Now, the ''contract's'' legislative agenda will turn to ''direct hits'' on Black America. For starters, Eleanor Holmes-Norton, the District of Columbia Delegate, has been striped of her right to vote on the floor of Congress. This act leaves the entire, predominately Black, taxpaying ($1.6 Billion at last count) population of the District without Congressional representation.

On affirmative action, they have already voted to end tax breaks for companies that sell broadcast licenses to minorities, a program that was created to foster minority ownership to those previously denied access to electronic media ownership. This will benefit primarily well-off self-employed persons, who will now be able to deduct a portion of the cost of their medical insurance.

Next, they have vowed to completely dismantle affirmative action, the Voting Rights Act and the welfare system, and unless we mobilize, it looks like no-one can stop them.

We urge our readers to write to The President, our Senators and Congressmen, and to let them know that we are about to start our own revolution. Our political organizations should be planning voter registration and education programs throughout the state, so that the Black community will once again become something to be feared, and not trampled over.

RADIOLOGY: 100 YEARS OF HEALTH PROGRESS

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1995

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, just 100 years ago this year, a German physicist, Wilhelm Conrad Roentgen, discovered x rays. Within weeks, American scientists, physicians, and industrialists were making new discoveries with x rays and were putting them to work in medicine and industry. No major scientific discovery ever spread so fast or found such instant acceptance in many areas of life.

At first physicians peered at dim images to perceive bullets, bones, and kidney stones. Equipment and technique were improved. Soon physicians could look for other health problems with x rays. They learned that x rays could be used to cure some diseases, particularly forms of cancer. A medical specialty, radiology, grew among the men and women who applied x rays in health care.

Over the century, radiologists added to their competence with the products of scientific breakthroughs. From the atomic bomb research came radioisotopes, so vital for diagnosing body organ function and treating cancers. From radar and sonar came medical applications of ultrasound. From the space efforts came the ability to analyze images electronically, bounce them off of satellites, and store them for instant recall. From computers came computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging. The million-volt energies of linear accelerators allow radiation oncologists to deliver pinpoint treatment of cancers.

This year, two-thirds of all Americans will receive a medical diagnostic imaging procedure. Two-thirds of those with cancers will receive radiation as part of their treatment. In a hundred years, radiology has become a vital part of our health care pattern.

During this year, more than 100 professional societies and companies which supply the family of radiology have organized Radiology Centennial, Inc. to conduct a year-long series of celebratory events. Among these events is a special convocation on April 30 here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the record show that this House joins other Americans in recognizing the value of radiology to all of us in this, its 100th year.

TERM LIMITS CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. HERBERT H. BATEMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 73) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the number of terms of office of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to outline my thoughts on the subject of congressional term limits—a matter included in the Contract With America and debated at length by the House. Unfortunately, the demands of my committee schedule did not allow me to participate in the debate. Belatedly, I offer these comments so that my constituents will be fully informed as to my position and vote. This provision of the contract should have been and was honored by the debate on the issue and the votes on it that were cast. As I have for years consistently opposed term limits, I signed the contract because this was all it required.

I continue to oppose congressional term limits. At best, they are an ill-conceived quick-fix response to a set of real and perceived problems with Congress as an institution. At worst, they represent a fundamental change in our representative democracy that abandons more than 200 years of American history and threatens to undermine the basic right of suffrage. In my view, term limits are a bad idea that were properly rejected.

Mr. Chairman, throughout our history Congress, as an institution, has been an object of criticism and some derision. I do not deny the legitimacy of much of that criticism and share some of the frustration the American people have directed toward this House and the other body. The new Republican majority has made sweeping changes in the internal operations of this House and I am confident we will continue to make steady progress in reforming the Federal Government. Among the ills the medicine of term limits purport to cure are incumbent advantage in elections, undue influence of lobbyists and big contributors, shoddy lawmaking and the ubiquitous professional politician. I submit that term limits will do nothing to address these real and perceived problems and will, in fact, create a series of headaches that are far worse than the disease they are intended to eradicate.

I would like to briefly touch on each of the items I have just mentioned. With regard to incumbent advantage and the influence of lobbyists and contributors, let me say plainly that I believe any inequity in the status quo is better addressed directly, through campaign finance, lobbying and congressional franking reforms, rather than the indirect route of congressional term limits. These are the real issues and they should be debated.

The other malady that term limits proponents claim their legislation will cure is the so-called professional politician. The argument, as I understand it, advances the simplistic notion that much of regulatory burdens and social dilemmas we face in the United States today are the direct result of the actions of an arrogant, isolated political class that exists inside the Capital beltway, selling out the people to the special interests in order to perpetuate themselves in public office. This is a simply ridiculous proposition. We certainly have too much Federal involvement in the everyday life and a great many societal problems that have been nurtured by it. But to claim that there is a direct causal link between these realities and the absence of a limitation on the length of service of Members of Congress presents a logical disconnect, and is insupportable on sound public policy grounds.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with our esteemed Judiciary Committee chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], and his assessment of this argument. We live in the most advanced and complex country in history and our public institutions reflect that. Clearly, we can streamline and simplify those institutions. We have and should be zealous in assuring that the Members of this body are accountable to the people. But this does not mean that we must reduce serving as a legislator on the national level to the only job in the country that is reserved for the inexperienced. Maturity, judgment and experience are attributes prized in every profession and should be as well in the Congress. Ironically, to deny these assets would greatly diminish the role of elected representatives and enhance the power of professional staffs, the bureaucracy, and special interest groups.

There is a larger issue at stake here, the basic right of suffrage that is afforded all citizens over the age of 18. Again, I cite the distinguished chairman from Illinois in stating that I see little difference between being denied the ability to vote for a candidate and being told how to cast my vote. Both instances are clear abridgments of the right to vote. Term limits are nothing more than a stalking horse for a minority attempting to overturn the decision of a majority of the voters in a free and fair election.

Many term limits advocates infer that we are entering a period in our life as a nation requiring this dramatic change in our democracy. Let me say that I worry about their grasp of history. We face problems, but I cannot believe that a system that brought us through the Civil War, the Great Depression and two World Wars is suddenly a historical anomaly. Now that we stand at some distance from those great cataclysms it is easy to forget how hard it was to walk the line between success and failure. Were term limits in effect, the Nation would have been denied the likes of Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Jeannette Rankin, Robert LaFollette, Sam Rayburn, Robert Taft, Everett Dirksen, Richard Russell, Arthur Vandenberg, John Stennis, Bob Michel, and countless others, each of them towering giants in the annals of Congress. To imagine facing the crises of the past without these individuals and their colleagues is simply beyond my comprehension.

Most upsetting to me is the implicit assumption of term-limits advocates that a career in public service is not only unacceptable but unworthy and therefore should be constrained by a constitutional prohibition. In 15 years of service in the Senate of Virginia and in the 13th year of service in this House, I have devoted myself to public service. It has not been a sacrifice, it has been a joy because of the satisfaction public service has brought me. There surely are those who, knowing my record, may not believe it distinguished or significant and that is for them to judge. But no one can fairly say it has not been honorable public service or that it was based on crass and self-serving motives. Sincere, constructive public service is not a curse. It is a blessing.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude by reaffirming my support for and my belief in the present system of congressional election. I hope that term limits are at the zenith of their 15 minutes of fame and will soon be seen for what they are, an attempt at a quick fix for complex national problems that discards a key pillar of our representative democracy. Term limits are a bad idea whose time has come and gone.