

high energy and substantial talents to his work. Thousands and thousands, inside and outside of the UAW, owe a debt of gratitude to Jess' dedication. He has worked with industry to make the system work more effectively.

On Thursday, May 18, a retirement dinner will be held to honor Jess' years of service. There will be words of praise from leadership and rank an file. Both will have witnessed the good efforts of Jess Damesworth. As someone who has been privileged to work with Jess over the last decade, I heartily join in the accolades to him.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1995

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn that four schools located in my congressional district are recipients of this year's Drug Free Schools Award, presented annually by the U.S. Department of Education.

The four schools—Ehrhardt Elementary School, Strack Intermediate School, Dueitt Middle School, and Tomball Intermediate School—were among just 98 schools nationwide to be so recognized. Winning this award attests to the hard work and concern of the students, faculty and administrators of these four schools, as well as to the hard work and concern of the parents of the students attending those four schools.

In particular, I would like to congratulate Heather Maedgen, principal of Ehrhardt Elementary School in Klein; Gary Jones, principal of Strack Elementary School in Klein; Rosalind Keck, principal of Dueitt Middle School in Spring; and Dr. Lee Weeditz, principal of Tomball Intermediate School. Their leadership in eliminating drugs and alcohol from their schools, and in creating a positive learning environment, has inspired educators and students alike to work together for the common good.

America's Goals 2000—a series of educational goals to which President Bush committed our nation—includes a commitment that "by the year 2000 every school in the United States will be free of drugs, violence, and the unauthorized presence of firearms and alcohol, and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning."

Mr. Speaker, the four schools located in my congressional district that have received the Drug Free Schools Award are well on their way to achieving that goal of a drug-free, alcohol-free and nonviolent environment in which teachers can teach and students can learn. Again, I congratulate everyone associated with those schools—students, administrators, faculty members and parents—on this tremendous, and well-deserved honor.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

LET'S TALK ABOUT THE FACTS

HON. JACK METCALF

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1995

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, while discussing the massive Federal debt and annual

budget deficits of over \$200 billion at a recent town hall meeting in Oak Harbor, WA, I used a Member of the other body as an example of the old guard in Washington, DC. I criticized him for his opposition to the Balanced Budget Amendment, his reputation for securing questionable spending projects for West Virginia, and his unwillingness to cut wasteful Federal spending.

I then said in a light-hearted vein at the town hall meeting that because of this, the Member should be tarred and feathered. Historically, since the late 1800's, tarred and feathered has been a humorous reference, meaning community outrage at a person who violates the general good of the community. I have never, nor would I ever, seriously advocate mob violence toward anyone.

A more important note, in my mind, however, is the misinformation regarding a remark, made from the audience, that the Member should be shot. At the time of the comment I was speaking and thus did not hear nor was I aware of what had been said. Had I heard the statement at the time, I would have condemned it on the spot.

Political rhetoric is one thing, but threatening violence is quite another. I have always condemned senseless acts of violence and have worked to enact laws ensuring swift and sure punishment for those who break the law.

My comments were intended to illustrate the abuses of the old, outdated political process, certainly not to support the use of violence.

IN APPRECIATION OF THE COMMITMENT OF WILLIAM REES HARRIS TO THE SALISBURY VOLUNTEER AMBULANCE SERVICE

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1995

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and appreciation that I rise today to commend Rees Harris, a lifelong resident of Salisbury, CT, for his generosity and leadership in forming the Salisbury Volunteer Ambulance Service in 1971.

Rees is known throughout the northwest corner of Connecticut for his vision of community life and his commitment to and support of programs that support the needs of the residents of the small towns, like Salisbury, that comprise the northwest corner. In 1971, through Rees' personal generosity, the Salisbury Volunteer Ambulance Service was established. Today, Rees will be honored by the board of trustees of the service in recognition of his dedication and compassion for his neighbors and for contributing to the quality of life they all enjoy.

In a small, tight-knit community such as Salisbury, many good deeds are accomplished, as neighbor helps neighbor in a quiet fashion. Rees is a humble man, a gentleman who has earned the respect of his peers for his unending concern for all those who call home the very special community of Salisbury, CT.

I know Rees finds deep, personal satisfaction through helping others, and on behalf of my Salisbury constituents, I express appreciation for his contributions to the lives of many

and for strengthening the services and institutions on which the community relies.

TRIBUTE TO GILBERT MURRAY

HON. FRANK RIGGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1995

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay homage to a very special person, who was recently taken away from us by a cowardly and desperate act. Gilbert Murray, president of the California Forestry Association, was killed on April 24, 1995, by a mail bomb at his office in Sacramento, CA.

Gil touched many lives, both professionally and personally. He dedicated his life to protecting the forests, which he learned to love as a child. He continued to explore and enjoy the outdoor world as an adult. He taught his family to love and appreciate nature in all its majestic forms—exploring mountain peaks, churning rivers, tropical reefs, snowclad hillsides, glaciers, and deep blue lakes.

Born on June 18, 1947, Gil spent most of his childhood in Southern California. After serving in the U.S. Marine Corps from 1967–70 in Vietnam, he returned to the United States to marry his childhood sweetheart, Connie.

Gil spent most of his professional life devoted to forestry issues. After graduating from the University of California at Berkeley in 1975 with a degree in forestry, he went to work as a dirt forester for Collins Pine Co. in Chester, CA. Through the years he worked in several organizations involved in forestry, eventually rising to the presidency of the California Forestry Association.

What is unique and special about Gil is the incredible amount of love and affection that his friends and family have for him. Devoted to his job, he never lost sight of the people around him. His family was always his first priority. Perhaps his young niece stated it best, "He was just the best person in the world."

Mr. Speaker, I hope all Members will join me in saluting Gilbert Murray and condemning his assassination. Gil was indeed a special person, and we can all best respect his life by advancing his ideals now that he is gone.

GOP SAVES MEDICARE

HON. STEPHEN E. BUYER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1995

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, Medicare is in dire need of improvements. Medicare part A will go bankrupt by 2002; in just 7 years. Medicare part B, has already begun to lose money. Medicare is our forth largest Federal budget item, consuming 12 percent of the budget.

If the Medicare system is not reformed now, we may not have a program to reform in the very near future. Since 1992, Medicare has been paying out more money in claims than it has received in payroll taxes. These services must be run in a more responsible and fiscally prudent manner while maintaining Medicare's quality.

Medicare part A, the hospitalization insurance program, draws its revenue from a trust fund that currently contains \$135 billion. This trust fund will begin losing money next year and will be insolvent by 2002. We must provide security to our seniors that there will be a safety net for their use if needed in 7 years.

Enrollees in Medicare part B, the program that finances outpatient medical treatment, will pay a premium of \$46.10 a month and a deductible of \$100 this year. In return they will receive benefits averaging nearly \$2,400 per enrollee, with taxpayers subsidizing \$1,800 per beneficiary. By 2002, that subsidy will reach \$3,900 per individual. This subsidy will cost taxpayers \$1.5 trillion over the next 20 years if the current course continues. The average one-earner Medicare couple will receive \$126,700 more in benefits than they contributed over their working life.

In April, I completed another round of town meetings in the Fifth District of Indiana. The solvency of Medicare was a top concern. I heard a similar message from young and old alike from Kokomo to Winamac and from Logansport to Plymouth. Hoosiers don't want a quick fix that doesn't work. They don't want accounting gimmicks. They don't want political posturing. They want Congress to reform the system to ensure security for years to come. The solvency of Medicare is very real to Hoosier families and seniors.

House Republicans have proposed a budget plan that balances the Federal budget by 2002, without touching Social Security or raising taxes. This means that for the first time since 1969, our deficit by 2002 will be zero. Medicare spending is projected to increase from \$178 billion in 1995 to \$258 billion in 2002. That's a 45 percent increase over the next 7 years. What does this mean for the average Medicare recipient? In 1995, the average Medicare beneficiary will receive \$4,684 in benefits which increase to \$6,293 in 2002. Again, benefits increase—not decrease.

The Board of Trustees for the Medicare Trust Fund, appointed by President Clinton, have issued a report saying Medicare's short-term fiscal health requires either an immediate increase in payroll taxes of 44 percent or an immediate decrease in Medicare spending of 30 percent. Yet both of their proposals would only ensure solvency for 25 years. I support a less draconian approach such as reducing the growth of Medicare by just 5 percent a year. No tax increase nor enormous cuts. A 5 percent reduction in growth will provide for long term security of the Medicare program.

Because a centralized Government monopoly is inherently inefficient, wasteful, and too slow to adapt to new ideas and new solutions, we must transform Medicare. Every senior citizen should have more choices in health care and more control over their own lives, thus providing more security. A transformed Medicare system will provide better health care at lower cost with greater choice. Failure to transform Medicare will lead to cuts in services and financial crisis.

The President should be a leader, not a follower. The President's own Cabinet members, as trustees of the Medicare Trust Fund, have issued a report clearly stating that Medicare is in dire need of reform. President Clinton has been absent from this debate. Frankly, I am very disappointed that it will take Congressional legislation to bring the President into this discussion. I hope the President will take

a seat at the table and help the Congress address this important issue. If not, the Congress clearly has the determination to do so without him. I support H.R. 1590.

Finally, the imminent crisis in Medicare funding is real and unavoidable. Responsible reform of Medicare is a top priority of this Congress. It should be everyone's purpose to reform and improve Medicare to provide the best possible service to its beneficiaries. I look forward to working with my constituents, my colleagues, and hopefully the President to find real solutions to improve these programs.

THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION REFORM ACT OF 1995

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1995

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor H.R. 1392, the Federal Aviation Administration Reform Act of 1995, introduced by our colleague, JIM LIGHTFOOT. Congressman LIGHTFOOT'S bill makes important reforms which will enhance FAA's ability to carry out its responsibilities, while preserving FAA's basic structure which has enabled the agency to become the world's finest. Although I have reservations about some provisions in the Lightfoot bill, overall it is a major contribution to our effort to reform the FAA.

I strongly support the provisions in H.R. 1392 which would take FAA out of the Department of Transportation and make FAA an independent agency. This reform has been supported by 10 of the 11 living former Administrators of FAA. The strong support of the former Administrators should be given great weight, in view of their distinguished careers in the military and private sector, and the fact that they served our a period of more than 30 years, under Presidents of both parties, from John F. Kennedy to George Bush.

As the former Administrators have pointed out, FAA's responsibilities to develop the aviation infrastructure and to ensure aviation safety and security are basically technical in nature. FAA's skilled professionals are well equipped to carry out these responsibilities, without second guessing from political appointees at the Department of Transportation.

I have observed DOT's oversight of FAA for many years. DOT's review often does little more than delay important decisions. In some instances, DOT overrules sound FAA decisions, on ideological grounds, or to gain short term public relations advantages.

I would also emphasize that all 11 of the living former Administrators strongly opposed a reform which is not in the Lightfoot bill, but has been proposed by the Department of Transportation; to split FAA into a quasi-public corporation, like the Postal Service, for air traffic control and a rump FAA to regulate the corporation and carry out FAA's other responsibilities. In hearings before the Aviation Subcommittee, Najeeb Halaby, FAA Administrators from 1961 to 1965, testified that: "Corporatizing part of the FAA could disintegrate the present comprehensive system of safety which has served the nation so well. It would result in potential serious conflict between the new corporation, the NTSB and the DOT/FAA. Since the proposed corporation

would be a monopoly, it would not achieve the savings of free competition. Since it would be a federal corporation, the public would not consider that federal employees really had been reduced or true savings achieved. . ."

Administrator Halaby's statement was specifically endorsed by all 11 former Administrators.

The Lightfoot bill makes important reforms in the laws and regulations governing FAA's procurement of equipment and FAA's relationship with its skilled work force. FAA is now governed by burdensome procurement laws and regulations which have slowed FAA's program to modernize the air traffic control system. Equally burdensome laws and regulations on personnel have limited FAA's ability to recruit scientific and engineering professionals and to fully staff air traffic control facilities in high cost of living areas. The Lightfoot bill adopts a balanced approach to these problems by giving FAA flexibility to develop its own procurement and personnel systems, while retaining an opportunity for Congress to review these programs before they are implemented. Congress would also review the new personnel and procurement programs in the year 2002 when they would need to be reauthorized. The personnel and procurement reform programs developed under the Lightfoot bill would not only benefit FAA, but would also provide important data for reforming these processes for other Government agencies.

I am also supportive of the provision in the Lightfoot bill which gives the FAA Administrator a 7-year term in office. In recent years, Administrators have often served for 2 years or less. This is not enough time to ensure that needed reforms are implemented. The turnover in Administrators has caused reform to proceed by fits and starts, and prevented a sustained, consistent approach. Last year we passed legislation giving the Administrator a 5-year term in office. A 7-year term would be even better.

I have reservations about the provision in the Lightfoot bill to establish a panel to consider innovative financing mechanisms to ensure adequate funding for aviation infrastructure needs. We do not need a panel to discover that the basic problem is that the more than \$5 billion a year generated by excise taxes on aviation system users, such as the 10 percent tax on airline passengers, is not being fully spent to develop the aviation infrastructure. The failure to fully spend these revenues is a breach of faith with aviation users. The taxes were imposed in 1970 for the purpose of financing the airport and airway trust fund which supports development of the air traffic control system and airports. In recent years, the user contributions have not been fully spent, but have been used to reduce the deficit in the general budget. The cumulative amount of taxes which has not been spent now totals more than \$3 billion. A critical step in overcoming this problem is to pass H.R. 842, which would take the trust fund out of the budget process and permit all funds contributed by users to be spent for the intended purpose of developing our Nation's airports and air traffic control system.

Overall, I believe that the Lightfoot bill makes a major contribution to FAA Reform. I look forward to working with Congressman LIGHTFOOT and my colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to develop an FAA reform bill which will ensure that