

in Russia, we are no closer to international arms containment and nuclear non-proliferation.

On the contrary, Russia is the biggest supplier of arms and technology to Iran. To date, Russia has sold Iran three Kilo class submarines, of which two have been delivered; MiG-29 and Su-24 deep airstrike aircraft, of which several have been delivered; and several hundred T-72 tanks, of which a few hundred have been delivered.

At the same time, China announced a 21 percent increase in its annual military budget, to approximately \$7.5 billion. This new Russia-China venture could ultimately alter the balance of naval power in Southeast Asia. With the purchase of 22 new submarines, China would be free to pursue its claims in the South China Sea to Vietnam, Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines.

Furthermore, on January 8, 1995, Russia signed an \$800 million contract with Iran to complete two light water nuclear reactors at the unfinished Bushehr nuclear site, as well as attendant training and services. This action by Russia is in direct violation of the international Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (Title XVI of Public Law 102-484). The act imposes sanctions on countries that "contribute knowingly and materially to the efforts by Iran or Iraq, or any agency or instrumentality of either country, to acquire destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons."

Similarly, Russia is in possible violation of many other United States laws which prohibit aid to countries that spread arms and nuclear weapons and related technology. The laws include, but may not be limited to: the Foreign Assistance Act Amendments, the Arms Export Control Act, the Export Administration Act, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act of fiscal year 1994 and fiscal year 1995.

Finally, in the State Department's annual human rights report, Russia was identified as being in violation of international human rights agreements. In the report, Russia was criticized for the horrifying conditions of its jails and the cruel hazing of military recruits. The most serious violations, however, occurred in the Russian military assault on the breakaway republic of Chechnya where massive aerial bombardment of the capital, Grozny, and the dislocation of thousands of refugees "were in conflict with a number of Russia's international obligations." In its most recent action, Russia reportedly has blocked humanitarian assistance to Chechnya by the International Red Cross.

In my judgment, Russia's, \$800 million nuclear reactor contract with Iran is sufficient evidence alone to cut off United States assistance to Russia. With respect to the Russia's human rights violations, let me remind you that China almost lost Most-Favored-Nation [MFN] trade status with the United States, for less.

As a result, I have introduced H.R. 1418, a bill to prohibit all United States foreign aid and military assistance to Russia for fiscal year 1996, unless the President of the United States certifies to Congress that Russia is not exporting any nuclear technology, offensive military weapons, or other military technology. H.R. 1418, however, exempts U.S. aid in the form of humanitarian assistance or assistance

for the purpose of dismantling nuclear and chemical weapons.

If Members support offensive military weapons containment and nuclear non-proliferation, I urge them to cosponsor H.R. 1418.

CONTRACT WITH AMERICA TAX RELIEF ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LUTHER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1215) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to strengthen the American family and create jobs:

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of the House of Representatives, I wish to explain my opposition to the GOP tax proposal.

For me, the most important issue is not tax fairness or the question of good tax cuts versus bad tax cuts. Many other Members have made those arguments with eloquence and insight.

There are plenty of reasons to vote "no" on this bill. But for me, the best reason to vote "no" is the impact this legislation will have on our efforts to reduce the deficit.

The proponents of this package have argued that the tax breaks they want to create are paid for with spending cuts—and they may well be. But that's not the problem.

The problem is that you can't use the same spending cut twice. If you use a spending cut to pay for a tax break, you can't use it to reduce the deficit.

And reducing the deficit must come first.

For years the national debt has paralyzed our Nation. It has prevented us from dealing with critical issues that will impact our competitiveness as a Nation well into the next century. Past efforts to deal with the deficit have largely failed and our debt now stands at \$4.8 trillion.

Whether we are Democrats or Republicans, we shouldn't risk losing the opportunity we have today to reduce the deficit now and get on the glide path to a balanced budget. Our economy is strong, productivity is up and there is a growing consensus among the public and Members of Congress favoring deficit reduction. Our country's future is too important to let this opportunity pass.

We should capitalize on the momentum we have today by reducing the deficit and finally putting this paralyzing issue behind us so that we can begin focusing on the many other issues affecting our Nation's future.

Mr. Speaker, I came to this Congress to work with Democrats and Republicans to solve the problems facing this country for the people I represent. I've voted for 10 of the 22 items we've voted on in the Contract With America so far so I'd have no hesitation in supporting this bill if it was a good idea like some of the other ideas in the contract.

But this is not a good idea at this time. There is just too much risk for our country.

CONTRACT WITH AMERICA TAX RELIEF ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1215) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to strengthen the American family and create jobs:

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the House voted to pass provisions to lift the Social Security earning penalty on older Americans of retirement age from the current level of \$11,280 to \$30,000 by the year 2000. In part, we have seven very special senior citizens to thank for this action. These people came out to Washington to tell their stories this week because America needs to know how the earnings penalty affects its citizens. Therefore, I would like to share these stories with the Nation.

GLORIA DAVIS, MARINA DEL REY, CA

Gloria has worked since she was 16 years old. Two years ago, when she discovered she owed the Social Security Administration \$4,000 for benefits she received after exceeding the earnings limit, she became active in the effort to change the law. The Social Security Administration gave her 30 days to pay. She has told her story on television and through print media and has heard from seniors across the Nation who wrote her after seeing her on television.

Gloria and her husband owned their own business, but went bankrupt in the 1980's. They lost everything and were saddled with debt. So, Gloria doesn't have a retirement income and must work. Gloria, like many older women, worked at jobs which paid little, and sometimes for employers who did not pay into the Social Security System. Her monthly benefit averages \$467.

Gloria has a background in public relations, sales, advertising, and television production. At one time she was State director of the Miss U.S.A./Universe Pageants, Miss America pageant and several other pageants. She has served as an event planner and trade show organizer for many years. Gloria currently works a full time job at Car Barn Airport Parking.

BETTY BOURGEOU, TAYLOR, MI

Betty entered the workforce at age 50 when her husband left her and her children. She worked two part-time minimum wage jobs at a department store and for a security company. She then became a teacher's aide for a Head Start Program, went back to school and became qualified to be a Head Start lead teacher. However, Betty quit teaching Head Start, the job she loved, when she began taking Social Security. She would lose most of her benefits with both jobs. Her department store job included health care benefits she needed, so she remained employed there.

Betty has received several Employee of the Year awards at the department store over the years, accompanied by pay raises. However, when she takes the raises, she must reduce

her hours or lose more of her benefits to Social Security. This puts her in a particularly difficult situation because her health benefits are predicated on working a certain number of hours for the department store. Regulating her hours is also difficult during the busy holiday season at the end of the year. The store needs her more during these times, but she loses most of her benefits if her work puts her further over the Social Security limit.

MARY LOU LIVINGSTONE, SPRINGFIELD, IL

Mary Lou was divorced 19 years ago and worked ever since. She has no pension or retirement plan to draw from. She had to pay the Social Security Administration back \$549 in 1991, \$281 in 1992, \$935 in 1993 and \$730 in 1994 for earnings exceeding the Social Security earnings limit. During those years, her average Social Security check was \$288 per month. In 1994, Mary Lou cut back her hours to try to avoid the penalty, but still had to pay some money back. Mary Lou supplements her grocery bill each month through the Share Program sponsored by Catholic Charities. This program allows her to pay \$14 per month and receive \$35 worth of groceries.

Mary Lou works as an information receptionist at the visitors center of the Lincoln Home National Historic Site in Springfield, IL. She has worked there for nearly 12 years and has received numerous complimentary letters for her job performance. She was also featured as a staff star of the Springfield Bureau of Tourism.

MR. AND MRS. ROBERT AND SHIRLEY HICKEY, UNADILLA, NY

Robert and Shirley have both worked most of their lives. Shirley suffered a brain aneurism several years ago and is no longer able to work. However, Robert still works at a calendar factory as a kensole operator imprinting the lettering on the calendars. This is just to make ends meet. They have a 401(k) plan, but no other outside income.

Last year, Robert earned more than the earnings limit allows and was recently fined \$1,650 by the Social Security Administration. As a result, he and Shirley took out a personal loan against their 401(k) plan at a rate of 10 percent in order to pay their bill to Social Security. They can not afford the alternative, under which the Social Security Administration would cease payment of monthly Social Security benefits until the payment was complete. At the same time, Robert pays over \$3,000 a year in Federal income taxes for the privilege of working.

MARY LOU HAGAN, GROVILLE, CA

Mary Lou is a widow and is currently looking for part time work. She has been in the banking business for years, serving as a bank manager, loan officer and operations manager. She was earning a comfortable salary when the bank went under, with her retirement benefits with it. All of her retirement plan was in bank stock. After the bankruptcy, she recovered only \$1,000 from her retirement plan. In addition, much of her savings was invested in this stock, so she suffered further loss.

Mary Lou is an avid volunteer and serves on the hospital board, the Chamber of Commerce, Friends of the Park, and Soroptimists International.

Nevertheless, Mary Lou wants and needs to get back to work, but the earnings penalty poses obstacles to gainful employment. A job she has recently applied for would require her to work all year at a salary that would exceed

the limit by about \$3,000. She could not take the job without agreeing to this work load, but she would not receive the benefits of the extra work.

JOSEPH O'BRIEN, RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA

Joe is an electrical engineer with 40 years of experience. He holds three patents for high speed counters. He has deliberately stopped working because he reached the earning limit after the first few months of the year. Society is being deprived of his considerable expertise because he is unable to keep his earnings if he works over the limit. He pays taxes to the Federal Government, which he feels are not adequately considered when the cost of the lifting the Social Security earnings penalty is calculated.

Joe feels that the optimum strategy is for a senior to work until hitting the limit, then quit for the rest of the calendar year. This makes it difficult for him to find a job fully utilizing his talents. His prospective employers know there must be limits on his commitments, so he ends up working on a contract basis, which means there are no benefits. In 1993, after reaching the limit, he made only 17 cents on the dollar after marginal tax rates were applied to his income. Joe realized he could have earned more on California unemployment.

Joe's father was also affected by the Social Security earning limit when he was alive. After raising three children alone—this wife died at age 42—and sending them through college, he was forced to work in his retirement years. Joe's father ended up taking money under the table through jobs that did not report his income to Social Security to avoid the law. While Joe does not advocate this, he knows it is a reality for many seniors.

THE SECOND ANNUAL SALUTE TO VIETNAM VETERANS

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1995

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, a very special event will be taking place in my district later this month. The Hillsborough County Friends of the Parks and the Veterans Memorial Museum Committee are hosting the Second Annual Salute to Vietnam Veterans at Edward Medard Park.

This week-long salute is to honor all Vietnam veterans and will include the moving wall. This event is dedicated to Vietnam veterans and their families.

The moving wall is a one-half scale replica of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC. It is 250 feet long and contains the names of 58,191 Americans killed during the Vietnam war. The wall also includes the names of American servicemembers still unaccounted for.

Eight women are listed among the names listed on the Wall. Seven of them were Army nurses and one was an Air Force nurse. There are also 16 chaplains listed on the Memorial. Two of these men were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The moving wall is a powerful symbol. Hundreds of thousands of people across the country have visited it in or near their communities. I am proud to say that on the previous occasions when it has been displayed in Florida,

approximately 300,000 Floridians have visited the moving wall.

As of January 1, 1993, the memorial has been displayed in 315 communities throughout the United States and Canada. In addition, it has been displayed in Puerto Rico and Guam. Requests to have the wall have come from as far away as Australia, Ireland, and Germany.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the organizers of this great event. It is a stirring reminder of just how blessed we are in the modern world to live in a free society, and will not allow us to forget that this blessing is due to the sacrifices of our friends, relatives, neighbors, and countrymen who served us all when duty called.

For as long as the American soldier stands ready to support his country and its allies, the forces of oppression and injustice will be held in check. For this, the American serviceman—the veteran—must never be forgotten.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ROBERT A. BURT

HON. BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1995

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to salute Robert A. Burt, a junior at Carson High School in Carson City, NV. Robert Burt was Nevada's winner of one of the 54 Voice of Democracy national scholarships awarded by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary. Along with 126,000 secondary school students, he entered the broadcast scriptwriting contest whose theme was "My Vision For America."

I believe his essay states an important theme and shows an optimism that we should all share, and I ask that it be reprinted in the RECORD.

MY VISION FOR AMERICA

(By 1994-95 VFW Voice of Democracy Scholarship program Nevada Winner, Robert Burt, Post 3726, Carson City, Nevada)

America. My vision of this proud and glorious lady is not a dream of highways and skyscrapers, money and influence, but a scene of common, hardworking, honest people. A people who respect their neighbors, honor their families, and stand by their country. My vision of America is of a people and a land who are, as Alexandre Dumas phrased it, "All for one, and one for all."

My America is a place where people are not judged because of money and influence but through the work of their own two hands and intellect. My America is a land free of prejudice and ignorance. In my vision, a poor boy from Harlem will collaborate with the daughter of refugees and the son of white middle class workers in a scientific or on a medical breakthrough of the century. They will work not as individuals, but together as Americans. It will not matter what the participants' social background, or religious faith is, but their work as human beings that will be regarded. It will be a place where tolerance and acceptance of differences is not trampled by fear and hatred.

The America of the future is a place where we know and respect one another. It is a place where neighbors greet each other, a place where parents sit down with children and teach them to read.

America is not a place of "us" versus "them," it is a place of "we." The vision I