

have been associated with her as I am sad to see her go.

Because of her experience, I have been able to run an efficient office on the western border of my district from the very first day. Because of her local knowledge, I have had an intense education—of the area, its people, and its unique strengths and needs. I was able to hit the ground running in Auburn after reapportionment included about half the city of Auburn in my new district in 1992. Even in a confusing situation wherein three congressional districts were designated parts of the city, Vivien provided leadership for all of us, and never forgot that the needs of constituents come first.

My wife DeDe and I have found Vivien and her husband Paul Norman, also an active public servant over the years, to be genuinely caring people who are in their private lives every bit as civic-minded as they appear in public.

We will miss them. We wish them well in this new and exciting phase of their lives. And we hope that all the good Vivien has done for others comes back to her 100-fold.

MEAN-SPIRITED CAMPAIGNS

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 8, 1995

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable Richard Lugar, has, in the following Indianapolis Star article of late August 1995, stated a truth that badly needs stating in this late 20th Century political atmosphere of incivility.

Those candidates who denounce and demean bring about a deadly contest of hate. In so doing, they serve their country not well.

REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGNS MISGUIDED, LUGAR SAYS

HOOSIER DECLARES THAT COMPETITORS' EXPLOITATION OF VOTERS' EMOTIONS IS THE WRONG WAY TO GET TO THE WHITE HOUSE

(By Mary Beth Schneider)

Maybe it was the local crowd of die-hard supporters.

Maybe it was the natural result of six months on the campaign trail, honing his message and his delivery.

Maybe it was just that Sen. Richard G. Lugar, R-Ind., has heard one acid-tongued speech too many from some of his competitors for the Republican nomination for president.

Whatever the reason, Lugar came home to Indianapolis on Monday and delivered the kind of speech that his critics say he can't—sometimes funny, often fervent, and with a point aimed right at the hearts of voters who tell pollsters repeatedly that they are sick of attack-dog politics.

In no uncertain terms, Lugar rejected the exploitation of "wedge issues" that candidates like Sen. Phil Gramm, Pat Buchanan and Gov. Pete Wilson have found can boost their poll numbers.

"We do have a dogfight out there," Lugar said of the presidential campaign. But the battle, as he described it, seemed not just a fight for higher poll numbers for himself, but a fight for the soul of the Republican Party.

Speaking at a luncheon honoring an organization he helped form to boost the political careers and involvement of women, the Richard G. Lugar Excellence in Public Service Luncheon, Lugar described the typical GOP

candidate forum for the several hundred Hoosiers.

One candidate, he said, boasts of being the most conservative, with a happy record of killing bills offered by "commies, socialists, radicals."

That diatribe, Lugar said, is topped by the next candidate, who says he is really the most conservative and brags, "You can't find anyone meaner or nastier."

These candidates—he didn't name them; he didn't have to—talk about immigration and affirmative action. Those are legitimate issues for debate, Lugar said, "but that's not their purpose in raising them."

EMOTIONS EXPLOITED

Candidates and anyone else who can read a poll know Americans are deeply worried that this country is on the wrong track; and some are making political hay by exploiting that fear and exacerbating division, he indicated.

He cited meatpacking workers in Iowa, who worry about their stagnant wages and are ripe for the pitch by some candidates that illegal immigrants are siphoning away the jobs and income.

Instead of discussing real problems and real solutions, discussions that inevitably involve boring and tedious complexities, those candidates call for walls on U.S. borders or a freeze on immigration, Lugar said.

"Raw meat," he said. "Raw emotion for people who sense the political system is not working well for them."

FIGHTING FOR WHAT'S RIGHT

He spoke with passion in favor of affirmative action—the type of affirmative action where someone works to open opportunities because that is right and not because it is the law.

Looking at the crowd there to honor this women's political network he had helped form, Lugar said some would suggest women shouldn't need or get a helping hand up in politics.

But it was right, Lugar indicated, to "jump-start" the opening of political opportunities for women.

He noted the minority scholarship program he began. "Isn't that affirmative action?"

Yet, some Republican candidates boast of racing to the White House to dismantle affirmative action.

"What kind of a party, what kind of an idea is that?" Lugar said. "I tell you—that's the nature of this campaign."

STANDS UP FOR INCLUSION

It's a campaign that is "extremely misguided, mean-spirited and nasty," he said, but "some Republicans think that's the road to the White House."

Instead, Lugar said, it is the road to defeat.

Republicans should stand for an opportunity for all Americans to reach "the starting line of life" with better education, health care and inclusion in society.

"To solve problems, we must deal with them constructively," he said. "That is my campaign. . . . It has to be a constructive process that reaches out to all Americans."

COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. BILL PAXON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1555) to promote competition and reduce regulation in order

to secure lower prices and higher quality services for American telecommunications consumers and encourage the rapid deployment of new telecommunications technologies:

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to see the provision in this legislation that will allow for greater competition in the directory publishing business. Section 222(a) requires carriers providing local phone service to provide subscriber list information "on a timely and unbundled basis, under nondiscriminatory and reasonable rates, terms and conditions, to any person upon request."

Independent directory publishers currently operate in an environment where local telephone companies have control over subscriber list information. In many States, independent publishers have been forced to wait until the local carrier's directors are published before they can get the subscriber list information needed to publish their own directories. Section 222(a) would ensure access to these listings on a timely basis.

It's equally important to protect independent publishers from excessive charges for these listings. The committee report indicates that phone companies are to be fairly compensated for supplying listing information to independent publishers. I am of the opinion that this incorporates the concept that prices will be based on the incremental cost of providing the information.

THE EXCELLENT WORK OF ROFEH INTERNATIONAL

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 8, 1995

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for several years now I've had the very distinct honor of sharing with my colleagues a description of the excellent work done by ROFEH International, sponsored by the New England Chassidic Center, at Beacon Street in Brookline, MA. Both of these important institutions are led by Grand Rabbi Levi Horowitz, known reverently by many as the Bostoner Rebbe. In addition to maintaining a vibrant and important institution for Jewish worship, Rebbe Horowitz and his colleagues do excellent work in the field of health. The Rebbe himself is recognized as an authority in the field of medical ethics, and he and those who work with him do a great deal to help support first rate medical care and to make it widely available to people who would otherwise not be able to benefit from it. This year, on November 12, Rebbe Horowitz and many others will join in a dinner in which they celebrate the important work that they do, and honor those who have played a major role in that work.

Two men in particular will be honored for the work they have done through ROFEH to benefit others. The 1955 Man of the Year is Milton B. Gray, who has a long family relationship, and is a staunch supporter of the New England Chassidic Center.

Mr. Milton B. Gray was born in Fort Kent, ME, and moved to Dorchester, MA, at an early age, where he attended the Boston public schools, graduating from Boston English High. He attended Northeastern University for 1 year after which he enrolled at the Bentley School

of Accounting, evening branch, graduating in 1941.

Mr. Milton B. Gray worked part time through junior high, school and college in a variety of endeavors, ranging from selling soda in the stands at Braves Field and Fenway Park, to employment at the firm of Morse and Nizel, CPA and with the U.S. Navy Department in Quincy, MA. In 1943, he enlisted in the U.S. Navy, and was assigned to the South Pacific. In 1948, he became a partner in the firm of Gray, Gray, and Gray, CPA.

Mr. Gray is a member of the Massachusetts Society of CPA; the American Society of CPA; Life member of the Temple Emeth's board, and past president of their Parents Teachers Association; Life member Massachusetts Cystic Fibrosis Foundation and past board member. In 1970 he was instrumental in the organization of Chug Aliyah working with David Roizenblit, the Israeli shaliach, at that time.

Milton and Shirley Gray, originally from Bridgeport, CT have been married for 49 years and have three married children and nine grandchildren.

Joining Mr. Gray as an honoree is Dr. John E. Hall who will receive the coveted Harry Andler Memorial Award.

Dr. John E. Hall was born in Saskatoon, SK, Canada. He attended the University of Saskatchewan, McGill University, and received his F.R.C.S. from the Royal College of Surgeons, Canada; and his F.A.C.S. from the American College of Surgeons.

Dr. Hall is one of the world's leading orthopaedic surgeons. He is the former orthopaedic surgeon-in-chief, Children's Hospital, Boston, MA; Associate in Orthopaedics, Brigham and Women's Hospital in Boston, MA; associate in orthopaedics, New England Baptist Hospital, Boston, MA. Dr. Hall is professor of orthopaedic surgery, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA.

Dr. Hall holds and has held such positions as associate surgery, University of Toronto; president of medical staff, Ontario Crippled Children's Center, Ontario; chairman, medical advisory board, Prosthetic Research and Development Unit, Ontario Crippled Children's Center, Ontario; appointed chief of division of orthopaedic surgery, Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto; and chief of clinical services, department of orthopaedic surgery, Children's Hospital Medical Center, Boston.

Dr. Hall is a member of the Canadian Orthopaedic Association; the Pediatric Orthopaedic Society; Examiner for the American Board of Orthopaedic Surgery; he is past president of the Pediatric Orthopaedic Society and of the Medical Staff, Children's Hospital, Boston, MA.

Dr. Hall is author and co-author of over 100 articles that have been published in leading medical journals and books.

Dr. Hall lives in Brookline, MA with his wife Frances and is a devoted father of 7 children.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to share with my colleagues and the country the record of this excellent organization and the biographies of the two men they so justly honor.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LUTHER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2126) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I support the Kasich-Dellums-Obey amendment to the 1996 military appropriations bill.

The arguments surrounding B-2 bombers are well known—in fact, we in this body considered the same amendment almost 7 weeks ago. We know that the Pentagon does not want and cannot afford any more B-2's beyond the 20 already being built. We know that B-2 bombers are being promoted not for the national security of our country, but rather for financial and economic reasons, many of which are parochial in nature.

My colleagues, let there be no question about it—this amendment strikes at the heart of our challenge in this Congress. We were elected amidst a growing national consensus that Federal spending has gotten out of control, burdening our children with a nearly \$5 trillion national debt and threatening the future of our Nation. Along with most of my other first-term colleagues, I feel I have a responsibility to the people who sent me here to make wise spending decisions that are in our national interest, even if it means voting against some financial benefit to my district. There are those in my district who will be affected by restricting B-2 spending, but these are the decisions that haven't been made in the past but that we were sent here to make.

Many of us who voted for the recent spending rescissions bill did so not because we relished in cutting the affected programs, but rather because we are deeply about the future of this country. And to vote against future commitments to education, Head Start, child nutrition and school lunches, and summer youth programs—in short, against investing in our children and our future—because of our deficit, and then to turn right around and see \$493 million added to a weapons system even the Pentagon does not want—to me that is a great injustice.

This amendment is not about jeopardizing national security; it's about whether we have the courage to save our country from financial disaster while trying to maintain other, key strategic investments in America that create opportunities for our children and future competitiveness for our Nation. Voting for this amendment to cap B-2 production may not be the easy thing to do, but it is the right thing to do. I therefore strongly urge my colleagues to support the Kasich-Dellums-Obey amendment.

“THE CASE OF CHINA VS. CHINA”,
AN ESSAY BY RYAN DAI

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 8, 1995

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Ryan Dai, recently took part in Faces of China, a national high school essay contest sponsored by Friends of Free China. Contestants were asked to write a 3,000 word essay on the theme “Should Taiwan be Admitted to the United Nations?” Ryan wrote an excellent essay entitled, “The Case of China vs. China” and was awarded a \$1,500 scholarship to the college or university of his choice. The conclusions drawn from his fine work reflect my own opinions regarding the admittance of the Republic of China into the United Nations. This strong independent nation, the antithesis of the People's Republic of China has from its inception deviated from the Communist principles upon which its Red Brother resides. As a strong supporter of the ROC, I recommend this essay to my colleagues and congratulate Ryan Dai on his fine work.

THE CASE OF CHINA VS. CHINA

The United Nations Charter states that one of its main objectives is “to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.”¹ Well, if this is the case, then the United Nations has not been living up to this promise. Ever since the General Assembly of the United Nations decided to replace the “China seat” in 1971 with a representative from the People's Republic of China (communist China), the Republic of China has been denied any participation in global activities held by the UN that benefit humanity. The motive behind this change was the United States' strategy of allying with communist China in order to curb the Soviet Union during the Cold War.² Not only that, but the UN passed this resolution to oversimplify the problem of having “two different Chinas.” In reality, the decision to change representation has done nothing to solve this problem. Communist China has never taken control of the Republic of China. Without ever receiving help from communist China, the ROC has become a strong, independent nation with a thriving economy, a democratic government, and a bright future. Why is it that the UN could afford to have two representatives for Germany and another two for Korea? Despite being excluded from the UN, the Republic of China has of their own free will lived up to the standards the UN wishes to pursue.

In 1948, the United Nations passed the “Universal Declaration of Human Rights” and in 1966, the “International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.”³ Both stress that every person has the right to partake in political, cultural, and economic activities. The ROC's government, much like the United States, unquestionably demonstrates these qualities. Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the founding father of the ROC, believed in “Three Principles of the People”—nationalism, democracy, and social well-being, which form

Footnotes at end of article.