (H. Res. 357) under which the bill was considered, "yea";

Rollcall No. 5: H.R. 2443—Expedited Funds Availability, the House rejected the Wylie amendment that sought to clarify the regulatory responsibility of the Federal Reserve Board to preserve the soundness of and prevent abuses of the payments systems, "noe";

Rollcall No. 6: H.R. 2443—Expedited Funds Availability, the House agreed to the Bartlett amendment, as amended by the Shumway amendment that allows depository institutions to exempt checks from the availability schedules when the institution has reason to doubt the collectability of funds on a check, and provides notification of such action no later than the close of the next business day, "aye";

Rollcall No. 7: H.R. 2443—Expedited Funds Availability, the House rejected the Shumway amendment in the nature of a substitute that sought to replace the temporary and permanent schedules with a requirement that the Federal Reserve Board issue regulations to improve the check clearing and notification systems, "noe"; and

Rollcall No. 8: 2443—Expedited Funds Availability, the House passed the measure to limit the number of days a depository institution may restrict the availability of funds which are deposited in any account, "aye."

NEW CASTLE COACH HONORED

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues to join with me in recognizing the outstanding service of New Castle Red Hurricane coach Lindy Lauro. Coach Lauro has just completed his 25th year of coaching at New Castle High School in Lawrence County, in my Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

Coach Lauro, in over a half century, has touched all phases in the world of football from junior high to the professional ranks as a player and coach. In 1961 he became head coach at his alma mater, New Castle High School.

His record at New Castle is 184 wins, 70 losses, and 13 ties. He has led undefeated teams in 1962, 1967, 1970, 1975, and 1984. Under his leadership the Red Hurricanes won three W.P.I.A.L. Championships, in 1967, 1973, and 1975.

Coach Lauro has dedicated his entire adult life to building confidence, character, and sportsmanship in youth of all ages. He is responsible for scores of boys advancing their education though college, who may otherwise have been denied were it not for their football experience.

Lindy Lauro is a fine example of the character of the people of New Castle. His dedication to the community has helped make New Castle a better place to live. And that is why I rise today, to call attention to Coach Lindy Lauro, before the full U.S. House of Representatives.

BEARS SUPERBOWL VICTORY IS AWESOME

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, picking the Patriots to win Superbowl XX, Mr. Speaker, was akin to picking TIP O'NEILL to win the U.S. Open. The Patriots, a good team, never had a chance against the Chicago Bears, a great team—an awesome team.

The Bears didn't just shuffle, Mr. Speaker, they romped and stomped your Patriots all over the field, holding them to just one first down and negative yardage in the first half. In fact, it was only when the Bears let the first team rest that the Patriots could move the ball at all. If New England quarterback Tony Eason was sick prior to the game, he became terminal after the first 15 minutes. The Bear defense sacked him and his successor, Steve Grogan, a record-tying seven times.

Mr. Speaker, after your prediction that the Patriots would win the Superbowl, all of us on this side of the aisle look forward to your next prediction that you Democrats will pick up seats in this fall's elections!

TRIBUTE TO MARVIN LEWIS

HON. BARBARA BOXER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a man who has done so much for the people of the San Francisco Bay area, Marvin E. Lewis.

As President of the Bay Area Rapid Transit Commission from 1949 to 1954, Marvin Lewis carried out his duties with such zeal and dedication that he has been bestowed with the title "The Father of BART."

As many of you know, BART, the Bay Area Rapid Transit, has been providing mass transportation to the ever-increasing population of the San Francisco Bay area for close to 10 years. As the "Father of BART," Marvin Lewis has made a substantial contribution to improving the quality of life for many bay area citizens.

The city of San Francisco is honoring Marvin Lewis with a day in his honor on February 6, 1986. Because BART could not have been created without substantial interaction between local and Federal Government, I think it is appropriate that I stand here today in the House of Representatives to salute Marvin Lewis' accomplishments and to thank him for all that he has done for the people of the San Francisco Bay area.

BILL INTRODUCED TO RESTORE COLA'S

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues are aware that cost-of-living adjustments for civil service, military, and railroad retirees are once again targeted—this time for elimination—under the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings budget balancing legislation. And while it is still too early to determine what additional cuts will be mandated for retirees by this law over the next 6 years, we already know that one of the first casualties of Gramm-Rudman was the 3.1-percent increase scheduled for 1986.

Although I strongly support a balanced budget, I also support a fair and balanced legislative remedy to our deficit problem. Once again, Government retirees are unfairly singled out for deficit reduction, while other groups are totally exempt. Gramm-Rudman, which claims across-the-board automatic spending cuts, actually spares three-fourths of the Government's programs and leaves retired Federal, military, railroad employees, and a few other groups to absorb the cuts.

In response to this legislative discrimination, I am introducing on behalf of Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. HOYER, and myself a bill to restore COLA's to retired civil servants, military personnel, and railroad employees. This bill, scheduled to take effect September 30, 1986, would exempt these groups for the proposed life of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. Like Social Security, the Federal military, and railroad retirees would have a COLA placed off-limits from automatic reductions. Unlike Social Security, these groups would have a COLA which, for the first time in years, would not be delayed, cut-in-half, or at the last minute eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against Gramm-Rudman because of its unbalanced approach to deficit reduction. Since its adoption, I know a number of my colleagues share my concern with regard to the Federal, military, and railroad COLA. I encourage those Members, whether they voted for Gramm-Rudman or not, to support my bipartisan bill and similar measures. Fairness is the only way we can achieve a balanced budget while honoring our original promise to maintain an adequate retirement system for this country's public servants.

TIMOTHY MENGEL RECEIVES EAGLE SCOUT AWARD

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives the accomplishments of a young man from Selingsgrove, PA.

Mr. Timothy Mengel will be receiving the Boy Scout of America's highest award—the Eagle Scout—on Sunday, February 2, 1986, in Selinsgrove.

Timothy has been an exemplary Scout since he first joined as a Cub Scout where he received the Arrow of Light Award. Cub Scout's highest award. As a member of Boy Scout Troop 419, Timothy has held leadership positions of patrol leader, assistant patrol leader, chaplain's aide, and junior assistant scoutmaster. In 1985 he was honored as Troop 419 Scout of the Year. In addition, Timothy attended the Boy Scout National Jamboree in 1985 at Camp A.P. Hill in Virginia where he was chaplain's aide and an assistant patrol leader for the council troop.

In working toward his Eagle Scout Award, Timothy planned and completed a landscaping project for Wesley United Methodist Church and community. As part of this project he planted trees, painted and constructed signs, and, with the permission of the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, placed street signs around the church to direct people to the church.

As if all this were not enough Timothy is also an emergency medical technician for an ambulance service in the Selinsgrove area and is an active member of the Selinsgrove High School Band.

Timothy Mengel should not only be congratulated on completing the requirements for the Eagle Scout but commended and thanked for his work in the Selinsgrove community. Congratulations Timothy and good luck in the future.

OVERSIGHT HEARINGS ON THE NATION'S CAPITAL TAXI SERVICE APPLAUDED

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Congressman MICHAEL D. BARNES, chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Operations and Metropolitan Affairs of the House District of Columbia Committee for his work and interest in conducting oversight hearings on the quality of taxi service in the Nation's Capital.

Over the years, I have received numerous complaints from residents, friends, colleagues, and family regarding the quality of service. Members of the Congressional Black Caucus have experienced such infractions as refusal to transport. The unfortunate experience of my wife last year with a rude taxi driver has given me more illustration of the nature and extent of the problem.

The House District of Columbia Committee has through the years maintained a continuing interest in taxi service and has conducted studies and held hearings on the taxicab industry in the city. The committee has intervened with problems at Union Station and National Airport in the past. We have to our distress reviewed the 1957 House District of Columbia Committee hearing record and found that the same questions were raised of the

then Commissioner-form of government in the city and taxi industry representatives. Questions concerning the following were raised in 1957: limitations on the number of drivers; the use of zones versus the meter taxis; the then Revocation and Review Board's role in regulating the industry; and whether or not the entire control of taxicabs should be centralized in one agency.

It is my hope that as a result of this congressional hearing that we discover ways to remove impediments and insure decent responsible taxi service at a fair and equitable rate so that at long last these questions will be resolved and that the Nation's Capital will have the taxi service it deserves.

SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS SAFEGUARD ACT OF 1986

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, Jr.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, you may recall that last year when Congress could not agree on raising the debt ceiling, the Government teetered on the brink of default. It then dipped into the Social Security Trust Funds as a way of keeping the Government from going broke. In the process, the Social Security Trust Funds lost millions of dollars in interest that it would otherwise have collected. If the Government had actually gone into default, millions of our senior citizens would have been unable to cash their checks. This is not only wrong—it is absurd! The Nation's debts were not caused by Social Security, and I see no reason why Social Security Trust Funds should be used to bail the Government out of its fiscal mess.

The bill I am introducing today will forever protect the Social Security Trust Funds from being raided by the Government to pay its bills or help reduce the deficit. This legislation would make the Social Security Trust Funds truly separate from the U.S. Treasury, prohibiting any outside organization, including the Federal Government from tampering with it. Also, my bill would allow the Social Security Trust Funds to invest in federally guaranteed private bonds. The Board of Trustees would submit an annual investment plan to Congress for review and possible revision. These measures would ensure that there would always be money available to pay Social Security benefits to our senior citizens if the Government were unable to do so because of a fiscal emergency such as we saw happen late last year.

Our senior citizens deserve nothing less than the assurance that they will always be able to cash their benefit checks. We should not be trying to balance the budget on the backs of the elderly, and my bill would see to it that this never happens.

NATIONAL BOWHUNTER'S WEEK

HON. THOMAS N. KINDNESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which designates the week of July 7, 1986 through July 13, 1986 as "National Bowhunter's Week".

This resolution is meant to recognize the importance of bowhunting in our Nation's early history, as well as the growth of bowhunting as a sport nationwide. Nowhere is this growth and interest in bowhunting and American archery more evident than in Ohio's Eighth Congressional District, home to the International Bowhunting Organization and 1984 Olympic gold medalist in archery, Darrell O. Pace.

We are proud, in the Eighth Congressional District and throughout the State of Ohio, of the positive influence of sportsmen and women in teaching an appreciation for our history, environment and the American spirit of competition. Indeed, these efforts are to be commended.

In recognition of the contribution of bowhunting to the livelihood of our earliest Americans and its increasing popularity, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the resolution.

ENTERPRISE ZONES GET RESULTS

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, study after study show the effectiveness of enterprise zones in retaining small firms and stimulating new business and private investment, especially in high unemployment and below-median income areas. State after State has used enterprise zones to bring new life to neglected neighborhoods. For 5 years now I have worked to establish a Federal enterprise zone program. We now have plenty of tangible evidence on how zones run and their benefits.

Yet another study, by the Small Business Administration, recently examined enterprise zones in eight States and has confirmed the success of these zones in revitalizing city areas. Particular attention was paid to Pennsylvania's program, because it is an administrative rather than a legislative program. Though there is an annual appropriation of funds for the program, no State law has ever been enacted to set it up. Even so, in Philadelphia's American Street Zone, one of three zones in Philadelphia and in existence since 1983, 27 firms have sprung up in response to the incentives. The zone has attracted private investment of \$7.48 million in its 2-year history, and 1,426 jobs have been created.

The continued message we get from the States that have tried enterprise zones is that they work. Not only are jobs created, but these jobs tend to go to the long-term unemployed. Businesses are expanding and new

ones are entering these zones, reversing a long trend of business decline and closings.

Enterprise zones are efficient in other important ways. They require virtually no new Federal bureaucracy. They provide incentives for private sector investment and job creation automatically rather than through lengthy grant application procedures. Highly important is the fact that should an enterprise zone fail to induce business activity, then it will not cost the taxpayer a cent. If tax credits are claimed, it is because people have been hired and a business has been formed or expanded.

So far, business, States, and local government have embraced enterprise zones enthusiastically. If Congress fails to follow up on the experience the States are now providing us, we will have missed a golden opportunity to help get jobs and to help our cities.

IN RECOGNITION OF NEW YORK STATE SENATOR RICHARD SCHERMERHORN

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. FISH] who has called to our attention the outstanding public service performed over the past 16 years by New York State Senator Richard E. Schermerhorn.

Dick Schermerhorn, who resides in the city of Newburgh, NY, represents an area which straddles both my congressional district and that of our colleague [Mr. FISH]. Since his first election in 1970, Dick has become closely identified with a number of crucial issues, including fairer insurance laws, improved mass transportation for our area, and a better life for our police, our firefighters, and our veterans. The American Legion recently became one of many groups to honor Senator Schermerhorn for his service in public office and for his Americanism.

Senator Schermerhorn serves as chairman of the State senate transportation committee. His role on behalf of our youth has earned him recognition as the first recipient of the distinguished service award presented by the New York State Youth Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, it has not only been gratifying to work with Senator Schermerhorn, it is an honor to be able to refer to Dick as a friend.

In a few weeks, at its annual Lincoln day Dinner, the town of Newburgh, NY Republican Committee will present Senator Dick Schermerhorn with an award as "Republican Man of the Year." This award is not only fully earned, it is long overdue.

I invite our colleagues to join with us in saluting New York State Senator Richard Schermerhorn for a job well done.

MECHTILDE LAUER

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Mechtilde Lauer. Sister Mechtilde is being honored today, January 29, 1986, by the Catholic Commission on Aging of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, for her outstanding endeavors helping the aging.

Sister Mechtilde has made many contributions to the people of Los Angeles. In 1968, after retiring from a long career as a high school and English as a second language teacher, she channeled her skills and energies into the new field of gerontology. Her first such efforts were with retired sisters in the Immaculate Heart Community, to which she belongs. She also became actively involved in the Hollywood-Wilshire Committee on Aging, the Affiliated Committees on Aging, and the Education Committee of the Los Angeles County Area Agency on Aging Advisory Council. Sister Mechtilde effectively dedicated hundreds of hours in planning, holding various offices, and volunteering. For 3 years she was editor of a fine newsletter for the Southern California Interfaith Coalition on Aging.

Sister Mechtilde has helped many senior citizens on a personal basis as well. She has taken communion and offered spiritual consolation and friendship to the sick and frail elderly in their own homes and in convalescent hospitals. Her personal contact shows her care and concern for the individual dignity of the elderly as well as her interest in the general problems of aging.

Sister Mechtilde continually participates in workshops, seminars, and classes to update her knowledge of gerontology and current events. She actively supports programs for Guiding Eyes, Inc., and helps provide reading materials for prison inmates.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress continually faces difficult decisions regarding Social Security, Medicare, and other bills that affect the elderly. We know how important are the actions that we take in this area. It is helpful to be reminded that our efforts on the national level are complemented by the dedicated and talented contributions of individuals such as Mechtilde Lauer.

A TRIBUTE TO NORMAN WOLLMANN

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize Mr. Norman Wollmann, a driver with Permacel Tape, North Brunswick, NJ, who was recently elected District Driver of the Year by Ryder Truck Rental, Inc.

Norman's meticulous driving has earned him an outstanding reputation in the transportation field. He was chosen to represent the New Brunswick District because he has achieved, among other things, over 1 million

accident-free miles. His safety record is impeccable, his knowledge of and attitude toward his work are unflawed and his dedication to his job is second to none. Additionally, he takes extra care in the operation of his equipment.

On this occasion of his award, I extend my congratulations to Norman and wish him continued success on the road and best wishes for the future.

THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOY SCOUT TROOP NO. 103 OF FLORENCE, MA

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Boy Scout Troop 103 of Florence, MA, which on March 31, 1985 celebrated its 60th anniversary. Troop 103, sponsored by Our Lady of the Annunciation Church, holds the unique distinction of being the longest continuously active Catholic troop in the Springfield diocese.

Since its conception in 1925, Troop 103 has had only two scoutmasters. The first 20 years were served by William Dunphy. The last 40 years have been under the guidance of George McDonald, who continues to this day.

These are obviously two unselfish and caring men. The fact that they have dedicated their service to the young men and boys of this troop for such an extended period of time, lends itself to the importance of this organization. It is refreshing in these times of faddism to honor such men and such a long-lasting organization as the Boy Scouts of America. Boys that are tomorrow's men learn the meaning of responsibility, duty, and commitment.

I am sure that many of you here today were once members of the Boy Scouts and remember the lessons in responsibility, comradery, and fun that you learned from your scoutmasters and fellow scouts.

This is an organization that we can all be proud of. The opportunity it gives young men and boys is a very important part of their education. Boy Scouts learn the value of working toward a goal through the merit badge system. They learn to earn what they want. While belonging to Troop 103, 120 scouts have received the highest award possible in Scouting, the eagle badge.

This kind of contribution to young people's lives, their communities, and this country is unmeasurable. It is an honor and a privilege for me and my constituents to have such a group of young men as Troop 103 in our district.

On February 8, 1986, Troop 103 will formally celebrate its 60th anniversary with a liturgical mass and dinner party. It is my hope that this will be a most memorable occasion as all involved should be proud. Let me extend my sincere congratulations and hope for their future.

MEMORIAL TO SOLDIERS WHO DIED IN NEWFOUNDLAND

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, last month, I attended the 101st Division memorial service at Fort Campbell, KY, which was held in memory of the soldiers who died in Newfoundland. During that ceremony, the commanding officer of the division, Maj. Gen. Burton D. Patrick, made a very moving address. I place it in the RECORD for all the Members to read:

"Fellow soldiers and members of the finest combat division assembled in this century. We have come together on this field to honor—albeit bitter cold—to pay our lasting respect to your friends and mine who have made their final 'rendezvous with destiny.' It's only fitting that we have snow today. This division seems to unite under these conditions as it did 41 years ago today at Bastogne—when the battle raged there.

As your commander it is my solemn duty to call you here under these tragic and difficult circumstances. I wish with all my heart it could be otherwise—and I know that each of you feel the same way. The airplane tragedy which has taken the lives of our fellow soldiers has cast a dark cloud over Fort Campbell, and the homes of other families throughout the land. We have suffered a loss of indescribable proportions—a loss that cuts across the entire division and the nation and its territories.

Our hearts go out to the families and loved ones of those brave soldiers who lost their lives in Newfoundland while on their way home from peacekeeping duties in the Sinai. A mission that they had done so efficiently, effectively and quietly that the general public didn't even realize that they were there. Our courageous peacekeepers have departed our midst suddenly, and they have ascended to heights where even eagles can't fly. They will be missed in so many ways, and their service and sacrifice, like our fallen eagles of the past, will remain in our memories forever.

The single and very bright ray of sunshine that has made its way through our dark cloud occurred yesterday morning when the remaining flights of our task force touched down safely at Campbell Army Airfield. Heavy hearts were lifted somewhat then as those of us who were there know so well. Welcome home task force 3-502 and job well done!

It is with heavy hearts that we welcome you home, each of you know that the fiber of Fort Campbell and the screaming eagles is strong—and the cohesion and comradeship of our people is like still water—it runs deep. It is with these words that I tell you that we must now look to the future and the promise of happier days. I know that these past eight days have been trying and hectic and that you haven't had sufficient time to regroup and mourn your dead. I promise you that time. As I've said previously—we will lick our wounds, help those families in grief, reconstitute our forces and continue the mission. I'll need your total support as always—as will those families personally affected by our tragedy.

Speaking of families—I have just received this message from Mr. and Mrs. Estol Banks, parents of SP4 Bobby L. Banks,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HHC, 3-502: "While we cannot be at Fort Campbell, we are with you in mind, heart, and spirit. We grieve with and for you. In our mutual sorrow we remember our son, and your loss; and their brave, courageous service to peace in our world, be strong. Be proud. We pray for you; pray for us."

I think that this message expresses the true feelings of families who have lost sons and daughters all across the country. I know they are mine.

LENNIE ROBERTS—SAN MATEO COUNTY'S ENVIRONMENTAL ADVOCATE

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon the Committee for Green Foothills, a leading environmental organization on the San Francisco Peninsula, will honor Lennie Roberts at a special reception. She is most deserving of this significant honor.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention and to the attention of this House to some of the accomplishments of this remarkable woman. Her lifelong concern has been to protect and preserve the special environment of the bay area. Though we on the peninsula have a special affection and claim upon her, she has served the entire San Francisco Bay area.

Lennie's energy has been quite remarkable throughout her highly active life. Originally an art major at Stanford University, she threw herself into the conservation movement wholeheartedly. Her involvement has ranged from local garden clubs and the Sierra Club, to the Committee for Green Foothills and the California Coastal Commission. Her efforts have helped educate a generation of bay area residents to the delights and benefits of our environment.

There are many active environmentalists who owe their love of nature to Lennie, and who have themselves become deeply involved in the conservation movement. This dedicated network of people has become a major force in the bay area and we now see many important programs and laws adopted directly through their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my friends and neighbors on the peninsula in paying this richly deserved tribute to Lennie Roberts. I only hope that she will continue her outstanding work. All of us in the bay area need her. Thanks to her untiring efforts, we all can pass on this precious legacy of our environment to our children and grandchildren.

HON. TED SHAW STEPS DOWN AS ICA PRESIDENT

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, at the February 20, 1986 Independent Cities Association [ICA] general membership meeting, Hon. Ted

January 29, 1986

Shaw, councilman for the city of South Pasadena, will step down as president of the association.

Ted Shaw has served the cities of the county of Los Angeles and the 22d Congressional District in an exemplary manner. His high standards, his productivity, his efficiency have all been recognized and praised by the ICA board of directors.

His tenure with the association has mirrored his approach to his personal, religious, and business activities. He is an advocate of the creed that if you are going to do something, you do it well and with energy and enthusiasm.

Mr. Shaw has a lifetime of commitment and involvement. He has served on the South Pasadena City Council since 1978, during which time he served three terms as mayor. He has been active in the ICA from 1982 to the present. He has simultaneously been involved in a host of civil activities.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the residents and communities of the 22d Congressional District, I would like to express my gratitude to Ted Shaw for all of his efforts on our behalf and to congratulate him for an effective and laudable tenure as president of the ICA.

GLENN ANDERSON—A PROFILE IN COURAGE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to relate to my colleagues a remarkable story about one of our most able colleagues, the gentleman from the 32d District in California, GLENN ANDERSON. It is a story involving great personal courage in the face of danger. It is a story which thankfully has a happy ending but might not have.

The date was December 30, the time about 11:45 a.m. GLENN ANDERSON had gone to the First Interstate Bank in the town of Wilmington, part of his district. GLENN had planned, as he had planned so many other days in his district on a full schedule of events, meetings, and activities. But this day was to be a great deal different than any other day of his life. He was carrying his briefcase and as he was leaning over to unlock his car door he was accosted by a "big man," the man demanded that GLENN give him his briefcase. According to a dramatic account of the incident published by the Press-Telegram of Long Beach:

ANDERSON refused to let go of the briefcase and he said he and the man were "tussling" over it when according to ANDERSON, "I felt a gun, I thought he was kidding and he shot me. I thought he had hit me."

The story continues. GLENN did relinquish his briefcase, but in doing so he startled the bandit by showing the briefcase at him. Again in GLENN's words:

It kept him busy and gave me a chance to run around the car. I wanted to get the car between him and me."

By this time, GLENN had realized the bullet fired had only torn through his trousers, be-

tween the thigh and knee, leaving three holes as it miraculously passed through a crease.

As the robber ran off with the briefcase, GLENN ran from car to car in the parking lot and asked people to call the police. Further demonstrating a great sense of mind and bearing, he grabbed an envelope from his pocket, borrowed a pencil, and wrote down the license plate of the white getaway van, driven by a second man.

According to GLENN, one car unsuccessfully did try to block the path of the van as it left the parking lot, and another driver did follow the vehicle. Ultimately, after police were notified, they did capture the suspects. After a frenzied and perilous pursuit using police cars and helicopters.

GLENN ANDERSON was carrying his briefcase, a normal everyday occurrence for many of us in our line of work. Yet, the importance of the briefcase to GLENN was reflected in the first words he spoke to the bandits who tried to rob him of it: "No it's mine, all my work is in there." Indeed it was, inside his briefcase were important Government documents, including constituent cases, problems, and other issues GLENN had brought home with him to read. It is a reflection on the character of our friend GLENN ANDERSON that he would take such effort, and display such courage, to protect his briefcase and the work that he was doing on behalf of his constituents.

In a sense, these criminals seeing a well-dressed man carrying a briefcase felt he was easy prey. Yet, they obviously picked on the wrong man. They don't serve with and know GLENN ANDERSON the way we his colleagues do. These criminals made the mistake of tussling with a former infantry sergeant and a man who takes great pride in his physical condition. They picked on a man who fought back, and ultimately won.

It is obvious that lady luck was with our friend GLENN ANDERSON in that bank parking lot. He is shot practically at pointblank range with the bullet traveling harmlessly through his pant leg. To quote GLENN from the same news article:

If I'd been standing up straight, it would have been in the front and out the back. The bullet went down and dug a big hole in the concrete.

GLENN ANDERSON and I share something in common. We were both elected for the first time to the 91st Congress in 1968. It has been my distinct pleasure to have worked very closely with GLENN these past 17 years. We have served together on the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. I know him to be an outstanding and effective legislator and a tireless worker for the people of the 32d District in California. Yet, I also know GLENN as a great friend and wonderful human being. He has all of these virtues and more. This experience displays but another fine attribute, courage.

I am certain that my colleagues join with me in breathing a great sigh of relief for our friend GLENN ANDERSON. Each of us should take a moment to express our thoughts to GLENN on his ordeal and how happy we are that he triumphed.

In order that my colleagues might better understand the full details of the harrowing experience endured by our friend and colleague

GLENN ANDERSON, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD the full article from the Press-Telegram entitled "Police Hold 2 Suspects in Glenn Anderson Robbery, Shooting Try—Anderson Feels 'Grateful' After Brush With Bandits."

(From the Long Beach (CA) Press-Telegram, Jan. 1, 1986)

POLICE HOLD 2 SUSPECTS IN GLENN ANDERSON ROBBERY, SHOOTING TRY—ANDERSON FEELS 'GRATEFUL' AFTER BRUSH WITH BANDITS

(By Susan Pack)

The briefcase contained just about everything—personal papers, government documents, even the keys to his Washington, DC, office.

"I always say my brains are in my briefcase," said Rep. Glenn Anderson, D-Long Beach.

So when a robber tried to grab the briefcase as Anderson left a Wilmington bank Monday, he held on tight.

"I said, 'No, it's mine,'" Anderson recalled Tuesday. "I need it. All my work is in there."

The 72-year-old congressman didn't let go until the assailant shot at him, blasting three holes in his trousers but missing his leg.

One day after the harrowing encounter, Anderson said he felt "very grateful and lucky and thankful."

"I was impressed by two things: the unbelievable speedy and professional work of the Los Angeles Police Department and the help of the people in the parking lot," he said. "I had more help than I knew what to do with."

As Anderson recounted his experience Tuesday, detectives in the police department's Harbor Division were contacting other law enforcement agencies to determine whether the two suspects were responsible for similar crimes elsewhere.

Lt. John Hopkins said there is no evidence that the robbery and shooting were politically motivated.

"There is nothing to indicate that it was anything other than a citizen being robbed," he said.

The two men—Darrel Borders, 25, of Pomona and James Lawson, 22, of Los Angeles—are expected to be arraigned Thursday in San Pedro Municipal Court on charges of robbery and attempted murder. They are being held without bail at the Harbor Division jail.

Hopkins said the pair apparently have criminal records, and Lawson may be using an alias. He said the getaway vehicle had been stolen.

Anderson said he went to First Interstate Bank at 1234 N. Avalon Blvd. at 11 a.m. Monday to discuss his MasterCard account with a Los Angeles bank executive who met him at the local branch because it was more convenient. Many of his travel expenses are charged on his MasterCard, he said, and he wanted to do a year-end review of the account.

He left the bank at 11:45 a.m. and walked to his station wagon, which was parked in a lot next to the bank and a shopping center.

Because he had half a dozen other appointments later in the day, he was wearing a suit and tie. He believes his attire and the briefcase caught the attention of the robbers, who assumed the case was full of cash.

"They saw a moderately well-dressed businessman carrying a briefcase out of the bank, and to them, that looked like money," he said.

He said he was leaning over to unlock his car door when "all of a sudden, this big man—he looked towering to me—said, 'Give me your briefcase!'"

The man was swarthy, he recalled, and he was wearing dark glasses and a hat. He spoke in a sort of growl.

Anderson refused to let go of the briefcase, and he said he and the man were "tussling" over it when "I felt a gun. I thought he was kidding, and he shot me."

At that point, Anderson yelled, "Hey, take it!" and shoved the briefcase at the assailant.

"It kept him busy and gave me a chance to run around the car," he said. "I wanted to get the car between him and me."

The bullet tore through Anderson's trousers between his thigh and his knee, leaving three holes as it apparently passed through a crease.

"If I'd been standing up straight, it would have been in the front and out the back," he said. "The bullet went down and dug a big hole in the concrete."

As soon as the robber ran off with the briefcase, Anderson said he dashed from car to car yelling, "Help, call the police! I've been held up!" He then grabbed an envelope from his pocket, borrowed a pencil and wrote down the license number of the white getaway van, which was driven by a second man.

Anderson said one car unsuccessfully tried to block the path of the van as it sped out of the parking lot, and another driver followed the vehicle. Less than a mile away, that driver flagged down a police car, which then took over the chase.

The suspects crashed the van into a car waiting at a signal at 106th Street and Normandie Avenue in an unincorporated area of Los Angeles county, Hopkins said. Borders was arrested there, but the other suspect escaped and crawled under a house at 1315 W. 107th St., the officer said.

That house and several others were evacuated, and the SWAT team was called in, Hopkins said. Police used tear gas to flush the suspect from his hiding place, and he surrendered shortly after 2 p.m.

Police recovered the briefcase, which was still full, and returned it to Anderson, who said it may have contained \$20 or \$30 in "emergency money" in addition to his papers.

Anderson said the incident didn't really change him or his views on criminals. He said he's always been a strong supporter of "use a gun, go to jail" legislation, and he believes the men who accosted him should serve time.

SPACE SHUTTLE TRIBUTE

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to pay tribute to the seven crewmembers of the space shuttle *Challenger*, who tragically perished yesterday morning when their craft blew up soon after takeoff.

I think that we were all the more shocked by yesterday's accident because of the complacency that we felt, living in a high-technology world that has witnessed 56 successful

American space flights over the last two decades. While we are used to hearing about weather delays and minor technical glitches holding up shuttle flights, no one could have expected a mishap of the magnitude of yesterday's tragedy. As we learned, though, space flight is not something to be taken for granted.

The seven crew members spent long, hard hours preparing for their flight. They volunteered for the rigorous Astronaut Program, and Ms. Sharon Christa McAuliffe competed against hundreds of other teachers from around the country for the privilege of flying in the space shuttle. Their dedication and sacrifice must not be lost.

I join with my colleagues in sending my heartfelt grief to the families and friends of the men and women who died in the service of their country yesterday. They will not be forgotten.

A TRIBUTE TO HAROLD M. RYAN

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to pay tribute to a man who has selflessly dedicated the majority of this life to public service, former Congressman Harold M. Ryan.

On February 6, his many friends in the community will hold a long overdue testimonial dinner in honor of Mr. Ryan. In choosing to salute him, they no doubt took, into consideration Mr. Ryan's unceasing commitment to public welfare, as seen in his exemplary career, which spans back to 1944. At that time, he was assistant prosecuting attorney for Wayne County, MI. From 1949-1961, Mr. Ryan represented Michigan's First Congressional District in the Michigan Senate. Between 1961 and 1964, he served the 14th Congressional District of Michigan in the U.S. House of Representatives. For the next 14 years, Mr. Ryan engaged in the private practice of law. In 1978, he was elected to the Wayne County circuit bench, a position he held until his retirement last year. To each of these positions, Harold Ryan brought a rare blend of intelligence, compassion, integrity, and involvement.

Harold Ryan's many accomplishments extend beyond the political realms to the community, where he continues his longtime commitment to the well-being of others. Mr. Ryan is also known as a generous and loving family man and friend.

As he is honored by his friends and family, Mr. Ryan can reflect with pride on his many contributions to the residents of Michigan. I would like to join them in extending my warmest congratulations to Harold Ryan, his lovely wife, Lillian Wagnier-Ryan and his five children, Kathleen, Harold, Jr., Nancy, Theresa, and John on this meritorious occasion.

REPEAL GRAMM-RUDMAN-HOLLINGS

HON. JIM MOODY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to repeal recently passed Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation.

I fully support deficit reduction, and I have introduced and supported various items of legislation to make real deficit cuts. But Gramm-Rudman-Hollings is not a rational or reasonable way for Congress to proceed.

First, it allows Congress and the President to avoid difficult choices in favor of a mindless formula—a gross abdication of congressional responsibility which may well be unconstitutional. Second, it is flawed economically because it requires a larger deficit cut when the economy is weaker and a smaller deficit cut when the economy is stronger—a result which exacerbates rather than softens fluctuations in the business cycle.

I voted against Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. I later joined 11 congressional colleagues in challenging its constitutionality in court. And though our suit is still pending, I am now introducing legislation that will allow us to restore the basic congressionally directed budget process which this country has used for 200 years.

Gramm-Rudman-Hollings was a mistake that we will surely come to regret. I hope that we can muster the political courage to admit our error, repeal the measure, and confront the important task of responsible deficit reduction.

COMMENDS APPRAISERS

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 202, which commends the Society of Real Estate Appraisers on the occasion of its golden anniversary, and to thank my colleague from Illinois, Representative CARLIS COLLINS for introducing it.

Although the Society of Real Estate Appraisers has chapters all over the world, I am pleased also to recognize today the Mahoning Valley No. 63 Chapter whose President is S. Martin Oyer, SRPA, of 3710 Mahoning Avenue, Youngstown, Ohio 44515. The Mahoning Valley Chapter encompasses Mahoning, Trumbull, and Columbiana Counties in my district.

Members of the Society of Real Estate Appraisers are employed by financial institutions, corporations, Federal, State, and local governments, and they also practice as independent fee appraisers. Their commitment to professionalism is exemplified by their extensive educational system of seminars and courses directed toward the advancement of the profession which are attended by approximately

8,000 people every year, members and non-members alike.

Mr. Speaker, the Society of Real Estate Appraisers has for 50 years promoted professional standards for all real estate appraisers. The need for sound, unbiased real estate appraisals continues to be as important today as it was when the Society of Real Estate Appraisers was first founded. I ask my colleagues to join with me in passing H.R. 202 commending the Society of Real Estate Appraisers for 50 years of service.

ALDEN AAROE, CELEBRATING 30 YEARS OF BROADCASTING

HON. THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, January 31, 1986, marks an important milestone for my friend Alden Aaroe of Richmond, VA. For 30 years Richmonders have been waking up to Alden's special brand of humor and information as the announcer of WRVA Radio's morning program. More than once, Alden's wit and wisdom have gotten me off to a fresh start in the morning. I miss hearing him when I'm in Washington, and I look forward to the mornings I'm in Richmond where I can be sure of an entertaining and informative start on the day.

On January 31, Alden will be celebrating his 30th year with Richmond and WRVA Radio. On behalf of his loyal fans, friends, and co-workers, I would like to say, "Thank you, Alden and may you be a part of our mornings for another 30 years."

TRIBUTE TO DR. JEAN HOLLISTER AND JOHN HARRISON

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, shortly before Christmas last month, my district suffered a great tragedy. A Life Flight air ambulance helicopter from St. Vincent Medical Center in Toledo crashed on its way to pick up a traffic accident victim. The pilot, John Harrison and a flight physician Dr. Jean Hollister were killed while on a mission of mercy.

Our community has always been blessed with courageous people, who have been willing to put their lives on the line in order to save the lives of others. We are very proud of the work done by the Life Flight team. They have saved lives—the ultimate contribution to society.

The grief over their deaths has been shared by our entire region. Though St. Vincent Michael Medical Center's Life Flight Program has rebounded with great strength and professionalism, the sorrow will always be felt. But even in tragedy their can be solace. Because Dr. Jean Hollister and John Harrison will always be remembered, their courage and willingness to give of themselves so that

others may benefit will serve as a shining example of that great spirit of community which the French writer Alexis de Toqueville found so exciting on his visit to America a century and a half ago. Dr. Jean Hollister and John Harrison epitomized what is best in America.

For myself and my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives, I offer my deepest condolences to the families of Dr. Jean Hollister and John Harrison. Thank you for letting them be part of our lives as well as yours. May the respect and admiration that they enjoyed in life somehow ease the pain of their death.

WILLIAM OVERMEER HONORED

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues the distinguished career of William Overmeer.

For the past decade William "Bill" Overmeer has demonstrated outstanding service to our community, as well as many adjoining areas, with meritorious achievement. During 10 years with the West San Gabriel Valley Consortium, Bill gave careful adherence to the fiduciary responsibilities of his position. Being a stickler for organization and thoroughness, Bill implemented high standards, reduced costs, and maximized the number of local residents trained. In addition to his work with the consortium, Mr. Overmeer spent 6 years with United Community Efforts Inc. in East Los Angeles. In the private sector, he performed outstandingly as an assistant controller for two different public accounting firms.

Perhaps the greatest example of this man's philanthropy is the 5 years he spent in the Royal Dutch underground serving to eliminate tyrannies in Germany and Holland. Here we find the intensity of this great American as he stood tall to fight the terror of oppression and represent the principles of freedom and justice.

Without hesitation and with much admiration I salute a public servant; a man of great moral character; and a man willing to uphold qualities which separate the humane from the inhumane. I salute William Overmeer.

AMERICANS FOR PRESIDENT REAGAN'S FOREIGN POLICY

HON. WILLIAM W. COBEY, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Speaker, Americans for President Reagan's Foreign Policy have called to my attention three articles from *The Truth*, a New Hampshire newspaper officializing in foreign affairs matters. All Americans are affected for better or worse by U.S. foreign policy decisions. I believe that we all need to be well informed about these policies in order to protect not only our Nation, but our individual lives and property from the costs and per-

sonal dangers generated by the Soviet Union's expansions and Soviet sponsored terrorism.

Over the last 5 years, the Reagan administration has demonstrated that it is committed to turning back the Soviet-takeover tide in Central America, Afghanistan, and southern Africa. I believe the two great foreign policy problems confronting President Reagan today are the Soviet efforts to expand their influence in the world and the Soviet strategy enunciated by late Soviet leader Krushchev, who said "... our aim is to gain control of the two great treasure houses on which the West depends ... oil from the Persian Gulf and strategic minerals from southern Africa."

Today we are seeing this dream become a reality. Currently, there are around 35,000 Cuban troops occupying Angola on behalf of the Soviet Union. These troops not only control the Soviet-puppet government, but they also support the Soviet backed terrorist group known as the Southwest African People Organization [SWAPO]. This organization uses Soviet military equipment under the guidance of Soviet military advisers in a campaign of violence to gain control of the country of Namibia before the recently formed Namibian Government can achieve internationally accepted independence.

Within the broad framework of U.N. Resolution 435, the people of Namibia have chosen their own political leaders and have established the Transitional Government of National Unity. This democratic government assures all powers of local self-determination by successfully negotiating a transfer of total local governing authority to the Namibian people from South Africa.

I believe the United States should lend political and economic support to this new government in Namibia because it offers a responsible anti-Soviet Government, supported by the people of Namibia, as a democratic alternative to a puppet-state set up by SWAPO.

I recommend the following articles to my colleagues and other Americans who have an interest in the foreign policy of the United States.

[From *The Truth*, Winter 1986]

STATE DEPARTMENT UNDER FIRE FOR NAMIBIA POLICY

OPPOSES SELF-GOVERNMENT

WASHINGTON, DC.—The U.S. State Department has come under direct attack by two respected forces regarding its handling of Namibia, an African country larger than Texas immediately south of Angola. Senator Steve Symms (R-ID) and Carl Shipley, President of the U.S.-South West Africa/Namibia Trade and Cultural Council, both lambast the State Department as "architects of disaster" for their "head in the sand" thinking regarding Namibia.

In articles below, they present the true picture of this virtually important, sparsely populated country, whose people desire their own government, free of the Communist influence which threatens them through SWAPO (South West Africa Peoples Organization), backed by the Soviets and the United Nations.

While the State Department encourages U.S. business to locate in Communist Angola, entrance into Namibia is discouraged. The State Department is still seeking to effect U.N. Resolution 435, under which

the U.N. would supervise an election of an assembly in Namibia. However, control of this assembly would be seized by SWAPO, with its U.N. backing. Shipley points out that it is a blueprint for U.N. sponsorship of a Soviet-puppet SWAPO government in Namibia.

FURTHERS RED AIMS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

(By Senator Steve Symms)

As a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Economic Resources, Competitiveness and Security Economics, I have long been concerned with the fact that since 1970 the U.S. Department of State has discouraged investment in Namibia, at a time when political leaders within that Territory have been trying to negotiate their independence from South Africa.

Namibia has been administered for the past 65 years under a 1920 League of Nations Mandate as a former German territory conquered by the British (using South African colonial forces) in World War I. On June 17 of this year, the Multi-Party Conference of Namibia's internal political leaders, all of whom have been elected or designated by their political parties and their various population groups to represent their interests, persuaded the Government of South Africa to transfer to the MPC all legislative, judicial and executive functions theretofore exercise in the territory by the Administrator-General appointed by South Africa.

The South African government voluntarily, and on the basis of non-violent and honest negotiations, agreed to the MPC request. Thus, the people of Namibia now enjoy all powers of local self-government (except foreign relations and defense, which they voluntarily left in South African hands because of their own lack of capacity in these areas) for the first time since the original German colonization of South West Africa in the 1800's.

However, the same type of head-in-the-sand thinking that seems to be a congenial affliction of bureaucrats in the U.S. Department of State, and which has given us such catastrophic diplomatic losses as North Korea, East Germany, the Berlin Wall, Soviet occupied Vietnam, Soviet occupied Afghanistan, and Soviet-puppet governments in Angola, Ethiopia, Mozambique and North Yemen, now turns a blind eye on the TGNU (Transitional Government of National Unity) in Namibia.

Thus, our State Department is once again lending its indirect support to Soviet empire expansionism in Africa by opposing recognition of the political reality of the TGNU, opposing the right of self government of the people of Namibia, and closing its eyes to the fact that the United Nations, the U.N. Council for Namibia, and its subordinate agencies all strongly support, both financially and politically, the Soviet-backed terrorist forces seeking to seize control of Namibia and bring it under the domination of the Kremlin before that Territory can achieve internationally acceptable independence.

H.R. 2589 would apparently subject all Americans, individual as well as corporate, to five years in jail and fines ranging from \$50,000 to \$1 million for using or dealing in any product which might contain a "natural resource" originating in Namibia without permission of the U.N. Council of Namibia. This proposal to transfer a part of the Nation's sovereignty to SWAPO's chief support in the United Nations would, if it were

not so well intentioned, come under the heading of treason.

For years committees of the Congress, as well as the Congressional Budget Office, have emphasized the 100 percent import dependence of the U.S. on certain strategic minerals found in the free world only in southern Africa, many of which are found in Namibia. In 1973, former Soviet leader Brezhnev announced to the world the Soviet goal of gaining control of the two great treasure houses—the oil in the Persian gulf and the minerals in Southern Africa—on which the industrial West depends.

Shortly thereafter, Soviet-backed "liberation groups" shot their way into power in Ethiopia, Angola, and Mozambique, as implementation of the Brezhnev policy got underway. Namibia is the next target.

Namibia, on the southwest coast of the African continent, like Mozambique on the eastern coast and Angola, on the western coast, is another keystone in Soviet strategy. Once Namibia is in the Soviet bloc, or behind the "iron curtain," then the Soviets can at the very least subject the U.S. to diplomatic blackmail, and under more severe conditions cut off our access as well as the access of NATO countries of Europe, to the minerals and oil on which the West depends.

One does not have to have a very good memory to recall that in the Soviet-sponsored campaign to seize control of what is now Zimbabwe, sanctions played a part. Rhodesia, as it was then known, sold its chrome on which we are 100 percent dependent, to the Russians, who then sold it to the U.S. and the rest of the world at more than twice the price. That is how sanctions and Soviet diplomacy work.

NAMIBIA: U.S. POLICY'S "FAILED MISSION" (By Carl Shipley)

Shortly after the Reagan Administration assumed responsibility for U.S. foreign relations upon entering office in 1981, President Reagan's United Nations Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick outlined U.S. policy for Namibia, formerly known as South West Africa, as follows:

"Our principal goal . . . is independence for Namibia . . . Namibia has the largest known uranium deposits in the world, and a second goal we have is to prevent this mineral-rich territory from being permitted to slide into the Soviet sphere of influence, which has expanded markedly in Africa. A related strategic goal is to keep the vital waterways around Namibia out of hostile hands . . . Our goals are complicated by the presence of more than 30,000 Cuban troops in neighboring Angola."

Five years later, the State Department architects of disaster who are charged with implementing President Reagan's policy for Namibia have produced a tattered and shredded shambles.

During these five Reagan years, the U.S. Export-Import Bank has extended loans of at least \$500 million to the Marxist government of Angola, which seized power with Soviet backing in 1976, while withholding aid and discouraging investment in pro-West, South West Africa (Namibia).

These loans have enabled Angola's Soviet-puppet government to entrench itself against its own citizens led by Jonas Savimbi and his UNITA forces. Indeed, the U.S. Department of State continues to urge President Reagan to withhold humanitarian and military aid for Savimbi's UNITA freedom fighters—the result is indirect support of Angola's Soviet-controlled government.

During these five years, the number of Cuban combat troops occupying Angola has doubled from 20,000 to 40,000. There have been massive infusions of Soviet military equipment, including MIG Soviet fighter planes, the deadly Soviet helicopter gunships, Soviet tanks, Soviet-antiaircraft weapons and rocket launchers, a quadrupling of Soviet and Soviet bloc military advisors, MIG and gunship pilots, and support forces.

In addition to heavy equipment, Cuban combat soldiers, and Soviet military personnel, the Soviets are supplying enormous quantities of AK47 rifles, ammunition and land mines. Angola is technically incapable of producing a single piece of military hardware, or a single aircraft or vehicle—the Soviets supply it all.

The disaster architects at the State Department are intelligent men and women, but their self-designed Namibia policy is a "failed mission." It is time to recognize that no progress can be made without participation of Namibia's Multi Party Conference political leaders.

Angola continues to help the Soviets equip, train and finance the SWAPO terrorists who operate from bases in southern Angola in a campaign of "landmine" murder and abduction of school children to intimidate the black civilian population of northern Namibia into accepting a SWAPO government.

UNITY PARTY A REALITY

The disaster architects at the State Department persist in opposing any U.S. investment in Namibia, despite the fact Namibia has the only successful multi-racial, multi-party government with a black majority in southern Africa.

They turn a blind eye on United Nations pro-SWAPO partiality, and have opposed both economic and disaster aid to the people of Namibia in the devastating drought of recent years, while funneling aid to the Marxist governments in Angola, Mozambique, and elsewhere in Africa.

They stubbornly refuse to acknowledge the existence, much less the reality, that on June 17, 1985, the Multi-Party Conference of Namibian political leaders successfully negotiated a complete transfer of all governmental powers over the Territory from South Africa's Administrator-General, who had governed Namibia since 1920.

Today the people of Namibia, as a result of their own efforts and despite U.S. State Department opposition, have more democratic freedom and the only peacefully negotiated multi-racial, multi-party national unity government than any former colonial area of Africa.

Some observers think the failed mission in Namibia is a result of the State Department's blind adherence to United Nations Security Council Resolution 435 of 1978—the Carter Administration's independence plan cooked up by his later-dismissed U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young and his deputy, Donald McHenry. Under this resolution, the U.N. would supervise an election of a constituent assembly in Namibia to write an independence constitution.

U.N. DESIGNATED SWAPO

The fatal flaw in Resolution 435 is the fact that at the time the Carter Administration "architected" it, the U.N. had already designated Soviet-backed SWAPO as the "sole authentic" representative of the Namibian people, conferred permanent observer status on SWAPO and established a U.N. agency known as the Council for Namibia

through which the U.N. channels millions of dollars a year to finance SWAPO propaganda, offices and meetings throughout the world. It is a blueprint for the U.N. sponsorship of a Soviet-puppet SWAPO Government in Namibia.

So here we have President Reagan's policy as articulated by Jeane Kirkpatrick held hostage to a Carter Administration blueprint to deliver the people and political leaders of Namibia to the tender mercies of SWAPO.

Having some familiarity with such well known Soviet and Soviet bloc techniques to persuade the recalcitrant as the "Gulag" peninsula, the salt mines, the insane asylum or a mind-bending session in a brain-washing facility, the people of Namibia are understandably inclined to prefer internationally acceptable independence within the parameters of the Resolution 435 plan under the supervision of an international agency not having pre-picked the winner of an independence election, and one without its thumb on the scales for one party as against all others.

TGNU, REAGAN'S BEST HOPE

The Namibian Transitional Government of National Unity, now providing interim local self-government in a commonwealth relationship with South Africa, is the Reagan Administration's last best hope of saving President Reagan's failed mission in Namibia. The TGNU is flexible, pro-West broadly supported by the people of Namibia, includes all major political parties and ethnic groups, and invites SWAPO to join in national unity. Above all it has successfully and peacefully negotiated a transfer of power from the RSA to its own multi-racial, black majority Multi-Party Conference, something the disaster architects of the State Department have failed to accomplish after seven years of defeated struggle.

And yet the State Department, thumbs in its ears, hands over its eyes, pursues its deaf, dumb and blind policy of pretending the Namibian TGNU does not exist. The predictable result is a "failed mission" for the Reagan Administration unless the foggy bottom strategists start implementing the Reagan policy instead of thwarting it.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of

an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 30, 1986, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 31

9:30 a.m.
Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1959, to clarify the tax treatment of certain mortgage related securities, and to authorize the ownership of certain mortgage loans in multiple class arrangements, S. 1978, to clarify the taxation of certain asset backed securities in multiple class arrangements, and S. 1839, to provide that certain deductions and credits not be allowed for expenditures within an environmental zone.
SD-215

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on the nomination of Lois Shepard, of Maryland, to be Director of the Institute of Museum Services.
SD-430

FEBRUARY 3

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the impact of debt ceiling legislation on aviation funding and safety.
SR-253

2:30 p.m.
Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on Senate committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1986.
SR-301

FEBRUARY 4

9:00 a.m.
Finance
To hold hearings on the nomination of Michael A. Samuels, of the District of Columbia, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador.
SD-215

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold hearings on U.S. military posture in review of the fiscal year 1987 Department of Defense military authorization request.
SR-325

Finance
To resume hearings on H.R. 3838, proposed Tax Reform Act of 1986.
SD-215

Labor and Human Resources
Handicapped Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for education of the handicapped, focusing on discretionary programs.
SD-430

9:50 a.m.
Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on Senate committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1986.
SR-301

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Administrative Conference of the United States.
SD-226

FEBRUARY 5

9:30 a.m.
Finance
To continue hearings on H.R. 3838, proposed Tax Reform Act of 1986.
SD-215

Rules and Administration
To continue hearings on Senate committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1986.
SR-301

Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.
SH-219

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings to review those programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee as contained in the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1987, focusing on the Department of the Interior.
SD-366

Judiciary
Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review issues surrounding the attempted defection of Miroslav Medvid and the Administration's procedures regarding East bloc defectors.
SD-226

Labor and Human Resources
Aging Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the 3% set aside for older workers in the Job Training Partnership Act.
SD-430

Joint Economic
To resume hearings in preparation of its forthcoming annual report, focusing on the economic outlook for 1986.
Room to be announced

1:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To continue oversight hearings to review those programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee as contained in the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1987, focusing on Forest Service programs of the Department of Agriculture.
SD-366

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
SD-226

FEBRUARY 6

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1966, to provide for efficient and equitable use of operating rights at certain congested airports.
SR-253

Finance
To continue hearings on H.R. 3838, proposed Tax Reform Act of 1986.
SD-215

Small Business
To hold hearings on the impact of tax reform and simplification proposals on small business.
SR-428A

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To continue oversight hearings to review those programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee as contained in the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1987, focusing on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
SD-366

Labor and Human Resources
Children, Family, Drugs, and Alcoholism Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for ACTION.
SD-430

1:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To continue oversight hearings to review those programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee as contained in the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1987, focusing on the Department of Energy.
SD-366

4:00 p.m.
Select on Intelligence
To hold a closed briefing on intelligence matters.
SH-219

FEBRUARY 7

9:30 a.m.
Joint Economic
To hold hearings on the employment/unemployment situation for January.
Room to be announced

FEBRUARY 18

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the American Battle Monuments Commission, Army cemetery expenses, Office of Consumer Affairs (Department of Commerce), Consumer Information Center, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission.
SD-124

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on the nomination of Jed Dean Christensen, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.
SD-366

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on those programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee as contained in the President's budget requests for fiscal year 1987.
SD-628

FEBRUARY 19

9:30 a.m.
Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1987 for the intelligence community.
SH-219

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Department of Transportation.

SD-138

Labor and Human Resources

Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1990, to establish an Education and Training Partnership to administer the Job Training Partnership Act, the Wagner-Peyser Act, and the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act.

SD-430

1:30 p.m.

Appropriations

To hold hearings to review the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1987.

SD-192

FEBRUARY 20

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Council on Environmental Quality, Selective Service System, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, and the National Institute of Building Sciences.

SD-124

Labor and Human Resources

Children, Family, Drugs, and Alcoholism Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Institute on Drug Abuse and the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.

SD-430

4:00 p.m.

Select on Intelligence

To continue closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1987 for the intelligence community.

SH-219

FEBRUARY 21

9:30 a.m.

Finance

Health Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review hospital income under the Medicare prospective payment system.

SD-215

Labor and Human Resources

Handicapped Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for education of the handicapped, focusing on discretionary programs.

SD-430

FEBRUARY 24

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Research and Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1686, to implement a research program regarding specified aspects of fuel cell technology, and S. 1687, to develop a national policy for the utilization of fuel cell technology.

SD-366

FEBRUARY 25

9:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1990, to establish an Education and Training Partnership to administer the Job Training Partnership Act, the Wagner-Peyser Act, and the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the National Credit Union Administration, Office of Revenue Sharing (Department of the Treasury), and the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

SD-124

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Office of the Secretary of Labor and the Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor.

SD-116

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

FEBRUARY 26

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Labor-Management Services Administration, Employment Standards Administration, and Bureau of Labor Statistics, all of the Department of Labor, and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

SD-116

Select on Intelligence

To resume closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1987 for the intelligence community.

SH-219

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Research and Special Programs Administration and the Office of Inspector General, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

1:30 a.m.

Appropriations

To hold hearings to review the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1987.

SD-192

FEBRUARY 27

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for Departmental Management, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and the Mine Safety and Health Administration, all of the Department of Labor.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold closed hearings on the status of Micronesia.

SH-219

Labor and Human Resources

Children, Family, Drugs, and Alcoholism Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for Head Start.

SD-430

4:00 p.m.

Select on Intelligence

To continue closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1987 for the intelligence community.

SH-219

MARCH 4

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Office of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

SD-116

MARCH 5

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-116

Select on Intelligence

To resume closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1987 for the intelligence community.

SH-219

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the National Science Foundation, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

SD-124

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Federal Highway Administration and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

Governmental Affairs
Governmental Efficiency and the District
of Columbia Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the Dis-
trict of Columbia courts.

SD-342

MARCH 6

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Edu-
cation, and Related Agencies Subcom-
mittee
To continue hearings on proposed
budget estimates for fiscal year 1987
for the National Institutes of Health,
Department of Health and Human
Services.

SD-116

4:00 p.m.
Select on Intelligence
To continue closed hearings on proposed
legislation authorizing funds for fiscal
year 1987 for the intelligence commu-
nity.

SH-219

MARCH 11

9:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcom-
mittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation
authorizing funds for job training pro-
grams.

SD-430

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Edu-
cation, and Related Agencies Subcom-
mittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget
estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the
National Institutes of Health, Depart-
ment of Health and Human Services.

SD-116

MARCH 12

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Edu-
cation, and Related Agencies Subcom-
mittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1987 for the
Health Resources and Services Admin-
istration and the Office of the Assist-
ant Secretary for Health, both of the
Department of Health and Human
Services.

SD-116

Select on Intelligence
To resume closed hearings on proposed
legislation authorizing funds for fiscal
year 1987 for the intelligence commu-
nity.

SH-219

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommit-
tee
To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1987 for the En-
vironmental Protection Agency.

SD-124

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Sub-
committee
To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1987 for the St.
Lawrence Seaway Development Corpora-
tion, Department of Transportation,
and the Panama Canal Commission.

SD-138

MARCH 13

9:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcom-
mittee
To resume hearings on proposed legisla-
tion authorizing funds for job training
programs.

SD-430

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Edu-
cation, and Related Agencies Subcom-
mittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1987 for the
Centers for Disease Control, Alcohol,
Drug Abuse and Mental Health Ad-
ministration, Office of Inspector Gen-
eral, and Office of Civil Rights, all of
the Department of Health and Human
Services.

SD-116

4:00 p.m.
Select on Intelligence
To continue closed hearings on proposed
legislation authorizing funds for fiscal
year 1987 for the intelligence commu-
nity.

SH-219

MARCH 18

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Edu-
cation, and Related Agencies Subcom-
mittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1987 for the
Health Care Financing Administra-
tion, Social Security Administration,
Office of Child Support Enforcement,
and refugee programs, all of the De-
partment of Health and Human Ser-
vices.

SD-116

MARCH 19

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Edu-
cation, and Related Agencies Subcom-
mittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1987 for Human
Development Services, Office of Com-
munity Services, Departmental Man-
agement (salaries and expenses), and
Policy Research, all of the Depart-
ment of Health and Human Services.

SD-116

Select on Intelligence
To resume closed hearings on proposed
legislation authorizing funds for fiscal
year 1987 for the intelligence commu-
nity.

SH-219

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommit-
tee
To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1987 for the
Veterans Administration.

SD-124

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Sub-
committee
To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1987 for the Na-
tional Transportation Safety Board,
Department of Transportation, and

the Architectural and Transportation
Barriers Compliance Board.

SD-138

MARCH 20

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Handicapped Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation
authorizing funds for rehabilitation
programs.

SD-430

4:00 p.m.
Select on Intelligence
To continue closed hearings on proposed
legislation authorizing funds for fiscal
year 1987 for the intelligence commu-
nity.

SH-219

MARCH 25

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Handicapped Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legisla-
tion authorizing funds for rehabilita-
tion programs.

SD-430

MARCH 26

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Sub-
committee
To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1987 for Inter-
state Commerce Commission and the
Office of the Secretary of Transporta-
tion.

SD-138

APRIL 9

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Edu-
cation, and Related Agencies Subcom-
mittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1987 for the
Office of the Secretary of Education,
Departmental Management (salaries
and expenses), Office for Civil Rights,
and Office of Inspector General, all of
the Department of Education.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommit-
tee
To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1986 for the De-
partment of Housing and Urban De-
velopment.

SD-124

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Sub-
committee
To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1987 for the Fed-
eral Railroad Administration, Depart-
ment of Transportation, and the Na-
tional Railroad Passenger Corporation
(AMTRAK).

SD-138

APRIL 10

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Department of Education, including elementary and secondary education, education block grants, and impact aid.

SD-116

APRIL 15

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Department of Education, including education for the handicapped, rehabilitation services and handicapped research, and special institutions (including Howard University).

SD-116

APRIL 16

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Department of Education, including student financial assistance, guaranteed student loans, higher and continuing education, higher education facilities loans and insurance, college housing loans, and educational research and training.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SD-124

Appropriations
 Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

APRIL 17

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Department of Education, including bilingual education, vocational and adult education, education statistics, libraries, and the National Institute of Education.

SD-116

APRIL 22

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, Prospective Payment Commission, Railroad Retirement Board, National Labor Relations Board, National Mediation Board, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and the United States Institute of Peace.

SD-116

APRIL 23

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for ACTION (domestic programs), Corporation for Public Broadcasting, National Council on the Handicapped, Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and National Center for the Study of Afro-American History and Culture.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the United States Railway Association and Conrail.

SD-138

APRIL 24

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and certain related agencies.

SD-116

APRIL 29

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and certain related agencies.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and certain independent agencies.

SD-124

APRIL 30

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and certain independent agencies.

SD-124

Appropriations
 Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

MAY 1

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and certain related agencies.

SD-116

MAY 6

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and certain related agencies.

SD-116

MAY 7

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, Department of Transportation, and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

SD-138

MAY 8

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and certain related agencies.

SD-116

MAY 13

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Departments of Labor, Health and

January 29, 1986

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

1033

Human Services, and Education, and
certain related agencies.

SD-116

MAY 14

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Sub-
committee

To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1987 for the De-
partments of Transportation and cer-
tain related agencies.

SD-138

MAY 15

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Edu-

cation, and Related Agencies Subcom-
mittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1987 for the De-
partments of Labor, Health and
Human Services, and Education, and
certain related agencies.

SD-116