

was also national chairman under President John Kennedy.

Mr. SHAYS. He sure was.

Mr. GEJDENSON. This was a family, on the Kennelly and the Bailey side, that had an incredible impact on the country.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Just briefly, and I thank the gentleman for yielding. I only met Mr. Kennelly a couple of times, but whether we have philosophical or political differences around here or not, we are all family. Once you go through the wars like we have, we build up a very strong mutual respect for one another, even though we do have those differences.

BARBARA KENNELLY is one of the finest people I know in this Chamber, and her husband likewise was a fine person. On behalf of the people who are not here tonight on our side of the aisle, we want to express our condolences to her and her family. I know this is a very difficult time. As part of the House of Representatives family, we want to express our concern for them.

Mr. SHAYS. If the gentleman would just yield so I could express my admiration and love for Barbara Kennelly, and let her know that everyone on our side of the aisle has extraordinary respect for her and hopes that the next few days are as easy as possible for her.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for taking this special order mourning the loss of Jim Kennelly and extending our condolences to our colleague.

As a fellow graduate of Trinity College, Washington, DC, as our colleague BARBARA KENNELLY is, I know how important her family is to her, how much she loved her husband, how proud her mother is of her entire family and this proud tradition that the Bailey family and the Kennelly family have brought to Connecticut, indeed to the entire country.

I hope it is a consolation to BARBARA that so many of her colleagues express their love and admiration for her tonight. As was said this morning, as we mourn the loss of those who die, in this case Jim, let us thank God that he lived.

Ms. DELAURO. I just wanted to add that I said I did not serve with the Speaker because I did not serve in the Connecticut State Legislature. But given where Jim Kennelly was in the firmament of Connecticut politics, and John Bailey, if the walls could tell stories, I think it would be pretty wild.

In fact, I think Connecticut has lost a piece of its history today. We all want BARBARA to know that she too and her family are Connecticut's history, part of the history of this body here, and that it is a tribute to her and to Jim to have so many of her colleagues on their feet tonight loving and being with her in spirit and thought and prayers.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would just close by saying the family,

the Kennelly children and the Baileys, Jim's other relatives, that we all give them our deepest sympathies, but to say that for Jim, his legacy are his accomplishments.

As Speaker of the Connecticut House, he molded every piece of legislation that went through it. He was an active Speaker that led the issues, fighting for change, and improving Connecticut's cities and its citizens' lot. For that he will always be remembered by the rest of society; by his family, of course, as their father and husband. We will all miss him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair joins with all Members of the House in expressing our deepest condolences to Congresswoman KENNELLY and her family.

#### SAY WHAT IS TRUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, out West the predominant church out there in one of the States sings a song that says, "Oh, say what is true." What a refreshing statement, that you should always say the truth.

When I was a freshman around here in 1981, I remember distinctly getting a fundraising letter from an organization, and they wrote to me and they said, if you will only send us some money, \$10, \$20, \$30, \$40, \$50, we will be in a position to take care of the Chesapeake Bay which then-Secretary of the Interior Jim Watt is polluting. We can take that money and we can step in and we will save Chesapeake Bay.

Strangely enough that afternoon Secretary Watt had an appointment with me. He came in the office. I showed him the letter. He got a good laugh out of it and he said, how ridiculous. He said, in effect, we are putting a lot of money into the Chesapeake Bay to take care of it. Out of curiosity, though, I sent them some money and about 6 months later I got an interesting reply that said out of your generosity, Mr. HANSEN, we were able to save Chesapeake Bay from the ravages of Secretary Watt and all the rotten things he was going to do.

We all know in reality that he did nothing to the bay. In fact he put the money into it, but it was a whale of a good fundraising letter.

I think that the American people should realize, Mr. Speaker, that this is the oldest fundraising trick in the book. Create a straw man and knock it down. I thought it was interesting today, because sent to me from the great State of Utah is a letter, and this letter comes from a man by the name of Robert Redford from Sundance, UT, kind of a familiar name around the United States, and he is sending out a fundraising letter and Mr. Redford is asking basically the same thing as these folks did on Save the Bay.

I will not bore the House with all of the things that are in it, but he says.

Incredibly the new leadership in Congress is ready to break this longstanding contract. They want to begin selling off our natural heritage to private commercial interests in order to raise a few quick bucks under the pretext of deficit reduction. Our national parks would be closed down like military bases.

I am sure that Mr. Redford is a little misguided here, but here is the bill he is referring to, H.R. 260. Page 13 of the bill, as we used to say around here, and in State legislatures and in county commissions and even the third-class cities, when all else fails, read the legislation.

Let me read it, for all these people who are trying to come out with a national park closing bill:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed as modifying or terminating any unit of the national park system without an act of Congress," the way it has been for almost 200 years.

He goes to say, "Our national forests would be sold off and logged." Pray tell, where is the bill? Can somebody bring the bill up, give me a bill number and show it to me? I am the chairman of that committee. I am the one that handles all the public land, national forest, parks. Where is the bill? I want to see it. But, of course, this will be a great one to raise a few bucks.

Our wildlife refuges would be opened to destructive oil and gas development. Name the wildlife refuge in America, Mr. Redford. Where is it? There is only one that I am aware of and that happens to be Anwar in Alaska, of 19 million acres, and Mr. YOUNG, the chairman of the full Committee on Resources, wants an infinitesimal part of that to be used for exploration of fossil fuels. But where in the lower 48 or Hawaii or Guam, the Virgin Islands, or Puerto Rico, where is it? I would like to know where it is, but I am sure that will hit the hot button with a few folks and they will come up with it.

Hundreds of millions of acres of scenic lands would simply be given away. Where is that bill? I do not know. Every piece of legislation, the Park Service, the BLM, the Forest Service, every one of them has a management plan, and nobody but nobody is giving away any private ground at this particular point.

Well, another one says, "Here in Utah, we would lose 20 million acres overnight. That's two-thirds of all our federally protected lands, under legislation that is now before Congress." What is the bill number? Where is it? Who is sponsoring the bill? As the old Member from Utah, I would sure like to know where that bill is.

I have nothing against Mr. Redford. He has a right to do that. But come on, now, folks, let us be reasonable about this. If we are going to do it, let us go back to that old Mormon song, "Oh, say what is true." What a refreshing thing to do. Would that not be nice if in all America the politicians did that?

I still remember all the people on Social Security who call in and say, gee, I got a letter from a past Congressman and he thinks Social Security is going to be gutted, but if you will give \$10, \$20, \$30, \$40, \$50, we will save that legislation. I have not been around here as long as a lot of folks but 15 years, and I will tell you most of that legislation is saved right now.

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot more examples here, I can see I have used my 5 minutes, but I would surely hope that people are wise enough, prudent enough, and have enough judgment to realize when they get these letters, are they predicated and grounded in truth or are they just some way to pick up a fast buck for a lot of people?

#### MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I hope all my California people right now are watching me an listening to me today, especially senior citizens, because I would like to talk about Medicare.

I am deeply concerned about all this rhetoric that is going on, frightening senior citizens by twisted information and disinformation. I would like to get the facts straight tonight.

I was an engineer all my life. I have been dealing with the facts, numbers. I used to get straight A's in all the math and physics. Tonight I am going to talk about facts again and perhaps dealing with the simple numbers.

All this rhetoric that is going on, saying that we give millions and millions of dollars tax credit to rich people at the expense of senior citizens by cutting Medicare spending. Let me get this straight. Give a tax credit to rich people? Let me get a little chart here.

The tax cut we are talking about is \$500 tax credit to the child support, \$2,000 for child adoption. That is what we are talking about. The tax credit is coming from a non-Medicare spending cut, roughly \$622 billion, the money is coming from this fund. Not the Medicare money, not the Medicare trust fund.

By doing this, we can save \$377 billion for deficit credit. By giving a tax credit to child support, we can stimulate the economy, thus create more jobs and more revenue to Government.

Besides, Congress passed an amendment to the Medicare bill to prohibit transferring any money from Medicare to other funds. It is illegal to transfer money from Medicare to other general funds. It cannot be done. So how can they say that we are giving all the million-dollar credit to rich taxpayers at the expense of a Medicare cut? That is absolutely false. It is not true.

The second argument is that we are cutting too fast too much. That is another rhetoric that I cannot accept. Let us talk about that quickly. Too fast. What do you mean by too fast?

Because according to the Medicare trust fund report, Medicare will be bankrupt in 7 years. We have got to save it.

Oh, yes, we have a plan, a counterplan to extend it out to 10 years, same general plan. But if Medicare is bankrupt in 7 years, how can you save it in 10 years? Let me show a little chart to show what we are doing.

We are talking about cutting too fast too much. Here it is.

□ 1915

Right now, the Medicare part A has been financed by payroll taxes. You pay half; your employer contributes the other half.

Is it fair to you that we have to raise the taxes so you can subsidize the existing Medicare plan? Of course not.

Let us take a look at the part B. This is what you are paying. The beneficiary only pays 31 percent. Other taxpayers are subsidizing by 68 percent. In other words, beneficiaries only pay one-third, and other taxpayers have to subsidize by two-thirds. It used to be half and half. It keeps going up. If you do nothing, within 7 years the beneficiary will only pay 18 percent; the other taxpayers have to subsidize by 82 percent. Is it fair, asking other taxpayers to pay almost 90 percent of the Medicare plan? Of course not.

All we are trying to do is maintain this relationship, one-third paid by the senior citizens, two-thirds paid by the other, younger taxpayers. We feel that is fair. We would like to maintain that same proportion, same 31, one-third, and two-thirds relationship.

They call that a cut. Is it really a cut, trying to maintain the same ratio of one-third, two-thirds? Is it really cutting too much to try to maintain the same ratio?

Right now, the Medicare price has gone up out of control. Part B last year alone has gone up 12 percent while the private plan only has gone up 1.5 percent. The price is out of control.

There is so much waste and fraud going on in the Medicare system. That is why we try to correct it, try to save the Medicare from bankruptcy. It is fair to everybody, fair to the younger generation as well.

Again, I would like to readdress again to my Democrat colleagues who argue \$270 billion Medicare savings is too much. They believe that \$90 billion is enough to save the system. Let me tell you, their plan would leave Medicare with a \$300 billion deficit just at the time the first wave of baby boomers reach retirement. This is going to be chaotic when the baby boomers decide to retire.

This Democrat plan will not work. We have got to do something now. Of course, it is better not to do anything and let it bankrupt it. But they are not going to get a quick decision.

I think that solving the Medicare problem is difficult now. But imagine when the baby boomers hit, it is going to be really chaotic.

Again, we are not cutting Medicare to provide a tax cut for the rich. We are not cutting too much too fast. Instead we are trying to save the Medicare from bankruptcy to preserve fairness for the working families.

#### AMERICAN DIES IN CUSTODY OF PALESTINIANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I hope all of my colleagues who are here will listen to what I am going to read to them. A man named Mohammed Rahim Mosleh, an American citizen, was picked up for questioning Wednesday at a cafe by plainclothesmen who identified themselves as agents of Jericho's preventive security police on the West Bank, now the new domicile of the Palestinian Liberation Organization.

He was picked up. He was dressed only in his trousers when his body was returned today at 2:00 a.m.

Now get this, my colleagues, his forehead was bruised blue, his lip was torn open, blood had flowed from one ear, and there were what appeared to be burn marks on his right foot, like cigarette burns, according to family members.

Palestinian security officials speaking on conditions of anonymity, said Mosleh was overcome by the 98 degree heat in Jericho and had a heart attack. Get that, he had a heart attack with his head smashed in, his lip bleeding, his blood coming out of his ear and burn marks on his feet.

A doctor at Jericho's hospital, where Mosleh was dead on arrival, refused to issue a death certificate. The certificate would normally include a cause of death.

Witnesses said Mosleh was playing cards at a village coffee shop when six men identifying themselves as preventive security agents for the PLO approached his table Wednesday and invited Mosleh outside. They said they were investigating a theft of gold from his sister and asked him to come with them to Jericho. When he did not return that night, his wife and two of his sons drove to Jericho on Thursday to ask about him. Preventive security agents twice told them to come back later, assuring them that Mosleh was there.

On the third trip, another agent said preventive security knew nothing about his whereabouts.

Now, I am for the peace process in the Middle East. We all want there to be peace in the Middle East, and we want it to work out between the Israeli Government and the PLO leader, Yasser Arafat, and the PLO forces. But