EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF GIRMA ZAID, FOUNDER AND CHAIRMAN EMERITUS OF THE GRACE WAITING HOME FOR CHILDREN

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Girma Zaid, a caring, committed man who has dedicated his life to improving the plight of abused and neglected children.

Girma began to acquire the educational tools needed for his crusade for children at Long Beach City College and California State University-Long Beach, where he earned his associate and bachelor of arts degrees in sociology. Zaid continued his education at the University of California, earning his master of social work degree in 1984.

In 1975 Girma combined his education with a compassion for children as a children's services worker with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services. Here he counseled at-risk children awaiting reunification with their families and developed therapeutic programs for them. Girma's hard work and dedication were rewarded in 1981 when he was promoted to supervisor of children's treatment counselors, a job in which he supervised a residential facility for neglected and at-risk children. His star continued to rise in 1985 with his elevation to deputy children's services administrator for the Los Angeles County Department of Children's Services. As administrator Girma was responsible for the supervision of children's services for more than 2,000 abused and neglected children. He also supervised 100 social workers, caseworkers, and related personnel.

Zaid's crusade took him to the Bay area in 1988 as program manager for the Black Adoption Placement and Research Center, where he developed, implemented, and supervised a therapeutic foster care program and helped review ethnically-matched and culturally-appropriate homes for dependent children. While in the Bay area Zaid also served as assistant director of the Department of Social Services for the city and county of San Francisco. He returned to the Los Angeles County Department of Children's Services in 1991 as the deputy administrator for the adoptions division.

One of Girma's crowning achievements came in January 1992, when he founded the Grace Home for Waiting Children and assumed the role of executive director. On behalf of Grace Home Girma worked with the Los Angeles County Department of Children's Services, community leaders, and elected officials to ensure a safe, nurturing environment for abused and neglected children. He provided in-service training as well as foster parent training, and monitored clinical program activities. Today Grace Home has three offices in Los Angeles County—Inglewood, Long Beach, and Panorama City. Offices will soon be opened throughout the State in San Bernardino, Riverside, and Sacramento.

Under Girma's leadership, Grace Home is also expanding its operations nationwide, with offices opening in Washington, DC; Atlanta, GA; Las Vegas, NV; and Milwaukee, WI. Girma has also traveled to Ethiopia and Eritrea in East Africa to set up programs for displaced children. He is currently utilizing his experience and talents as CEO of Management Services International, a consulting firm which plans, develops, and implements innovative child welfare programs both in the United States and abroad.

Despite his busy work schedule, Zaid has found time to serve on several boards, including the International Foster Care Organization, the PROVIDERS South Central Los Angeles Residential Facility, and the Martin Luther King Drew Community Advisory Counsel.

Mr. Speaker, California and the Nation owe a debt of gratitude to Girma Zaid's pioneering work with foster children. His deep commitment to improving the lives of abused and neglected children greatly benefits all of us. I ask that you join me, Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute to this tireless and compassionate crusader for children.

THE REPUBLICAN ASSAULT ON MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Republicans' $270 billion cut in Medicare, and $163 billion cut in Medicaid. Cuts of this magnitude will not only devastate these programs, but most importantly, they will seriously threaten the health status of the people which Medicaid and Medicare were designed to improve and to protect—children and seniors.

To jeopardize the quality of life—for millions of the most vulnerable in our society—for the sake of giving a tax break to the wealthy, is unconscionable. This tax cut giveaway will add millions of additional Americans to the already swollen ranks of the uninsured.

To gut critical quality of life health care services at a time when the health status of Americans is already compromised is irresponsible. Health status statistics confirm that now is not the time to destroy the Nation's health safety net system. This year alone nearly 1.3 million Americans will be diagnosed with cancer, over 500 thousand will die from the disease. Only about 40 percent of those who get cancer this year will be alive 5 years after diagnosis. Cardiovascular disease including heart attack and stroke, cause a death every 34 seconds in the United States, killing more than 900 thousand Americans each year. Nearly half of the 14 million Americans suffering from diabetes are not even aware that they have the disease. The gap in minority health continues to widen. The reemergence and spread of infectious diseases is on the rise. AIDS has become the leading cause of death for all Americans ages 25 to 44. Medicaid is especially critical to women and children suffering from AIDS.

It appears that the Republicans did not factor the adverse impact of these devastating diseases into their Medicare and Medicaid restructuring equation. If the Republicans are allowed to gut $270 billion from Medicare and $163 billion from Medicaid, the health status of the American people will deteriorate further. We must not tolerate the Republicans' blatant disregard for the needs of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the GOP assault on health status and health care services must stop. I applaud the President for his veto of the Republican budget, and I strongly urge my colleagues to stand up for the American people—vote ''no'' on measures to gut Medicaid and Medicare.

TRANSFER OF TWIN CITIES RESEARCH CENTER

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, December 5, the House unanimously passed H.R. 308, a bill to transfer certain surplus Federal land in Hopewell Township, PA, to the Beaver County Corporation for Economic Development. The goal of the corporation, a nonprofit entity, is to utilize the transferred land, in cooperation with Hopewell Township, as the centerpiece of a Hopewell Aliquippa Airport Industrial Park, and thereby promote economic development and create needed jobs for the people of Hopewell Township.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated during debate on this legislation, the Federal Government should be alert to opportunities like Hopewell that link property transfers to airports, industrial park opportunities and other core infrastructure facilities to create and promote jobs. The fact is that the only way to create job opportunities to succeed those that no longer exist because of industry closing or dislocations is to make property available for new business to locate there.

The transfer of Federal property, when done effectively, can reap untold benefits in terms of employment, economic development, and economic stimulus.

Such is the case with the U.S. Bureau of Mines' Twin Cities Research Center in Minneapolis, MN. The 225 outstanding and dedicated employees have provided world-class research capabilities for the mining industry for over 85 years. Their research has resulted in the development of advanced technologies that: First preserve and enhance the quality and integrity of the environment; second, mitigate health and safety in the work place; third, improve efficiencies and economics of current mining practice; and fourth, develop new and more environmentally-friendly mining systems.

With the impending closure of the facility, the Twin Cities Research Center Transition Task Force has been developing a vision to transform the center into an applied engineering and physical sciences research institute. In order to accomplish their mission, the title of the land, buildings and equipment must be transferred at no cost to the State of Minnesota so that the new institute is able to lease the facility from the State to work in conjunction with the University of Minnesota. In this new arrangement, it may be necessary to transfer the equipment to the Natural Resources Research Institute in Duluth, sell some of the property, and/or manage the facilities in an innovative and cost-effective manner.

This no-cost transfer of public property will preserve the research capabilities of the Bureau of Mines' Twin Cities Research Center, continue the University's partnership with the State, and create economic opportunities for Minnesotans and the mining industry.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons stated, this property transfer is important. That is why in the report accompanying H.R. 308 (House Report 104–372, p. 2) language is included directing the General Services Administration to expedite negotiations to transfer the U.S. Bureau of Mines, Twin Cities Research Center, in Minneapolis to be used in conjunction with the University of Minnesota. I am pleased with the inclusion of this language and look forward to the transfer.

TRIBUTE TO GERTRUDE MAXWELL

HON. MARK FOLEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker I rise today to pay tribute to the founder and lifetime Chairman of Save a Pet, Mrs. Gertrude Maxwell. Dedicated to protecting the rights of animals, Mrs. Maxwell and Save a Pet have saved over 50,000 pets. And on the upcoming commemoration of Save a Pet Day this weekend, I want to share with my colleagues in the House of Representatives and Senate, and the entire Nation, the remarkable work of Mrs. Maxwell and Save a Pet.

Founded in 1972 in Illinois, Save a Pet provides funds for surgery, transport, therapy, placement of pets in responsible homes to provide people with companionship. The organization promotes the idea that relationships between people and animals benefit both parties. It has a 100% adoption rate, does not support euthanasia, and promotes the widespread use of spaying or neutering to end overpopulation and neglect. Save a Pet is strongly committed to educating us to treat animals humanely with love and respect.

When a 1-year old nameless mutt was found paralyzed on South Dixie Highway, in South Florida, Nancy Mizelle found it difficult to fund treatment. She contacted Mrs. Maxwell who immediately funded the treatment. ''I wasn't going to let an animal die because of money,'' she said.

Mrs. Maxwell has connected her organization with various other volunteer agencies to enhance service to pets. In 1994, a 5-year-old Labrador was shot by a Palm Beach County sheriff's deputy, the dog needed to be transported to the University of Florida veterinary facility. Mrs. Maxwell arranged for the dog's surgery and transportation.

Maxwell's philanthropies began long before she founded Save a Pet. As a teacher and social worker, she served her community and was able to form interrelationships between people and pets. Every week for 25 years, between 1949 and 1974 she would drive 60 miles to teach underprivileged children. She taught them about the love and responsibility involved in owning a pet and the proper way to treat animals. As a social worker she set up programs to bring the love of pets into the homes of inmates and retirees. Mrs. Maxwell provided loving companionship for people everywhere she went.

Her interest in solving community problems including prison reform, therapeutic policies for troubled children and adolescents, and for improving senior citizen lifestyles earned her the appointment of honorary State's Attorney for the 15th Judicial Circuit of Florida in September, 1981.

Gertrude Maxwell's philosophy can be a lesson to us all. In her words,

> We do not live alone on Planet Earth. There are other living things here, too. The other living things are the animals whose useful service shares our homes and hearts, the pets and the wild creatures who are part of our daily lives.

This compassion for animals including promoting their freedom from want, from suffering, and from pain is commendable and will not be forgotten.

Mrs. Maxwell has been a true servant to my community and I thank her for a lifetime of dedication to such a noble cause. On this year's Save a Pet Day, and during this holiday season, let us all take time to thank valuable members of our local communities like Mrs. Maxwell, and give them the credit they deserve.

A TRIBUTE TO MALCOLM AND MARY FARRELL FOR 68 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I've been involved in Scouting for most of my adult life, and few things have given me more satisfaction. Scouting has always been and continues to be an apprenticeship in life, a preparation for citizenship and a source of our future leaders.

That's why I take great pride in drawing your attention to Malcolm ''Mac'' Farrell and Mary Farrell of Schuylerville, NY in my congressional district. One would be hard pressed to find a couple who have done more to fulfill these missions of the Boy Scouts of America throughout their lifetimes. In fact, Mac and Mary have each contributed 34 years of service to scouting. That's a total of 68 years worth of guidance for the youth of Schuylerville.

Through their years of service, Malcolm has held the position of cub master for pack 13 in Schuylerville, while Mary has been the secretary and treasurer of the pack. Their leadership in these positions has certainly shown through considering the success and direction of the entire Boy Scout community in Schuylerville. In addition, their commitment of 34 years has brought a great degree of continuity and success to cub scout operations. In fact, after undergoing this apprenticeship in life with Mac and Mary, generations of boys and young men have become valued members of their families, communities, and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would add that those who worry about the direction of this country can take comfort in the sound guidance offered by people like Malcolm and Mary who have promoted the popularity of Scouting along with its principles of community service and moral values. In that regard, I have always been one to judge people based on what they return to their community. By that measure, Malcolm and Mary Farrell are truly great Americans.

This Sunday, friends and family will join the Farrell's in celebration and tribute to their decades of selfless sacrifice and service to Scouting. Mr. Speaker, knowing that many other Members of this body are also products of Scouting and share my high admiration for the Boy Scouts of America, I proudly ask them and all Members to join me in paying tribute to Mary and Malcolm Farrell and wishing them many more happy years, they have certainly earned it.

A SALUTE TO LIONEL HAMPTON

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Lionel Hampton, a great artist, a great American, a great ambassador, and one of the greatest musicians America has ever known.

In tribute to Lionel Hampton, I would like to share with you and this House, some of he highlights of the life of this extraordinary man.

Lionel Hampton, the reigning king of the vibraphone for over half a century, and one of the few surviving internationally renowned jazz talents of the swing era, was born in Birmingham, AL on April 20, 1908. He was a member of the Benny Goodman Quartet which was the first racially integrated group of jazz musicians in the Nation, but left the group to form his own big band in the early 1940's.

His original ballad, Midnight Sun, written with Johnny Mercer and Sonny Burke, has become an American jazz and popular classic. His two major symphonic works, the King David Suite and Blues Suite have been performed by many leading symphonic orchestras throughout the world.

Nevertheless, whether you are familiar with his musical accomplishments, over the years, Lionel Hampton has known no status where he was not eagerly accepted, as he has been well received the world over by Presidents, politicians, kings, and queens. His very music has caused the walls of Communist nations to come tumbling down.

Allow me now to share with you Lionel Hampton, the constituent, the friend, the community leader. His frame and greatness have not let him forget the homeless and the hopeless. Long a supporter of public housing, he developed the Lionel Hampton Houses in the early 1970's, and upon completion, built the

Gladys Hampton Houses, named for his late wife. To this day, those projects are considered among the best in the Nation.

The Lionel Hampton Community Development Corp. has built more than 500 low- and moderate-income apartments in my congressional district of Harlem alone.

Lionel Hampton holds more than 15 honorary doctorates and received the gold medal of Paris, its highest cultural award, from its mayor, Jacques Chirac.

He was appointed to the board of trustees of the Kennedy Center in 1991 by President George Bush, and in December 1992, he was awarded a prestigious Kennedy Center honor for his lifetime career achievements as a musician and teacher. Since then, he continues to produce educational events and considers the real highlight of his career as having the music school at the University of Idaho named for him, the Lionel Hampton School of Jazz.

Whether you are black or white, Democratic or Republican, liberal or conservative, Lionel Hampton represents the very best of America.

TRIBUTE TO RUTH VARNADO

HON. THOMAS M. BARRETT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I pay tribute today to Ruth Varnado of my hometown of Milwaukee. Her many years of community service and dedication to making a difference in the lives of people are truly deserving of our appreciation and praise.

Ruth was raised in Jasper, AL where she completed her high school education. During her young adult years, she moved to Milwaukee to further her education.

We all know that Jasper, AL is a long way from Milwaukee. But I am very grateful that Ruth made the journey. Her years of community service span more than three decades, and the people of our community have benefited from her tireless service, dedication, and hard work.

Ruth has been a leader of efforts to save people from the ravages of guns, drugs, violence, and crime. Recognizing the importance of reaching out to people in despair, Ruth founded the Lincoln Park Community Center in 1989 and still serves as its director. Through her work at the center, she has helped to expand opportunities for people who have often felt hopeless. And she has helped to instill in them the values they need to succeed and endure in this society.

Ruth's efforts to reach out to inmates in penal institutions for insight into the root causes of crime have caught the attention of local, State, and national leaders including the President of the United States. For the first time in Wisconsin history, inmates nominated Ruth for a volunteer award sponsored by J.C. Penney, the Volunteer Center of Greater Milwaukee, and WTMJ–TV Channel 4.

Ruth's civic involvement and her countless contributions have earned her many other acclamations and awards. In 1991, she was named Citizen of the Year by the National Association of Social Workers.

''Boundless energy'', ''fearless'', ''determined'', ''compassionate'' and ''tough'' are terms the Milwaukee Times newspaper used to describe Ruth when she was honored as the 1990 Woman of the Year.

Just as significant as all of the Ruth's achievements is the spirit of community service she represents. Her willingness to help individual community members of our society as a whole is what makes her especially deserving of our recognition and praise.

The spirit of service she actively portrays is something we see far too little of in this society. And we all would do well to follow the shining example that Ruth has given us.

I know that Ruth will continue to play an important role in our community for decades to come, and that America will continue to benefit from her dedication, service and hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in saluting Ruth Varnado and in applauding this remarkable citizen for all she has done, and for all she has meant, to those of us whose lives she has touched.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES ''KEN'' ZISA

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I address my colleagues today to extend my heartfelt congratulations and warmest wishes to Charles ''Ken'' Zisa. On December 18, 1995, Ken will be inaugurated as chief of police of the city of Hackensack, NJ.

For many years, the name ''Ken Zisa'' has been synonymous with a tradition of community service, dedication, and love of the city of Hackensack. Chief Zisa has dedicated his professional life to his career in law enforcement. He joined the force in 1975, was promoted to sergeant in 1983, lieutenant in 1989, and captain in 1993.

Chief Zisa is a man of the utmost integrity who cares about his neighbors, his community, and his country. He is a man of vision who will continue to make the city of Hackensack proud of their police department.

Ken has been a member of HAPADA, the Bergen County Youth Services Commission, PBA Local #9, Knights of Columbus Trinity Council 747, B.P.O.E. Lodge 658, and Hackensack UNICO. Ken and his wife, Mary, reside in Hackensack and have two children, Anthony and Kristen, who attend the Hackensack public schools.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my best wishes to Chief Charles K. Zisa on this most special occasion.

SECURITIES LITIGATION REFORM

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 6, 1995, the House passed the conference report on H.R. 1058, the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. I am disappointed that the House approved this legislation. Many experts predict that it will only marginally deter frivolous lawsuits while causing significant harm to investors with meritorious claims.

By this time next week, President Clinton will have had to veto the bill or sign it. At this point, I would like to submit for the RECORD two articles that point out the serious flaws in this bill and why it should be vetoed.

[From the Bond Buyer, Dec. 5, 1995]

CALIFORNIA COUNTIES ASK CLINTON TO VETO SECURITIES BILL

(By Joe Bel Bruno)

LOS ANGELES.—The California State Association of Counties on Friday elected a new president—San Mateo County supervisor Mike Nevin—whose first action was sending a letter to President Clinton opposing the Securities Litigation Reform Act.

CSAC, a nonprofit corporation that promotes the interests of California's 58 counties before the state legislature and Congress, contends the reform act will severely hinder local governments' ability to recover losses related to securities fraud.

''We need to have the ability to recover losses in the case of securities fraud,'' Nevin said yesterday. ''We just wanted to let the President know that this bill, if he signs it, would make things tough on local governments and the taxpayers. It would be sending the wrong message.''

The letter to Clinton was signed by 106 county and other local government officials.

In addition to CSAC, signers of the letter include the California Association of County Treasurer/Tax Collectors, the city and county of San Francisco and the counties of Sacramento, San Diego, San Mateo, Riverside, Alameda, Kern, and Fresno. The letter was also signed by administrators of several county retirement systems.

A House-Senate conference committee has cleared the way for final congressional action on the bill. The Senate and House are slated to vote on it on Dec. 5 and Dec. 6. As currently worded, the bill would limit the type of securities-related lawsuit that could be filed, as well as the dollar amount of damages requested.

Steve Szalay, executive director of CSAC, said the legislation would have a dramatic impact on local governments. The legislation was a much-discussed topic at the association's 101st annual meeting in San Jose last week, he said.

''Local governments are victims of securities fraud; they need access to the courts to recover their losses,'' he said in a press statement. ''Orange County, on behalf of 187 independent California governments, is suing to recover about $1.5 billion on the grounds that the investments made on its behalf were unsuitable and violated the California constitution and statutes.''

''This bill makes it very difficult for local governments and taxpayers to recover their losses in securities fraud cases, and it will give wrongdoers a green light to commit more fraud,'' Szalay said.

The letter was drafted and signed by the association's new board on Friday. Also elected to the association's board was Yolo County supervisor Helen Thomson, first vice president; and El Dorado County supervisor John Upton, second vice president.

Nevin represents urban counties, while Thomson and Upton represent suburban and rural counties, respectively. One of the association's goals is educating the public about the value and need for county programs and services. Founded in 1895, CSAC is headquartered in Sacramento and has a research office in the District of Columbia.

[From USA Today, Dec. 8, 1995]

SECURITIES LAWSUIT BILL MAY HURT INVESTORS

(By Christine Dugas)

A securities law aimed at reducing frivolous lawsuits also may make it harder for investors with legitimate claims.

The bill, approved by Congress this week and awaiting President Clinton's signature, means ''investors are going to have to take a lot more responsibility for their own welfare,'' says Philip Feigin, Colorado Securities commissioner. ''It will be harder to get a case started and more difficult to prevail.''

Among the bill's provisions:

Companies would be able to say anything about future performance if they include some cautionary statements.

The amount of damages reckless wrongdoers would pay generally would depend on their share of liability. So a victim may not fully recover his or her damages if the main lawbreaker has claimed bankruptcy. In the case of Charles Keating's savings-and-loan fraud, Keating claimed bankruptcy, so damages to victims were paid mainly by accountants and lawyers who might not pay so much under this bill.

A judge would require investors or their lawyers to pay defendant's legal fees if a lawsuit were considered frivolous.

Investors would have to have specific evidence of fraud before they could go to court.

Investors still would have only one year after fraud was discovered, or three years after it occurred, to file suit.

''Now more than ever, investors must go beyond what companies tell them, and do some independent checking,'' says Maureen Thompson, legislative adviser for the North American Securities Administrators Association.

Because efforts to stretch the statute of limitations failed, investors still would have to check their investment account statements promptly for irregularities. They also would have to carefully document problems and consult a lawyer quickly, says Gerri Detweiler, policy director of the National Council of Individual Investors.

But it might be hard to find a lawyer to take investor fraud cases. ''The law tells us we can't just have a good case, we must have a great case,'' says Matthew Kelly, a lawyer who represents investors at Roemer, Wallens & Mineaux in Albany, N.Y.

The Securities and Exchange Commission, mean-while, is unlikely to pursue investors' cases. ''It doesn't have the resources,'' says Kim Schweitzer, counsel for the National Association of Securities and Commercial Lawyers. ''Its mandate is enforcement, not recovery for victims.''

The measure would benefit investors because companies would have to disclose more information, says Louis Thompson Jr., president of the National Investor Relations Institute.

And some investors support the bill because they are fed up with lawsuits that mainly enrich lawyers. The bill is aimed at a small number of ''professional investors'' and lawyers who file class-action lawsuits and take most of the proceeds.

''The money spent by corporations on frivolous lawsuits would better serve all shareowners if it remained in the company, resulting in higher net profits and earnings per share,'' says Kenneth Janke, president of the National Association of Investors.

But the legislation doesn't only stop frivolous lawsuits. ''It's a balancing act,'' Feigin says. ''Even good cases might not make it.''

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL MAXWELL R. THURMAN

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart to announce that our country has lost a great soldier and friend, General Maxwell Reid Thurman. General Thurman, a soldier whose career spanned more than 37 years, died on December 1, 1995, at Walter Reed Army Medical Center after a 5-year struggle with leukemia.

General Thurman was a principal architect of the all-volunteer Army and served as the Commander-in Chief of United States Southern Command during Operation Just Cause in December 1989. He learned that he had an aggressive form of leukemia in July 1990, and retired from the Army 8 months later in March, 1991.

Born in High Point, NC, General Thurman attended North Carolina State University, graduating with a degree in Chemical Engineering in 1953. While at North Carolina State, he enrolled in the Reserve Officer Training Corps and was commissioned an officer in the Ordnance Corps. Early in his career, General Thurman applied for, and received, a regular army commission in the field artillery. His professional military education included attendance at the ordnance and field artillery basic courses, the field artillery advanced course, the Army Command and General Staff College, and the Army War College.

General Thurman held a variety of staff and command positions, both in Europe and the United States. In Europe, he commanded light artillery and rocket units with the 11th Airborne Division, and he saw service in the 1958 Lebanon Crisis. He served in Vietnam, first as an intelligence advisor, and later as commander, 2d battalion, 35th field artillery, during the Tet Offensive. Returning to the United States, he commanded the 82d Airborne Division Artillery. Other assignments included duty as an instructor at the U.S. Military Academy, the Army Field Artillery School, and the Army Training and Doctrine Command.

In 1979, General Thurman was assigned as the Commanding General of the U.S. Recruiting Command. It was during this assignment that he helped shaped the post-Vietnam Army and helped transform it into the high quality, ready-to-flight force we have today. Under his leadership, General Thurman advertised the Army as a place where men and women with lots of drive and potential could be all that they could be, not a safe haven for underachievers. This is still the Army's basic recruiting slogan: ''Be All That You Can Be.''

Promoted to the rank of lieutenant general in 1981, General Thurman became the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel for the U.S. Army. In 1983 he was promoted to full general and appointed Vice Chief of Staff of the Army. He assumed command of the U.S. Training and Doctrine Command at Fort Monroe, VA in 1987. During these years it was largely through General Thurman's inspiration and leadership that the Army's new recruiting and training programs were implemented and the modern, volunteer professional Army fully came into existence.

In September 1989, General Thurman was named Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Southern Command, responsible for all American military national security policy and strategy in the region. It was under his leadership that the United States prepared and launched Operation ''Just Cause'' in Panama, which successfully removed dictator Manuel Noriega, and helped restore democracy to that strategic nation.

General Thurman held numerous awards and honors. His U.S. military decorations include two awards of the Defense Distinguished Service Medal; two Distinguished Service Medals; two Legions of Merit; the Bronze Star Medal with Valor Device (with Oak Leaf Cluster); four Air Medals; Meritorious Service Medals; Army Commendation Medals; and the Joint Service Achievement Medal. Additionally, General Thurman was decorated by the Governments of France, Germany, and Venezuela. He was a master parachutist and held the Army General Staff and the Joint Chiefs of Staff identification badges.

Since his retirement, General Thurman has been a Senior Fellow of the Association of the United States Army's Institute of Land Warfare and an executive-in-residence at North Carolina State University. General Thurman also served on the President's Commission on Women in the Armed Forces and the President's Commission on Panama. In 1992, he received the North Carolina Award for Public Service for a native North Carolinian living outside the State. In 1995, General Thurman was awarded an honorary doctor of humane letters degree from North Carolina State University.

Mr. Speaker, General Thurman was the epitome of selfless service to nation. He was always enthusiastic, and unstoppable tinkerer, sometimes abrasive, and yet humorous and warm when the pressure was off. He was a leader who truly made a difference, and his legacy can be found in the magnificent men and women who make up our trained and ready Army. He has our thanks—he served our Nation well. We will truly miss his leadership and friendship.

THE COALITION BUDGET

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, December 13, 1995 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE COALITION BUDGET

Budget negotiations between Congress and the White House have been difficult, but I am pleased that all parties have agreed to a common goal—balancing the budget in seven years and protecting Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment. Thus, the central question to the debate is not ''when'' the budget is balanced, but ''how''.

Both sides in this debate deserve credit for making progress on the deficit. Under the leadership of House Speaker Newt Gingrich, Congress passed one budget version, which was vetoed by the President. The President has presented an alternative proposal, and negotiations will continue on a final agreement. Throughout the debate, both sides have moved slowly towards a proposal put forward by the conservative ''Coalition'', a group of centrist House Democrats.

The Coalition budget is a tough and remarkably sensible budget plan. It meets the

stringent test of balancing the budget in seven years by cutting spending by more than $850 billion, and it results in even less debt than the plan vetoed by the President. The Coalition budget does not borrow money to pay for tax cuts and it better protects important priorities such as health care, nutrition, job training, education, and infrastructure. Because it does not postpone tough spending cuts, the Coalition plan would leave a national debt of almost $100 billion less than the Speaker's budget.

I support the Coalition budget for several reasons:

1. It puts deficit reduction first: The Coalition budget makes spending cuts immediately, and postpones tax cuts until the budget is balanced. In contract, the Speaker's budget would give out $245 billion in tax cuts early on and delays unpopular spending cuts until after the 1996 and 1998 elections. Under that plan, deficits would actually increase in 1996 and 1997. Congress has passed balanced budget plans before, but most failed because they made popular short-term tax cuts while postponing the tough medicine until many years later. This means that we borrow money to give ourselves a tax cut, leaving our children with the bill. Surely we have learned from recent history that when dessert comes first, we never get to the spinach. The coalition budget begins spending cuts immediately, and makes gradual cuts until the budget is balanced in 2002.

2. It spreads the sacrifice more fairly: The Coalition budget takes a balanced, fiscally responsible approach to major entitlement programs. It trims Medicare costs by allowing recipients to choose private insurance plans and charging upper-income enrollees higher premiums, but it takes $100 billion less from Medicare than the vetoed budget. These Coalition savings are equal to those necessary to keep the program solvent for the foreseeable future, keeping promises made to both today's and tomorrow's seniors. Medicaid, the program of health insurance for the poor, survives at lower levels than under current law, and with a spending cap that adjusts for inflation and the number of enrollees. It preserves the guarantee of assistance to nursing home residents, the disabled, and lower-income women and children. The Speaker's budget proposal calls for much larger Medicaid cutbacks and takes no account of future enrollment, inflation, or recessions. This approach often hits states like Indiana extremely hard with cumbersome block grant formulas that favor larger states with less efficient health care delivery. Without the Medicaid guarantee, state taxes, local governments, and the middle-class children of nursing home residents will bear the brunt of longterm health care costs The Coalition plan also proposes cost-of-living adjustments for social security and other federal benefits, but designs those changes so that modest income families will not suffer.

3. It invests in the future: The Coalition budget rejects cutbacks in student loans and job training, choosing instead to create new opportunities for younger Americans. It does not make cuts in research, technology, and export promotion, and it restores funding for education, rural health, research, and economic infrastructure. Overall, the cuts in the Coalition budget are 25 percent less severe than the harsh reductions proposed by the Speaker's budget.

4. It makes work pay, and welfare recipients work: The Coalition budget makes major welfare reform that balances compassion with a sense of personal responsibility. It requires people to move from welfare to work in two years, and provides limited job training and child care to those entering the workforce. The Coalition plan also eliminates the vetoed budget's tax increase on lower-income working families. Welfare should not pay more than work, and this plan helps families make that transition.

5. It enforces strict compliance: The Coalition budget provides the only meaningful enforcement of spending cuts to be found in any of the budget proposals. It uses nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates and includes a line-item veto and tough enforcement measures to make it difficult for any future Congress to violate this plan. This honest approach does not rely on ''smoke and mirrors'' to achieve a balanced budget. It rejects gimmicks like ''unspecified cuts'', as in the alternative plans.

Conclusion: I am pleased we have agreed to balance the budget in seven years. Congress and the President must now decide how we balance the budget. To have the long-term support of the American people, a balanced budget plan must make tough budget choices while reflecting the values Americans cherish: responsibility, honesty, fairness, compassion, and the promise that the future will be better for our children. Only a budget that is politically and economically sustainable over a period of years will actually achieve balance.

Although differences are large, I believe the American people want us to reach an agreement on the budget. It is the responsibility of Congress and the President to put aside partisan differences for the common good of the nation.

The Coalition plan offers Congress and the President a real opportunity to find common ground and unite the American people behind a tough, honest, compassionate, and fair balanced budget that reflects basic American values and invests in our future. The Coalition plan may not be perfect, but it is a good starting point for real progress on the budget.

MAYOR TIERNEY DEFENDS NEW BEDFORD ECONOMY

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have been disappointed recently to read a number of very uninformed attacks on Indian-run casinos. A number of people have extrapolated from their own personal opposition to gambling to make unfounded criticisms of Indian casinos, to denigrate the very important economic advantages these casinos have represented for American Indians and to inaccurately claim that they have been a source of legal problems. In addition, in some cases casinos can be a very important source of economic opportunity for people in addition to Indians who live in areas which have suffered economic losses beyond their control.

One such area is the city of New Bedford, MA, which I am privileged to represent in Congress. The proposal to establish a casino run by the Wampanoag Tribe in New Bedford has been overwhelmingly supported by the people of that city, who recently voted for it by a 3-to-1 margin in a referendum. It has unfortunately been the subject of a good deal of unfounded criticism. I was therefore very pleased to read in the Boston Globe for December 12 a very well argued essay by New Bedford Mayor Rosemary Tierney, in which she states the case for allowing New Bedford and the Wampanoag Tribe to go forward with this casino in very persuasive terms.

I have worked closely with Mayor Tierney, with labor representatives, with business leaders, and with a wide range of citizens to support economic development for New Bedford. All of these groups share the mayor's and my opinion that the casino is a very important part of this effort. The very hard working people of New Bedford have been hit by unfavorable international trade trends, and by the conservation driven restrictions on fishing. As we deal with these issues, we agree that the economic development that would result from the casino is essential in our effort to overcome the negative effects of these other trends. As the mayor notes in her well-documented and thoughtful essay,

New Bedford does not look upon gaming as a cure-all or quick fix for the local economy. The impact of the casino falls in two categories: employment and tax revenues. New jobs create new earnings and new spending. New spending, in turn, increases demands on suppliers, vendors, merchants, contractors. Thus new jobs create the need for yet more employment throughout the economy.

Mr. Speaker, because Mayor Tierney speaks with great authority on the need for economic development in the city of New Bedford, and because on this issue in particular she articulates a viewpoint that is shared by virtually all of us who are seriously concerned within the New Bedford area about economic improvement, and because the merits of Indian-run gambling operations are now a subject of some debate in this body, I ask the Mayor Tierney's article from the Boston Globe of Tuesday, December 12 be printed here.

[From the Boston Globe, Dec. 12, 1995]

GAMING AND NEW BEDFORD'S FUTURE

(By Rosemary S. Tierney)

The City of New Bedford is not unique among older New England cities when considering the economic challenges it is confronting as the 21st century approaches. As mayor of this proud and historic city, I believe it is unique in demonstrating a frank willingness to acknowledge those challenges and to develop a systematic, long-term plan for overcoming them.

Throughout its long history, New Bedford has been bound to both national and international economic trends. Whaling and shipbuilding dominated the local economy in the early and mid-1800s. As the whaling industry declined, textiles became the dominant industry. Companies with such household names as Hathaway and Wamsutta made New Bedford their corporate homes. The manufacturing base was broadened by glass and metal-working factories, such as Revere Copper and Pairpoint Glass. In more recent times, the city's economic fate returned to the sea. For several years, New Bedford was the nation's No. 1 fishing port in the dollar value of its fleet's catch. New Bedford also became a site for quality needle trade industries, Polaroid, Aerovox and the Acushnet Co.'s Titleist golf ball plant.

Today New Bedford faces a challenge from the continuing decline in manufacturing, coupled with a fishing industry in crisis. These factors may be beyond local control, but the city can have an impact on the regional economic environment by employing its potential resources to maximum advantage.

Let me cite a few of those advantages being developed in New Bedford: a harbor with potential to handle increased shipping traffic; a location close to major transportation routes; and airport with a foreign trade zone and plans for a $30 million expansion; a coastal resource laboratory and aquaculture center at the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth. In addition, plans

are in the works for establishment of a New Bedford national park and a commuter-rail link to Boston.

These projects are being over-shadowed today by the debate over casino gaming in Massachusetts and, in particular, the Wampanoag proposals to develop a casino/-entertainment complex in New Bedford. Critics argue that gaming will only provide short-term economic gains, while the cost to society in regulation, diversion of funds, crime and related social problems will outweigh the benefits. Implicit in these arguments is that New Bedford is susceptible to promises by developers of a better tomorrow because of the plight of its local economy. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The Wampanoag gaming proposal is the most comprehensive economic development initiative in the history of southeastern Massachusetts. It will provide some 5,000 jobs (plus 3,000 construction and temporary jobs), spur tourism, generate millions of dollars in revenues for the state and cities and towns, and allow Massachusetts vendors the opportunity to contract for services and goods to support the gaming and entertainment complex.

This is not just a New Bedford issue. It is a Worcester issue, a Springfield issue, a Fall River issue, a Taunton issue, a Brockton issue, a Lowell issue. It is an issue each mayor understands: job creation and economic development go hand-in-hand. New jobs can give hope and opportunity to thousands of hard working men and women—and can help build a stronger economic future for generations to come.

New Bedford does not look upon gaming as a cure-all or quick fix for the local economy. The impact of the casino falls in two categories: employment and tax revenues. New jobs create new earning and new spending. New spending in turn increases the demands on suppliers, vendor, merchants, contractors. Thus new jobs create the need for yet more employment throughout the economy.

If the local unemployment rate of 9.3 percent can be reduced to the statewide average of 5.1 percent, business in New Bedford and the area will certainly benefit. It has been the failure to reduce unemployment through new or expanded industry that has plagued this area for years. The Wampanoag project offers the city the opportunity to couple the project to other initiative, such as the harbor, airport and rail, to make them a reality.

It is estimated 25 percent of the gross revenue at the Foxwoods casino in Connecticut comes from Massachusetts residents. Those are revenues that leave this state by the busload every day. As Congress shifts federal responsibilities to the states, I urge the Legislature not to reject revenue sources that will be sorely needed in the not-too-distant future. Twenty-three states across the nation are beneficiaries of 130 compacts with 115 tribes. Massachusetts would not be reinventing the wheel.

Aside from minimizing or dismissing the economic potential of gaming, opponents employ the strategy of fear based upon threats of increased crime. As mayor of the host community, I am mindful of this threat. But there is no better prevention for crime than a job. The Wampanoag tribe not only supports strong regulation and has indicated a willingness to find its cost, it has encouraged the Legislature to maintain strict oversight over the new regulatory agency to ensure that it is composed of top professionals with knowledge of accounting and law enforcement. Instead of attempting to undermine a proposal legitimately put forward under federal law that will benefit this state and its people with economic opportunities, law enforcement personnel and prosecutors should insist the Gaming Commission be staffed by people who will have impeccable reputations and integrity and be supported by a staff adequate to meet the job.

The task of rebuilding New Bedford and the region is vital to southeastern Massachusetts. The Legislature has an opportunity to make an important contribution to this effort by approving the compact between the state and the Wampanoag tribe. The area has always had an enormous potential for economic growth and development. The gaming/entertainment complex offers New Bedford a catalyst for the full economic recovery. I urge the Legislature to approve the compact expeditiously and to avoid arguments that seem more focused on scoring short-term political points than on seeking pragmatic solutions to bring to this state a well regulated and managed gaming industry.

COMMEMORATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, by Presidential proclamation, December 10–16 has been designated Human Rights Week. As Americans prepare to celebrate the holidays and the coming new year, I hope that each of us will reflect upon the blessings we reap because of the deep commitment to human rights that America stands for. Indeed the world looks to us as a beacon or hope because of our tradition of respect for and continual effort to bring to life the freedoms enshrined in our Constitution.

Those who have suffered from a denial of the basic human rights and fundamental freedoms, that we, in this country, often take for granted, known how important the achievement of human rights really is. In countries such as North Korea, China, Vietnam, Cuba, Burma, and Bosnia, people struggle to win the liberty that we have enjoyed for over 200 years.

In the United States, respect for international human rights has long been supported on a bipartisan basis. We have enjoyed many successes in advancing human rights, evidenced by the collapse of communism in Europe, the defeat of Communist subversion in Central America, and in the defeat of aggression in the Persian Gulf. We understand the role that human rights can play in advancing democracy and economic development with free markets. For instance, in the collapse of communism in the Soviet Union and its satellites, human rights was a key aspect of the difference between the quality of life in Western and Communist societies, and therefore became decisive as the people of the Communist bloc rose against their governments.

The importance of restoring human rights has been recognized in the Dayton peace agreement for Bosnia. We hope and pray that as our troops are deployed, the Bosnian people will seize the opportunity for justice and reconciliation, so that all the people of Bosnia can rejoin the community of nations as a free people. In Rwanda, success in restoring an acceptable standard of human rights will determine whether Rwandan refugees can return home in peace and safety, and rebuild shattered lives.

Maintaining international standards for human rights, promoting these standards, and encouraging their adoption where necessary remain a key aspiration of our Nation's policy. Let us resolve to continue our efforts to ensure for all the enjoyment of human rights.

HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to submit for the RECORD Ambassador Madeleine Albright's remarks on the human rights situation in Burma to the U.N. General Assembly Third Committee. I join Ambassador Albright's endorsement of the U.N. resolution to urge the Government of Burma to cease its violations of internationally recognized human rights.

I also want to take this opportunity to commend Ambassador Albright for her tremendous work on this issue. I encourage all Members to support the work of our U.N. Representative as she relentlessly pursues the cause of Burmese democracy leader Aung San Suu Kyi. Ambassador Albright had a great meeting in Burma this fall Aung San Suu Kyi.

Recent developments in Burma have given us cause for great concern. It is imperative that the governing State Law and Order Restoration Council understand that the United States and the international community will not tolerate threats or actions that suppress the advancement of the democratic movement in Burma.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY, THIRD COMMITTEE, HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATION IN BURMA, DECEMBER 11, 1995

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss my Government's decision to join consensus on the resolution concerning the human rights situation in Burma, despite some reservations that prevented us from cosponsoring.

The resolution reflects a tremendous effort by the Swedish mission to develop a strong consensus text, and my government endorses strongly the purposes and recommendations contained in that text,.

We join with the other members of this Assembly in urging the Burmese Government to cease its violations of internationally recognized human rights. And we urge the government to begin a substantive political dialogue with Aung San Suu Kyi, other democratic leaders and representatives of ethnic groups concerning the future of the country. These recommendations are at the heart of the Assembly resolution, and we believe the Government of Burma should respond favorably to them.

The Unites States was not able to cosponsor the resolution because of three issues that we believe could have been dealt with more precisely or urgently.

First, we would have tempered the language in paragraph 17, which welcomes the cessation of hostilities between the Government of Burma and various ethnic groups, because the Burmese Army has not fully honored those ceasefires.

Second, we believe the resolution should have included language similar to that adopted by the UN Human Rights Commission last spring, encouraging the Secretary-General to hold discussions with the Burmese Government for the purpose of stimulating progress towards democratization and national reconciliation.

Third, we believe specific mention should have been made of the International Labor Organization's decision last June to condemn Burma's continued use of forced labor and forced porterage, especially of members of ethnic minorities, for military and civilian infrastructure projects. The ILO recommends, and my government strongly agrees, that Burma should bring both its laws and its practices into compliance with internationally recognized standards of workers' rights.

Finally, we believe that more specific and urgent attention should have been given in the resolution to important events that occurred in Rangoon near the end of last month. I refer, of course, to the withdrawal and subsequent expulsion from the National Convention of delegates from the National League for Democracy.

The governing State Law and Order Restoration Council, or SLORC, has asked the world to view the Convention as a representative mechanism for drafting a new constitution and facilitating a transition to democracy. Clearly, it is not that if the National League for Democracy, which received 60 percent of the votes in the 1990 election, is not free to participate openly, freely and without fear of intimidation. We must remember that the SLORC handpicked all the delegates, greatly under-representing those from the democratic movement.

Following the release from detention last July of Aung San Suu Kyi, there were hopes that the National Convention would, in fact, become a meaningful forum for discussion about Burma's future. Instead, the Government has maintained its habit of rigid control, and the few representatives of the democratic movement and of the various ethnic groups have been prohibited from voicing dissenting views.

The SLORC has said that its goals for Burma include economic prosperity and multiparty democracy. Burma's democratic leaders share those goals. The General Assembly should continue to express strong and unyielding support for actions that would close the great divide that now exists between what the SLORC professes to want and what it has thus far been prepared to do.

In this connection, my Government also wants to express its very great concern about recent statements from Rangoon that brand Aung San Suu Kyi and her supporters as ''traitors'' and speak of ''annihilating'' those who criticize the National Convention. The SLORC should have no doubt that it will be held responsible for any actions that result in physical harm or unjust punishment against those who have simply engaged in the peaceful exercise of internationally recognized rights.

In closing, Mr. President, let me once again congratulate the Swedish mission for its leadership on this resolution. Let me restate my Government's strong endorsement of its core recommendations in support of human rights and a substantive political dialogue. And let me re-emphasize my Government's concern about recent events and its hope that the Government of Burma will reconsider its policies and begin now to move down a democratic path.

LET'S HEAR IT FOR QUEEN ISABELLA

HON. JON D. FOX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the following letter to the Editor in the Trenton Times on November 26, 1995.

LET'S HEAR IT FOR QUEEN ISABELLA

Nov. 26, 1504, is a milestone in history that should never be forgotten, especially by New Jerseyans and Pennsylvanians.

Why? Because that's the date that Queen Isabella of Castile, the great woman who was instrumental in the discovery of America, passed away at her castle in Medina del Campo, Spain.

A year ago, Nov. 6—yes, that far back and the news just reaching our shores—the worldwide BBC/TV in London aired a documentary for their ''Time-Watch,'' its peak-audience program, in which their scholarly panel exonerated Queen Isabella of Spain from historical lies attributed to her regarding the Inquisition.

That Queen Isabella did not act out of any anti-Semitic, racial or religious hatred or bigotry can be firmly substantiated by her unequivocal condemnation and personal interventions to stop riots and acts of violence against Spaniards of Jewish descent even before her formal accession to the throne, and sometimes at the loss of support of wealthy and influential partisans.

Lastly, an intelligent response to the long-time assault upon Queen Isabella and her legacy requires knowledge of the actual history of her now celebrated reign.

So, on this 491st anniversary of her death, let's tip our hats, and on April 22, her birthday, let's let loose with a big ''Ole.''—John Paul Paine, Philadelphia, PA.

EXPRESSING SORROW AT THE PASSING OF MRS. ELLA H. BECTON

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, It is with great sadness that I rise to announce the passing of Mrs. Ella H. Becton on December 11, 1995. Mrs. Becton formerly served as executive director of the Phillis Wheatley Association. At the time of her death, she was an associate on the staff of the Murtis H. Taylor Multi Services Center. With her passing, the Cleveland community suffers the loss of a dedicated human being. I want to share with my colleagues and others throughout the Nation some information concerning a special individual who touched the lives of many.

Ella Becton was the daughter of Ella H. Wilson and the late Kalep Wilson. She was reared in Birmingham, AL, and went on to earn a bachelor of arts degree in physchology from Wilberforce University. Ella earned a master's degree in psychology and rehabilitation counselling at Wayne State University. After completing her education, Ella Becton began her professional career at the Lapeer State Home and Training School for the Mentally Retarded in East Lansing, MI. She relocated to Cleveland, OH where she married Leroy Becton, and began working for Vocational Guidance Rehabilitation Services.

Ella Becton's most significant career challenge came when she was selected as executive director of the Phillis Wheatley Association. The association is one of the oldest social service organizations in the area. Under Mrs. Becton's leadership, the Phillis Wheatley Association reached out to the elderly population, families, and the youth of the community with services and programs to assist them. During her tenure, the organization developed a summer camp, an elderly meals program, a day care program, a music school, and the Youth Computer Center created in conjunction with Case Western Reserve University. Ella Becton was a dedicated individual who sought to improve the lives of others.

During her lifetime, Ella Becton also earned the respect and admiration of her colleagues and others throughout the community. She was the recipient of numerous awards and honors which recognized her commitment and dedication to service.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of Ella Becton brings to a close a life of love and compassion. Those of us who were the beneficiaries of her unselfish devotion will miss our friend and colleague. She was a woman of grace and dignity, and she was very special to all who knew her. I take this opportunity to express my sympathy to Ella's mother, Ella H. Wilson, and her loving husband, Leroy. I also extend my sympathy to her sons, Leroy, Jr., and Aaron, and other members of the Becton family. God has called Ella Becton home to rest, but she will always be in our hearts.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MEDICARE PREVENTIVE BENEFITS IMPROVEMENT ACT

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce the Medicare Preventive Benefits Improvement Act. This bill seeks to amend Medicare by adding new preventive benefits to the program—benefits that not only save lives, but improve quality of life, and will save Medicare expenditures in the long run.

My bill would improve Medicare by adding the following new benefits:

Mammography: The benefit would be expanded so that all women over age 50 would be eligible for yearly mammographies and the deductible is waived.

Screening pap smears and pelvic exams: Expands the benefit from the 3-year limitation so that women of childbearing age or at high risk of developing cervical cancer are eligible for yearly pap smears and cervical exams. The deductible is also waived.

Colorectal cancer screening: Adds procedures for the purpose of early detection of colorectal cancer. These tests would include: screening fecal occult blood test, screening flexible sigmoidoscopy, and colonoscopy for high risk individuals. The Secretary also would make a decision within two years about covering screening barium enemas as an alternative to flexible sigmoidoscopy or colonoscopy. In addition, changes in technology would be taken into account to update the benefit in future years.

Prostate cancer screening: Adds procedures for the purpose of early detection of prostate cancer in men. The tests would include a digital rectal examination and a prostate-specific antigen blood test. In addition, changes in technology would be taken into account to update the benefit in future years.

Diabetes screening benefits: Adds two new diabetes benefits. First, coverage of diabetes

outpatient self-management training services which teach people with diabetes how to properly care for their disease and avoid unnecessary medical complications. Second, Medicare would cover the costs of blood-testing strips as durable medical equipment.

Many of you should recognize this package of preventive benefits. It is the same as the benefits we included in the Democratic alternative Medicare proposal that was considered on the House floor earlier this year. In addition, the coalition budget proposal includes a similar package of benefits. President Clinton has also included a preventive benefits package in his new Medicare proposal.

Congress is currently facing the daunting task of making the most dramatic changes to Medicare ever contemplated. We keep hearing the words ''Medicare reform'' in relation to the variety of plans being put forth at this time. My contention is that if we are to accomplish real Medicare reform, we must make needed improvements to the program

Medicare is 30 years old and its benefit package shows its age. What I am proposing with these new benefits is not a major cost item for the program. Of course there will be an upfront investment in these new screening procedures—and we expect that cost to be around $2 billion over the next 7 years based upon CBO analysis of earlier versions of the bill. However, this is a small price to pay at the beginning compared to the benefits Medicare will reap in the long run by covering such procedures. As we all know, preventive medicine saves money as well as lives. Early identification of a disease allows less costly, more effective treatment techniques to be used.

For example, in the area of colorectal cancer, the second deadliest cancer in this country, 138,000 new cases will be diagnosed and 53,300 people will die from this disease this year. Most of these people will be Medicare beneficiaries. These patients often suffer through years of chemotherapy, surgery and hospitalization. In fact, the most recent data has shown that colorectal cancer has led to over 125,000 Medicare hospital admissions in one year. Each of these admissions led to costly diagnostic, surgical and medical therapeutic interventions. Surely, it is both more cost effective and more medically appropriate to prevent than to treat this disease.

To continue using colorectal cancer as the example, this disease is one of the most preventable and curable types of cancer when detected early. Most colorectal cancers develop from benign polyps. Finding and removing these polyps reduces the risk of developing cancer by 90 percent.

Screening for colorectal cancer and other preventive services included in this bill must be covered by Medicare if we hope to stem rising health care costs. We must not continue to be ''penny wise and pound foolish'' by covering the expensive treatments and ignoring preventive services. These efforts are supported by broad-range of organizations representing consumers and health professionals. The following organizations have endorsed our bill: the American Cancer Society, the American College of Gastroenterology, the American Gastroenterological Association, the American Nurses Association, the Digestive Disease National Coalition, the American Diabetes Association, the American Association of Clinical Urologists, the American Foundation for Urologic Disease, the American Urological Association, the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy, the Cancer Research Foundation of America, the Association of American Cancer Institutes, the Association of Pediatric Oncology Nurses, and the United Ostomy Association. I have also attached a letter to the congressional leadership signed by 15 organizations supporting the identical provisions included in my bill.

It is my hope that this legislation will be used as a model for the preventive benefit package that should be added to Medicare as we seek to reform the system. I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of this bill and look forward to continuing to work on this important issue as Congress grapples with the difficult task of reforming Medicare.

NOVEMBER 16, 1995.

Hon. ROBERT DOLE,
Majority Leader U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DOLE AND SPEAKER GINGRICH: In crafting the future Medicare system, the 104th Congress would be remiss to overlook the most significant key to the future health status of our nation's citizens—preventive health services. The undersigned organizations urge you to include preventive services coverage for Medicare recipients during the Reconciliation Conference.

When details of the draft Republican health plan first became known this summer, we applauded the foresight of Congressional policymakers for including Medicare payments for a small number of proven preventive health services. While we recognize the fiscal constraints dominating this first round of Budget Reconciliation decisionmaking, we urge your reconsideration of the critical omission of colorectal cancer screening, mammography expansions, pap smears and pelvic examinations, prostate cancer screening and reimbursement for diabetes care and education. We believe strong bipartisan support exists for including these limited preventive benefits under Medicare.

In revamping Medicare, now is the time to provide reimbursement for:

Annual mammography screening services for all women over the age of 49, without a twenty percent copayment.

Pap smear and pelvic exam screenings as well as clinical breast examinations for female Medicare beneficiaries, without copayments.

Colorectal screening services for Medicare beneficiaries, including screening of fecal-occult blood testing, flexible sigmoidoscopies and colonoscopies.

Prostate cancer screening for men.

Diabetes care and education, specifically the coverage of outpatient self-management training services and blood testing strips for diabetics.

We strongly urge that you include the above screening services as part of the revamped Medicare program. In the long run, providing preventive services to Medicare beneficiaries will save not only money, but more importantly lives. The Senate and House are uniquely poised to better the lives of millions of Medicare beneficiaries who stand so much to lose or gain from this historic legislative opportunity.

We respectfully request the opportunity to meet with you at your earliest convenience to discuss including these preventive benefits in the final package.

Sincerely,

American Cancer Society, American College of Gastroenterology, American Diabetes Association, American Foundation for Urologic Disease, American Public Health Association, Cancer Research Foundation of America, Digestive Disease National Coalition, Families Against Cancer Terror (FACT).

National Breast Cancer Coalition, National Coalition for Cancer Survivorship, The Oncology Nursing Society, The Association of Pediatric Oncology Nurses, The Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation, United Ostomy Association, The V Foundation.

A TRIBUTE TO HEMAYETUDDIN

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of the very finest diplomats with whom I have had the pleasure of working during my tenure as former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on Asia and the Pacific.

Hemayetuddin is truly an outstanding diplomat. He represents his country with dignity, pride, and warmth. His knowledge of the workings of the U.S. Congress and the American body politic would be impressive for a citizen of this country, nonetheless for a foreign diplomat. It was through cooperation with His Excellency Ambassador Humayun Kabir and his very able Minister Hemayetuddin that our Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held the very first hearing ever on ''The Other South Asia—Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Bhutan, and Afghanistan.''

Perhaps Hemayet's greatest contribution to diplomatic life in Washington is his passion for his native Bangladesh. It was through Hemayet and Ambassador Kabir that my staff and I first learned of the tremendous economic reforms and opportunities for American business in Bangladesh. It was from Hemayet and his colleagues that I learned of Bangladesh's commitment to a secular, pluralistic society. And it was from Hemayet and Ambassador Kabir that I learned of the tremendous commitment Bangladesh has made to improve child labor practices in a nation struggling to develop.

While Hemayetuddin is unquestionable a diplomat of the highest caliber, he is also one of the finest gentlemen it has been my pleasure to work with in Washington. He, his lovely wife, Zeenat Jahan, and their beautiful children have indeed left their mark on this town.

I know my colleagues and I on the House International Relations Committee will miss Hemayetuddin and Zeenat. We wish them well at their new post in Beijing. All of us who know and admire Hemayet fully expect to see him back in Washington as his Nation's Ambassador some day.

FOOD AID MUST CONTINUE, H.R. 2775

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have worked long and hard on the issue of world hunger. Key U.S. Government initiatives, like the Food for Peace and Food for Progress

Programs, are the cornerstones of our efforts to wipe out hunger.

Recently, the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development approached my committee, asking to extend the authorities of these programs which are set to expire at the end of this year. While a new farm bill would be the preferred way of extending the life of these programs, it is becoming clear that will not be possible during this session of Congress. I have been working with Chairman ROBERTS and Chairman LUGAR hopefully to preserve these programs while a new farm bill is finalized.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that has been cosponsored by the ranking Democratic member of our committee, Mr. HAMILTON of Indiana. It protects authorities for programs that directly save lives. For example, one-third of all Bosnians depend on this program for food. We can all agree that keeping the food flowing to Bosnia is a key part of our peace efforts in that region of the world.

This bill will extend the authority of the title II minimum tonnage requirements, the Food Consultative Group, the Food for Progress Act, and the authorities for Agricultural Exports to Emerging Democracies under the Food, Agriculture and Conservation Trade Act of 1990.

This bill is needed to keep these life-saving programs functioning while a new farm bill is finished. As chairman of the International Relations Committee, I will call on my committee to mark up this bill shortly. I will also work with the Agriculture Committees of both House and Senate as well as the administration to seek its swift passage in the Congress.

I request that the full text of H.R. 2775 be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

H.R. 2775

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480.

(a) LEVELS OF ASSISTANCE FOR TITLE II.—

(1) MINIMUM ASSISTANCE.—Section 204(a)(1)(E) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1724(a)(1)(E)) is amended by striking ''for fiscal year 1995'' and inserting ''for each of the fiscal years 1995 and 1996''.

(2) MINIMUM NON-EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE.—Section 204(a)(2)(E) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1724(a)(2)(E)) is amended by striking ''for fiscal year 1995'' and inserting ''for each of the fiscal years 1995 and 1996''.

(b) FOOD AID CONSULTATIVE GROUP.—Section 205(f) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1725(f)) is amended by striking ''1995'' and inserting ''1996''.

(c) EXPIRATION DATE FOR ASSISTANCE.—Section 408 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1736b) is amended by striking ''1995'' and inserting ''1996''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES UNDER THE FOOD FOR PROGRESS ACT OF 1985.

(a) EFFECTIVE AND TERMINATION DATES.—Section 1110 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (known as the ''Food for Progress Act of 1985''; 7 U.S.C. 1736o) is amended in subsection (k) by striking ''1995'' and inserting ''1996''.

(b) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE IN ADMINISTRATION OF FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—Section 1110 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1736o) is amended in subsection (l)(1) by striking ''1995'' and inserting ''1996''.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES FOR AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS TO EMERGING DEMOCRACIES UNDER THE FOOD, AGRICULTURE, CONSERVATION, AND TRADE ACT OF 1990.

Section 1542(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5622 note) is amended by striking ''1995'' and inserting ''1996''.

CROATIA'S VIOLATION OF HELSINKI PRINCIPLES

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, after nearly 4 years of war, the leaders of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Serbia have made a tangible commitment to peace. The Dayton peace agreement is, as Bosnian President Alija Izetbegovic stated, an unjust peace, but less unjust than the continuation of war. We can be hopeful, though, that the peace can be more just if there is international resolve to keep the signatories to the agreement in line with the commitments they have undertaken, not only in Dayton but, more broadly, in the OSCE and in international law.

Most of us recognize that the chief concern in this regard will be the adherence to the agreement on the part of the Serb militants who have engaged in aggression and genocide against non-Serbs, and have undertaken a massive propaganda campaign to garner support from the Bosnian Serb population. However, there is a real cause for concern regarding the recent policies and actions of Croatia, and the Bosnian Croats over whom it exercises control.

For example, since retaking last summer territory occupied by Serb militants, Croatian authorities have tolerated and even encouraged the harassment of fleeing Serbs, the looting and burning of their property, and the killing of dozens of Serbs—many elderly—who remained behind, in their homes. I commend my colleague and fellow Helsinki commissioner, FRANK WOLF, for taking the lead in raising this issue here in Congress.

Croatia held elections in October of this year in an effort to capitalize on military successes. By severely cutting back the representation of the Serb community in the parliament, the electoral process sent departed Serbs the message that they are not welcome back. At the same time, they sought to sway the loyalties of Croats from Bosnia and Herzegovina by giving them large representation in parliament. While observers concluded the elections to be free, controls on the media and other subtle manipulations of the electoral process made them less than fair.

Croatia states its readiness to cooperate with the International Tribunal in the Hague where alleged war criminals from the former Yugoslavia are to be tried, but in reality the Croatian Government has refused to do so. One indicted Bosnian Croat general, Tihomir Blaskic, was transferred to the Croatian Army rather than surrendered to the court, while Ivica Rajic, a Bosnian Croat commander indicted for his role in the slaughter of civilians at the village of Stupni Do; was just released from custody by Bosnian Croat authorities who were holding him for unrelated reasons.

Last Sunday's newspaper reported on the massive burning and destruction of property in Croat-controlled parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina that are to become parts of the Serb entity under the Dayton agreements.

These actions, Mr. Speaker, are an outrage. As chairman of the Helsinki Commission, and as a Member of Congress who condemned the Serb aggression to which the international community allowed Croatia to be a victim, I nevertheless find these acts in violation of Helsinki principles to be inexcusable. Tactically, they do more to validate the fears of the average Serb than the most efficient propaganda machine, and damage Croatia's image abroad. Strategically, they feed on a cycle of hate, and ensure that Croats will again someday be the victims of that cycle. Morally—above all, morally—they are reprehensible, and deserve our condemnation.

Beyond this expression, we should consider, for the new year, the implications of these policies on our relations with Croatia. If the burning, looting, and killing go on; if the indicted are not surrendered; if intolerance continues to dominate Government policy; then we cannot maintain the good, friendly relations with Croatia that we may nevertheless want. Our State Department may want to consider diplomatic action, such as the recalling of ambassadors, and possible economic actions as well.

Let there be no mistake about it, Serb aggression remains the main problem in the former Yugoslavia. That does not mean we can turn a blind eye to the violations of others.

VETERANS HOUSING, EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS, AND EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS BENEFITS ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1995

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House of Representatives voted for legislation to ensure continued assistance to our Nation's veterans. I voted for this bill, the Veterans Housing and Employment Rights Benefits Act, which would permanently extend programs which provide invaluable assistance to our Nation's veterans and military retirees.

The bill would extend a number of important home-loan programs. One such program permits veterans to negotiate for favorable interest rates and terms for mortgages. Another service allows veterans to get mortgage loans with interest rates fixed by the Department of Veterans Affairs. A third program extended by the bill allows veterans to secure mortgages for energy-saving improvements to their homes.

All of these services allow veterans, who often do not have the collateral or financial resources normally needed to purchase a home, a chance to pursue the American dream of owning and maintaining their own home.

Other programs reauthorized by the bill include the Homeless Veterans Employment Program, and the VA program providing housing assistance to homeless veterans. It also makes changes to current law to help veterans further and prevent discrimination against veterans—such as a measure ensuring that employers cannot force employees to use their vacation time to participate in military training programs.

I thank my colleagues, Chairman BOB STUMP and Representative SONNY MONTGOMERY, for bringing this important legislation to

the House floor. It is my hope that we shall soon see this bill signed into law.

THE STERLING FOREST

HON. WILLIAM J. MARTINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce, along with my colleagues RICHARD POMBO and FRANK LUCAS, the Federal Lands Prioritization Act of 1995. This legislation will sell idle public lands deemed pointless for Federal ownership and will use the proceeds to purchase Sterling Forest; therefore ending the funding deadlock that has existed in Congress with regard to Sterling Forest.

With the help of Representatives POMBO and LUCAS, I now introduce a bill that, not only saves Sterling Forest, but also specifies a funding source for its acquisition. Last week I heard of Representative FRANK LUCAS' desire to sell public lands in Oklahoma and approached Representative POMBO of the House Resources Committee to propose that Sterling Forest be the beneficiary of funds from those Federal lands being reverted to private ownership.

Together, we were able to propose a bill that makes the Federal land acquisition process more fiscally responsible, and sets a precedent that the Federal Government reprioritize its land holding policies and streamline its inventory to better target budget resources and meet environmental goals.

As a Passaic County Freeholder, I understood early on the need to take action to protect Sterling Forest. In fact, during my service on the Passaic County Board of Freeholders, the board was the first entity to secure part of Sterling Forest in 1993—purchasing 2,000 acres. I have since been looking forward to the day that the reserve would have complete Federal protection. Selling dead-weight public lands to buy Sterling Forest is a fiscally responsible solution to a decade-old stalemate.

Located in southern New York and bordering northern New Jersey, Sterling Forest, in its current undeveloped State, is important to the residents of both States for a variety of reasons.

Sterling Forest is a 17,500-acre water and recreational reserve that area residents and public officials have repeatedly requested the Federal Government protect. Stalls in the actual purchase have been attributed to budget-cutting times and the concern about adding more public land to the already bloated Federal Government inventory.

As a recreational area for New York and New Jersey, Sterling Forest offers a haven for families and individuals interested in leaving behind stresses of everyday life. The picturesque beauty of this natural sanctuary provides a wide variety of outdoor activities for the enjoyment of everyone. Sterling Forest even serves as a connections to the Northeast with the Appalachian trail winding its way through the forest's rough terrain.

Most importantly, however, Sterling Forest is a watershed for most of northern New Jersey and the surrounding area. It provides nearly 2 million New Jersey residents with clean and safe drinking water.

Proposed development and urbanization of this area will destroy a great bounty of natural resources to the entire Northeast. Furthermore, if the land is developed, the water that flows from Sterling Forest could become polluted. The only viable solution at that point would be to build a water treatment center at the cost of $150 million to New Jersey taxpayers. Not only would this cost the taxpayers revenue they just don't have, but it is, at best, a second-rate solution. Truthfully, Mr. Speaker, there is just no comparison between treated water and water from a natural watershed such as Sterling Forest.

Sterling Forest is an issue of national significance, involving one of Government's most essential functions: the preservation of a vital, life-sustaining resource—water. As stated before, Sterling Forest provides clean water for 2 million Americans in New Jersey alone—a fact that transcends any suggestion of parochial interests.

For this reason, an alliance of governmental agencies and public interest groups have joined together in the fight to save this vital resource. This legislation sets up a management and fiscal partnership between all levels of Government. In fact, purchasing this land is just a one-time expense. The Department of the Interior will not be burdened by the costs of managing and maintaining the forest, for this will be done jointly by New York and New Jersey. A partnership such as this of local, State, and Federal Government is positive for all involved and should serve as a model for future land acquisition. It is our responsibility to protect Sterling Forest and assure an ample water supply for generations to come.

It is important to note that there is a bipartisan consensus to save Sterling Forest. Senator BILL BRADLEY of New Jersey has already sponsored a bill in the U.S. Senate, Gov. Christine Todd Whitman of New Jersey signed the appropriation and authorization of $10 million toward the project, and Gov. George Pataki of New York approved the 1995–96 budget including $18 million for land conservation. Many members in the New Jersey delegation have been active in the collective pursuit of this achievement, and I commend them for all they have done.

The States and the Federal Government have been working to preserve this vital resource to insure that Sterling Forest is around to meet both the recreation and environment needs of the area. It is time that we realize our goals.

No matter how you look at this project, saving the forest yields no negative repercussions. The preservation of a vital source of water to one of the most populated areas of the country is not simply a laudable aspiration, but rather a necessary undertaking. Furthermore, the residents are opposed to development; the local governments are opposed to development; and the taxpayers are opposed to development.

Three sites totalling 56,000 acres will be put up for sale to the private sector: Optima ''Lake''—the failed flood control project, which now consists of a 17,000-foot earthen dam and a dry lake bed (13,500 acres), Black Kettle National Grasslands (30,710 acres), and Rita Blanca National Grasslands (13,576 acres). Both Black Kettle and Rita Blanca are odd-lot Federal tracts. These proceeds will be earmarked for the purchase of the Washita National Battlefield and Sterling Forest.

Please support this budget-friendly preservation of land that actually needs the Federal Government protection. Support the Federal Lands Prioritization Act of 1995.

EXTENDING AU PAIR PROGRAMS, H.R. 2767

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to extend the authorization for a program important to many American families. This measure renews the authority for the Au Pair program that expired on September 30. This bipartisan measure includes as original sponsors the ranking Democrat on the International Relations Committee, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Hamilton, the chairman of the International Operations and Human Rights Subcommittee, Mr. Smith of New Jersey the gentlelady from Maryland, Mrs. Morella, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Moran, the gentleman from California Mr. Baker, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Wolf, and the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Davis.

This measure will: Extend the authority for the program for 2 years; open it up to world wide participation; lift the limitation on the number of organizations that may participate and manage an au pair program; and, require the U.S. Information Agency to report on the compliance of the au pair organizations with recently adopted regulations.

Many families rely on the au pair program for their child care and particularly welcome the opportunity to broaden their children's experience by having someone from another country live with them for a year. The lapse in the program has caused untold inconvenience to many families turning their child care plans upside down. It is time to fix this problem.

Accordingly, I am pleased to be able to introduce this bipartisan bill and will seek rapid consideration by both Houses of Congress.

I request that the entire text of H.R. 2767 be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

H.R. 2767

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AU PAIR PROGRAMS.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 8 of the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–454) is repealed.

(b) AUTHORITY FOR AU PAIR PROGRAMS.—The Director of the United States Information Agency is authorized to continue to administer an au pair program, operating on a world-wide basis, through fiscal year 1997.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 1996, the Director of the United States Information Agency shall submit a report regarding the continued extension of au pair programs to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives. This report shall specifically detail the compliance of all au pair organizations with regulations governing au pair programs as published on February 15, 1995.

AMERICA'S FORGOTTEN ATOMIC HEROES

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to talk about forgotten heroes. As we contemplate sending United States troops to Bosnia, we would be well-served to remember the fates of those men and women known as Atomic Veterans. Most Americans, and maybe many of us here in Congress, are not aware that there exists today a group of veterans who were exposed to ionizing radiation while in the U.S. military in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, in the nuclear and thermonuclear tests in the Pacific, and the Nevada nuclear tests. Some were directly exposed, some were exposed by cleaning up contaminated sites, ships, or aircraft. Some, sadly, lost their lives. And, in the 50 years since nuclear testing began, many of our Atomic Veterans have fallen ill from exposure and, today, probably more than half of them are dead.

Our Government has recognized more than 40 cancers and conditions that are caused by exposure to ionizing radiation, but only the 13 named in PL100–321 and 2 in PL102–578 are deemed presumptive. Many of the Atomic Veterans don't think these laws go far enough. They tell me that the law we passed in 1984, PL93–542, under which most radiation claims are adjudicated, do not go far enough. They say, in fact, that we have a double standard. The Marshall Islands Nuclear Claims Tribunal Act of 1987, as amended, gives compensation to Marshall Islanders, presumptively, for cancers and conditions that are denied to U.S. servicemen. These veterans are exposed at the same time and places as the Marshall Islanders. Does that sound fair to you?

The President's Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments issued their final report of over 900 pages on October 3, 1995. President Clinton apologized on behalf of the United States for the human experiments performed on both civilians and the military. The report brought some long-overdue recognition by the executive branch of Government. Today, I would like to ask Congress to recognize the Atomic Veterans, throughout the country, for their valor and service. I know many of my colleagues join me in thanking them for their sacrifice, and I know many of you will join me in working with the Veterans Administration to equalize the standards for those veterans with radioactive cancers and diseases.

UNICEF: 49 YEARS AND COUNTING

HON. THOMAS M. BARRETT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1995

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for those of us lucky enough to grow up in an environment free of civil war and famine, it can be difficult to imagine the hardships that confront millions of children every day in places like Bosnia and Rwanda. At least 40 conflicts are currently raging throughout the world, and as a result, approximately 1.5 million children have been killed, more than 4 million disabled, 5 million forced into refugee camps, and 12 million rendered homeless.

The United Nations Children's Fund [UNICEF], a special program of the United Nations established on December 11, 1946, is dedicated to the health and welfare of children, who represent the future of our world. UNICEF's annual report on the State of the World's Children, released this week, highlights its success in combating disease, hunger, and death among the world's children.

UNICEF's immunization, sanitation, and nutrition programs have helped reduce child mortality rates by 50 percent in the last 30 years. Every year, UNICEF provides oral vaccines and other medicines that save the lives of 3 million children. In 1994, UNICEF's close cooperation with various international food programs helped feed 57 million hungry people.

Given the tight budgetary constraints presently facing the United States, we need to use our limited resources wisely. I believe that our interests include UNICEF programs benefitting millions of children in developing nations. I am pleased that this year's Foreign Aid appropriations bill would create the Child and Disease Program's Fund, to include such programs as AIDS prevention, nutrition, polio eradication, an infectious disease surveillance system, and funding for blind children.

One of the central principles behind the creation of UNICEF is that action taken today to prevent disease and malnutrition will save us money in future years. An example is the fight to eradicate polio. Although there have been no reported cases of polio in the Western hemisphere or in Europe for 3 years, experts estimate that funding for immunizations must continue for another 5 years to ensure that the disease is eliminated. Failure to contribute to this effort could lead to a resurgence of polio, and a drastic increase in the cost of combating the spread of disease.

UNICEF will celebrate its 50th anniversary in 1996. We should honor the successes of the last 50 years, but we must also prepare for the next 50 years. As we work for a better world for our children, UNICEF's programs are worthy of our continued support.

AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION ENDORSES MEDICAL USE OF MARIJUANA

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1995

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced legislation which would allow physicians to prescribe marijuana when in their judgment it is medically appropriate to do so. I first became a supporter of this legislation more than a decade ago, when it was introduced by our late colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut Mr. McKinney. I was recently advised of a resolution passed by The American Public Health Association which supports the concept embodied in the legislation I have introduced and I ask that this resolution be printed here.

ACCESS TO THERAPEUTIC MARIJUANA/CANNABIS

The American Public Health Association:

Being aware that cannabis/marijuana has been used medicinally for centuries and that cannabis products were widely prescribed by physicians in the United States until 1937; and

Being aware that ''marijuana'' prohibition began with the Marijuana Tax Act of 1937 under false claims despite disagreeing testimony from the AMA's representative; and

Being further aware that the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 completely prohibited all medicinal use of marijuana by placing it in the most restrictive category of Schedule I, whereby drugs must meet three criteria for placement in this category: 1) have no therapeutic value, 2) are not safe for medical use, and 3) have a high abuse potential; and

Being cognizant that the Drug Enforcement Administration's own administrative law judge ruled in 1988 that marijuana must be removed from Schedule I and made available for physicians to prescribe; and

Knowing that 36 states have passed legislation recognizing marijuana's therapeutic value; and

Also knowing that the only available access to legal marijuana which was through the Food and Drug Administration's Investigational New Drug Program has been closed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services since 1991; and

Understanding that while synthetic Tetrahydrocannibinol (THC) is available in pill form, it is only one of approximately 60 cannabinoids which may have medicinal value individually or in some combination; and

Understanding that marijuana has an extremely wide acute margin of safety for use under medical supervision and cannot cause lethal reactions; and

Understanding that marijuana has been reported to be effective in: a) reducing intraocular pressure in glaucoma; b) reducing nausea and vomiting associated with chemotherapy; c) stimulating the appetite for patients living with AIDS (acquired immunodeficiency syndrome) and suffering from the wasting syndrome; d) controlling spasticity associated with spinal cord injury and multiple sclerosis; e) decreasing the suffering from chronic pain; and f) controlling seizures associated with seizure disorders; and

Understanding that marijuana seems to work differently than may conventional medications for the above problems, making it a possible option for persons resistant to the conventional medications; and

Being concerned that desperate patients and their families are choosing to break the law to obtain this medicine when conventional medicines or treatments have not been effective for them or are too toxic; and

Realizing that this places ill persons at risk for criminal charges and at risk for obtaining contaminated medicine because of the lack of quality control; and

Realizing that thousands of patients not helped by conventional medications and treatments, may find relief from their suffering with the use of marijuana if their primary care providers were able to prescribe this medicine; and

Concluding that cannabis/marijuana was wrongfully placed in Schedule I of the Controlled Substances depriving patients of its therapeutic potential.

Recognizing the APHA adopted a resolution (7014) on Marijuana and the Law which urged federal and state drugs laws to exclude marijuana from classification as a narcotic drug; and

Concluding that greater harm is caused by the legal consequences of its prohibition than possible risks of medicinal use; therefore

1. Encourages research of the therapeutic properties of various cannabinoids and combinations of cannabinoids; and

2. Encourages research on alternative methods of administration to decrease the harmful effects related to smoking; and

3. Urges the Administration and Congress to move expeditiously to make cannabis available as a legal medicine where shown to be safe and effective and to immediately allow access to therapeutic cannibis through the Investigational New Drug Program.

WORLD HAS A CHOICE: FAMILY PLANNING OR CHAOS

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1995

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee on Foreign Operations I wanted to bring to everyone's attention once again an issue which we cannot ignore and which figured prominently in floor debate yesterday.

We cannot keep putting money toward economic assistance in developing countries without first addressing the population problem through family planning funding. Continuing to turn our backs on this issue and relying solely on development aid is like pouring water in a leaky bucket.

The Houston Chronicle recently ran an op-ed piece that address these concerns very well. I submit it now, for your consideration.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Dec. 11, 1995]

WORLD HAS A CHOICE: FAMILY PLANNING OR CHAOS

(By Werner Fornos)

As the year draws to a close, the consequences of rapid population growth in a world that already has more than 5.7 billion—79 percent of them living in the world's poorest countries and regions—are being brought into sharp focus.

Some 600,000 square miles of forest have been cut in the last 10 years, much of it attributable to the need for more living space and firewood, still the main source of cooking and heating fuel in the developing world.

Twenty-six billion tons of topsoil have been lost.

Regional fresh water supplies are dangerously low. Rivers are drying up and many lakes are at their lowest levels in history.

All 17 of the world's major fisheries are being exploited at or beyond their capacity.

Eighty-eight nations have been classified by the United Nations World Food Program as low-income, food-deficit countries, unable to grow or buy enough food to accommodate their inhabitants.

There are nearly 960 million illiterates in the world today, but 130 million children—including 90 million girls—are denied access to primary schooling.

About half a million women die every year of pregnancy-related causes.

All this in a world growing by nearly 100 million people a year.

Meanwhile, a myopic majority in the U.S. House of Representatives, overlooking these facts regarding the interrelationship between overpopulation, poverty, maternal and child mortality and environmental degradation, continues to confuse—either by design or denial—family planning with abortion.

The House has voted twice this year to deny funding to the United Nations Population Fund, the largest provider of multilateral population assistance to poor countries, so long as it continues to support voluntary family planning programs in the People's Republic of China. The rationale behind these votes is rooted in allegations that the Chinese national population program relies on coercive abortion, though not a dime of U.N. assistance to China has ever been found to finance abortion, forced or voluntary, there or anywhere else.

Ironically, the net effect of withdrawing U.S. assistance to the fund (the 1996 contribution request for that agency is $35 million) does little to penalize China. But it does needlessly punish women and children in the world's poorest countries that seek agency support and who are placed in harms way as potential victims of pregnancies that occur too soon, too frequently and too closely spaced.

In fact, there are an estimated 350 million couples in the world who do not have access to a full range of family planning services, and it has been conservatively estimated that 120 million of these couples would use these services if they were available.

But the irony does not stop there. The U.N. Population Fund's assistance to China and 140 other countries is primarily in the areas of establishing and strengthening the delivery of conventional modern family planning information, education and services. Under its mandate, the fund cannot be involved in the delivery of abortion services.

It should be remembered that China with 1.2 billion people, is the most populous country in the world. By the year 2030, the population of China is expected to consume an amount of grain equivalent to the entire world grain production of 1994.

The U.S. Senate, contending there is a sufficient safeguard in the existing prohibition against the U.N. agency using any funds in China that have been contributed by the United States, has rejected both efforts of the House of Representatives to cut off the contribution to the Population Fund.

The Senate apparently understands what the House cannot seem to grasp: Family planning is the first line of defense against abortion.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO U.S. TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

SPEECH OF

HON. SAM BROWNBACK

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I continue to oppose President Clinton's plan to deploy 20,000 United States troops to Bosnia. While I want to end the genocide that has plagued the Balkan Peninsula for the last 4 years, the administration's plan for achieving peace in Bosnia is severely flawed, and, I fear, destined to fail.

We would not be debating whether the United States should send troops to Bosnia if Presidents Bush and Clinton had not supported the misguided international arms embargo imposed upon Bosnia. If we had lifted the arms embargo several years ago and imposed a no-fly-zone over Bosnia, the outnumbered Bosnian Serb forces would never have achieved military superiority over the Bosnian Government troops.

Instead, we prevented the Bosnian Government forces from defending themselves while Serbia armed the Bosnian Serbs. This policy led to more than 200,000 deaths and created more than 2 million refugees.

Having suffered the consequences of one bad policy decision, we now face another. However, this time, we are risking not only more Bosnian lives, but American lives as well.

The greatest flaw in the administration's current strategy is that peace has not yet been achieved. There will be no peace as long as there are 4,000 or more foreign Moslem fighters in Bosnia. There will be no peace as long as the Bosnia Croats refuse to fully cooperate with the International War Crimes Tribunal. In addition, there will be no peace as long as rank-and-file Bosnina Serbs continue to oppose the peace plan.

All sides in this conflict have a considerable amount of work to do before peace can be achieved. Until all of the parties demonstrate their commitment to ending the bloodshed, long-term peace will not be possible, regardless of the number of troops that are used to separate the warring parties.

As long as there is no meaningful peace, United States troops deployed in Bosnia will serve as convenient targets for rogue units frustrated by their inability to attack their real enemy. Even though, as Commander in Chief, the President has the constitutional authority to commit United State soldiers to Bosnia, I cannot support a plan that does not minimize the risks to, and maximize the security of, our troops, especially a deployment that is not vital to our national security interest.

I fully support every man and woman who has volunteered to serve in our armed services. I have the greatest admiration for these men and women, and they enjoy my unequivocal support, whether they are here or abroad. By deciding to deploy our troops in Bosnia under the current plan for a mission that is not vital to our national security interests, the President has not properly minimized the risks in military duty, and has jeopardized the credibility that our political leaders enjoy with our Armed Forces.

TRIBUTE TO MARCIN GORA

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1995

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a young and talented individual from my home State of Michigan, Marcin Gora of Shelby Township. Marcin recently traveled to Lyon, France, where he competed in the International Vocational Training Competitions [IVTC] as part of Team USA.

Team USA was fielded by the Vocational Industrial Clubs of America [VICA]—a national organization of students in public high schools

and college vocational-technical institutions. This year's team was composed of 14 of America's best future workers and they competed against 28 other countries in the Biennial IVTC. They achieved the highest overall team score in the history of the United States' participation—a world-class standing.

At a time when some are questioning America's ability to compete, our placement at this competition illustrates that American workers can and will compete with any nation. Without a doubt, Marcin Gora is indeed exceptional, but he epitomizes the abilities and skill level that all Americans can and should achieve. With the support of organizations like VICA and the efforts of people like Marcin Gora, we will continue to lead the world in the development of new technologies and the production of world-class products and services.

I congratulate Marcin Gora and all the members of Team USA for their outstanding performance at the International Vocational Training Competitions. I urge my colleagues to support them as they work to ensure that America remains the industrial leader of the world.

PENN HILLS HIGH SCHOOL 1995 AAAA FOOTBALL CHAMPIONS

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1995

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Penn Hills High School Indians who won the 1995 Pennsylvania AAAA Varsity Football Championship. This past Saturday, December 9, at Altoona's Mansion Park Stadium, they defeated Lower Dauphin High School by a score of 35 to 14. The team was undefeated, 15 and 0, this season and this is the first time in history that this high school football team, which is located in the 18th Congressional District in western Pennsylvania, won the State championship.

Not to take sides between last year's champions, the McKeesport High School football team, also in my district, but what makes this championship especially important is that USA Today ranks the Penn Hills team as the No. 5 high school football team in the United States.

Congratulations to the players, the coaching staff, the supportive student body and families, and the Penn Hills community. I share your pride and claim the appropriate bragging rights on Capitol Hill. Keep up the team spirit and the motivation to succeed.

RADIO PIONEER BILL ZAK RETIRES FROM KTRH

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1995

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to salute Bill Zak, radio pioneer who will soon retire after 45 years as a newscaster and host of ''Gardenline,'' a 6 day-a-week call-in gardening show on radio station KTRH Houston, TX.

Bill Zak joined the staff of KTRH in 1951—a year before I was born—after graduating from Texas A&M University, which I now proudly represent. Early in his career, Bill was assigned to the KTRH news department, and for a time he anchored the ''KTRH Morning News'' show with another budding journalist: Dan Rather.

But it was gardening knowledge that Bill had, and it was gardening advice Houstonians needed. Few relationships have been so mutually beneficial.

As you may know, gardeners in the greater Houston era endure torrential rains that can last for days; flooding; hurricanes; harsh heat and high humidity; and, occasionally, freezing cold. This variety creates a great many potential gardeners, but prevents many more from ever turning a spade of soil.

For many, many years Bill Zak has rescued frustrated gardeners from botanical catastrophes, and has turned potential gardeners into actual gardeners. His expert advice and guidance have helped tens of thousands of Houstonians turn bare, sun-scorched lawns into oases of beauty.

But Bill has done far more during his four and a half decades of broadcasting. During Hurricane Alicia, which hit Houston hard in 1983, Bill served as one of KTRH's primary voices—providing hundreds of thousands of listeners with life-saving information that enabled our community, and its residents, to get through that disaster. It was just one more instance of journalistic excellence that has made KTRH the authoritative radio news station in the Texas Gulf coast region, and it was just one more example of Bill Zak's commitment to his station and his community.

I'm not sure how he managed to find the time, but Bill is also an author. His book, ''Critters,'' is a popular pictorials encyclopedia of the native insects of Texas—and there are plenty of them. He also has authored a similar publication in Florida.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Zak's last day on the air at KTRH will be Friday, Dec. 22. I know that you join with me in wishing Bill and his wife of many years, Jean, well in the years ahead as they enjoy their retirement in the Houston area. I understand that following his retirement, Bill plans to spend his time reading, traveling, possibly writing another book and—not surprisingly—gardening. While he claims to be retiring, there are many Houstonians who know that old habits are hard to break and who suspect Bill's voice may yet be heard again on KTRH—providing news or gardening advice to his tens of thousands of loyal, longtime listeners.

SWEARING IN OF JESSE L. JACKSON, JR.

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1995

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day for myself, the 2nd Congressional District of Chicago and all of America. Jesse L. Jackson, Jr. has the resounding qualities of humility, honesty, a willingness to work in behalf of those who cannot fight for themselves. He can walk proudly with kings and with the same ease walk humbly with the common man.

I am proud and appreciative of the Jackson family. Many years ago, his father Jesse L. Jackson, Sr. stood beside me tirelessly during a time of my own personal tribulation. The son of a man who so gallantly stood by me can be nothing less than a warrior and a man of impeccable spirit.

Greatness is a by-product of working with the disenfranchised. One who has worked and fought so diligently for the less fortunate will naturally develop a sense of compassion, commitment, and integrity. Thus, I am certain that Jesse L. Jackson, Jr. will serve not only as a capable Representative but will also be a shining example of statesmanship.

Without equivocation or hesitation, I give my whole-hearted welcome and praise to Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., who I am certain will serve the people of the 2d Congressional District of Illinois with passion, zeal, and integrity.

Jesse, I look forward to working with you and beside you in representing the people of Illinois. May God continue to bless you.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1995

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, due to the death of a close personal friend, I was absent during the following rollcall votes. Had I been present I would have voted as follows: On 847 ''yea'', 846 ''nay'', 845 ''yea'', 857 ''nay'', 856 ''nay'', 855 ''yea'', 854 ''nay'', 853 ''yea'', 852 ''nay'', 851 ''nay'', 850 ''nay'', and 849 ''nay''.

I would ask unanimous consent that these votes be placed in the appropriate place in the permanent RECORD.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WALLY HERGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1995

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, December 13 on rollcall vote No. 850, H.R. 1868, the conference report making appropriations for Foreign operations for fiscal year 1996, I was inadvertently recorded as a ''yes'' vote.

CONGRATULATIONS TO GEORGE AND MABEL SHREVES ON THEIR 75TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1995

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark a truly special occasion. George and Mabel Shreves, of Karnak, IL, will celebrate their 75th wedding anniversary on December 18. It is with great admiration that I offer them my best wishes.

A diamond anniversary is not a common event. Such an occasion is more than just a testament to the Shreves' commitment to each other. Their life together exemplifies the beauty that marriage is meant to symbolize, and gives real meaning to words such as dedication and devotion. Since their wedding day in

1920, they have witnessed the changing of our Nation—a World War, the challenge of the Last Frontier, 15 Presidents, and the anticipation of a new century. However, through these many transformations, their union has been a brilliant fixture.

Mr. Speaker, the Shreves are a shining example to all Americans about the value of a loving family, and I am proud to represent them in Congress. It is my hope that they have many more years of happiness.

MEDICARE AND THE ILLUSIONS OF PROTECTION

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1995

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Robert Goldberg ran in the Washington Times on December 6, 1995. Mr. Goldberg does an excellent job of explaining why the current Medicare system is in dire need of an injection of quality-based competition and incentives. As the Medicare debate continues, I commend this article to my colleagues:

MEDICARE AND THE ILLUSIONS OF PROTECTION

(By Robert M. Goldberg)

For all the rhetoric about how the Republican plan will bring misery and financial hardship to millions of Medicare beneficiaries, the fact is you couldn't design a better system than the current one to achieve that goal.

Medicare's financial problems are largely the direct result of its subpar treatment of the chronically ill. In particular, seniors bear an unnecessary financial and medical burden in the form of higher out-of-pocket expenses and costly supplemental health insurance.

Worse, because Medicare pays for all care regardless of its quality and outcome, the elderly—thinking that Medicare offers them health security—are actually spending billions on health care services that add nothing to their well-being. Those who are fighting Medicare reforms are perpetuating a system that makes the elderly sicker than they have to be for longer periods of time than they should.

At the heart of the problem are Medicare's price controls which get people out of hospitals quicker (so providers can keep the difference between what they spend and what Medicare pays for), but leaves them sicker as a result. For example, a University of California at Los Angeles medical school study of seniors hospitalized for depression found that Medicare's price controls led to more care without any additional benefit to patients. The income doctors and hospitals lost because of price controls was made up by increasing the volume of services provided.

Similarly, sub-optimal care has contributed to the 20-percent-a-year growth in home health services under Medicare. For instance, studies show that Medicare regulations increase the number of elderly with hip fractures that were discharged before they were fully well. As a result, more people had to rely on home health care or be sent to nursing homes for longer periods of time after the fracture. And a Rand Corp. study found that Medicare's regulations increased by 50 percent the chances that patients will be sent home in an unstable condition. The number of patients remaining in nursing homes one year after the fracture suggests that their quality of care had deteriorated. Overall, a study of a national sample of Medicare patients found that patients are more likely to be sick or die after discharge than they were before the current set of Medicare regulations were imposed.

In fact, because premiums and deductibles have not increased for more than a decade, Medicare only provided the illusion of protection. And, the elderly pay a hidden tax in the form of higher out-of-pocket expenses and supplemental insurance coverage called Medigap, due to Medicare's mismanagement of medicine.

There is a little evidence that the additional coverage increases well-being. Seniors with Medigap spend up to 70 percent more on health care than seniors with Medicare coverage alone, regardless of their health status. These are the dirty little secrets that defenders of the current Medicare system will never reveal to America's seniors.

Medicare can be and is being made less expensive with medical innovations that make it more humane and more responsive. One such effect is the Healthy Seniors Program, created by The Carondolet Health Plan, in Tucson, Ariz. Gerry Lamb, the director of the program notes it is designed for the ''elderly with serious chronic illness, those who constitute the highest costs, fastest growing health service group.'' Healthy Seniors provides examinations, service and individual assistance to reduce the incidence of serious and expensive episodes of illness. The result is dramatic: Participation in the Healthy Seniors program use fewer medical services than those who do not, saving nearly $6,000 per patient each year. Notes Mr. Lamb, who is a nurse practitioner: ''There are huge dollars to be saved from dealing with chronic illness early, rather than in the hospital and emergency rooms''.

In fact, the proposition that better care saves money is the foundation for transforming entire private sector health care system. The Business Heath Care Action Group (BHCAG), a coalition of 21 of the largest employers in Minnesota, provides a dramatic example of such initiatives. Starting in 1997, BHCAG's 1.5 million employees and retirees will be given vouchers that will be used to purchase health care from different groups. Medical providers will have to furnish consumers with patient-level information on how they improve the health of people with chronic conditions which afflict the elderly most such as stroke, hip fractures, heart disease and arthritis. BCHAG projects that with a greater investment in quality, the voucher system will be able to reduce the rate of spending 5 percent to 15 percent each year compared to other managed care approaches.

Rhetoric and emotion aside, quality-based competition and incentives are at the heart of the GOP plan. Such quality-driven reductions in spending are possible if Medicare is dramatically changes. Providers need to be placed at risk for making such savings while at the same time they are required to compete for business in terms of the quality of care they can offer. The Republican Medicare plan isn't perfect, but it does take health care for seniors in this direction.

As for Democratic and federally funded senior group efforts to save Medicare as we know it, they condemn this generation of elderly and the next to substandard care. House speaker Newt Gingrich is right: The faster the government-run Medicare program withers on the vine, the sooner it will stop taking dollars out of the pockets of seniors in order to prop up an obsolete health plan that undermines their quality of life.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO U.S. TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

SPEECH OF

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to articulate my position on the President's policy of sending 20,000 American troops to Bosnia.

I oppose, and have voted consistently in Congress to oppose, the introduction of United States ground troops into Bosnia. I do not believe that American soldiers should be on the frontlines of a multiethnic, quasi-religious conflict that dates back several hundred years. My position has been that we should have lifted the arms embargo against the Bosnians long ago, so that they could have defended themselves against Serbian aggression and helped put an end to the slaughter. It was clear that one reason the three parties came to the table in Dayton was the increasing strength of the Bosnian resistance.

I believe that this war, which has raged for 3 years with massive losses of life, is in the heart of Europe and is primarily a European responsibility. That is why I have opposed sending our soldiers into the heart of Bosnia to police the peace agreement signed in Dayton.

Let me make it clear, however, that I do believe the United States has a responsibility to our NATO allies and the world to assist in this effort. This terrible slaughter can and should end, and our diplomatic efforts to bring about a peace agreement have been admirable. With a real, signed agreement at hand, our European allies would use our air support, intelligence capability, and humanitarian efforts to accomplish this mission.

Unfortunately, the President believes the United States has a responsibility to put our soldiers—along with the French and the British—on the Bosnian frontlines. It is a policy I do not agree with.

Today, we are voting on three different resolutions.

The Dornan resolution would cut off funding to the troops stationed in Bosnia, some of which are already in or on their way to that country.

The Skelton resolution would express opposition to this policy, in particular the introduction of ground troops into Bosnia, but would also express support for our troops there.

Finally, the Hamilton resolution would express approval for the President's policy of sending ground troops to Bosnia and unequivocal support for the men and women of the United States Armed Forces who have been stationed there by their Commander in Chief, President Clinton.

I oppose the Dornan resolution for two reasons: First, our troops are on their way to Bosnia with some already in the Balkans, and to cut off their funding while they are in Bosnia would put them in serious danger; and second, the President has said he would veto the legislation if approved by the Congress, and given that fact, passage of this particular resolution would tell our troops, our soldiers, that they do not have the full support of the American people or their representatives. That is

reminiscent of Vietnam and a wrong message to send to our troops.

However, given my opposition to ground troops in Bosnia, I will support the Skelton-Buyer resolution. The President has the authority to dispatch these troops just as President Bush dispatched troops to the Middle East in 1990. However, I have an obligation to let the President know that I disagree with this policy. I have voted consistently against this policy and believe it is not in the best interest of our Nation.

Finally, I cannot support the Hamilton resolution, which expresses support for the President's Bosnia policy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the President's policy. I believe the United States should lend air and other support to our European allies, to enforce this peace agreement. However, as our troops are now stationed or en route to Bosnia, I believe the Congress has a responsibility to let the President know that public opinion is extremely wary of his policy. He should also know that at the first opportunity, we should bring home our troops and let Bosnian soldiers take their place, a policy I believe we should have implemented all along.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO U.S. TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

SPEECH OF

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, for me, the most important priority is to support our servicemen and women. The President has made the decision, and while I am angry that he made it without consultation with Congress and the American people, we need to back them 100 percent.

Our actions tonight should send this message loudly and clearly to them as they prepare to go. Because 25 years ago, I was one of them in Vietnam. I was sent on a mission that bitterly divided this country and this House.

But I learned then, as I know now, that our troops deserve nothing less than the undivided support of this House and all the resources necessary to support their mission.

Please support the Buyer resolution.

We have all seen vivid and shockingly graphic pictures from Bosnia, but my visit there made the issue intensely human. I spoke with our troops on their way to the region from Germany, met with the Balkan leaders, wore a flak jacket, and took a bumpy bus ride into war-torn Sarajevo. No doubt, watching CNN and seeing things live are completely different. No longer is this a civil war in a faraway land, it is 32,000 American troops going into a historically troubled region as peacemakers.

President Clinton made that decision. He made it without congressional approval, but as Commander in Chief he has the authority to do this. In fact, it became clear that he made this decision long ago, since we learned from our troops that their training for this mission began more than 6 to 8 months prior to the Dayton peace talks. We are going to Bosnia, and in some areas our soldiers are already there.

On November 30, I was selected to join a bipartisan congressional delegation to survey the Bosnian situation. Our trip was organized in response to concerns in Congress that the White House had not kept us informed of this major policy decision in a proper and timely manner. Indeed, State Department and Pentagon officials were dispatched to Capitol Hill just 1 day before we boarded our plane to Serbia.

We went with objectives—ours was a true fact-finding mission. Before leaving, we were briefed by Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, the chief U.S. negotiator at the Dayton peace accords. We were to meet with Serbian, Bosnian, and Croatian leaders to solidify their support for the peace accord and to get their assurances that United States forces would be protected. Our foremost objective was to verify that our troops would have the training, equipment, and resources necessary to defend and protect themselves.

We met with Serbian President Milosevic, Croatian President Tudjman and Bosnian President Izetbegovic. They remain committed to the peace agreement, pledged their support of protection for U.S. troops, and shared the fact that their citizens were truly weary from war. They said Americans were considered to be even-handed and that our military presence was vital for peace. Despite their words, they remain suspect due to past broken promises, and because facts show that these were indeed the very warmakers that caused 250,000 deaths in over 3½ years of ethnic and religious strife. As President Reagan used to say, ''trust but verify.''

Our trip to Sarajevo is one I'll never forget. We landed at the airport which was little more than a small pitted concrete platform surrounded by sandbags and bunkers. After an escort of U.N. armored vehicles was assembled, we boarded a bus and headed toward the city. We went through four Bosnian Serb armed checkpoints and saw defused land mines along the roadside which had previously lined our path. Along our well-protected route, the pictures came to life—buildings blown apart, people milling around, and everywhere burned out buses, trolleys, and cars. The 8-mile trip took almost 45 minutes.

What was left of the architectural beauty of structures from the time of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, or the towering high-rise buildings built during Marshall Tito's 30-year-reign, was now a twisted combination of bombed-out building shells, collapsed factories, or acres of roofless and pockmarked houses. Sarajevo is undoubtedly a scarred survivor.

I remember, too, the stories of no food, heat, or fresh water, and the chilling testimonials of snipers killing pedestrians in the street and marketplace. There were constant reminders of the 2½ million refugees who were either burned and bombed out of their houses and communities, or simply fled the area with terror.

After this eye-opener, we flew to Naples, Italy, for a briefing by the U.S. Southern Commander of NATO forces, Adm. Leighton Smith. He told us that our troops would be able to defend themselves, would be fully equipped, and that the military mission was limited to a year. ''American troops would be enforcing a peace'', he said, ''not fighting a war.'' He was honest, however, and reminded us that this mission was not without risk.

Our final stop was the most moving—meeting with our young soldiers in Germany who will go to Bosnia in mid-December. I had lunch with two soldiers from New Jersey, one a very young woman, perhaps early 20's, from Burlington County and the other a slightly older man from Bergen County. Both were professional, well-trained, and motivated. Still, I sensed apprehension—the same apprehension I felt 25 years ago as a young private headed to Vietnam.

This encounter placed everything in perspective and literally put a human face on this situation. For me, the most important priority for us is to support our servicemen and women. They are Americans, with over 80,000 family members on the homefront.

No question, the President should better define our national interest in Bosnia and explain what our total commitment will be. I feel he has an obligation to the families of our troops and all Americans to outline the specific objectives of this mission.

But while we can argue about his policy, which I do remain skeptical about, the fact is that the decision has been made and American soldiers, our soldiers, are going. And since they are going, we need to support them 100 percent. They deserve nothing less.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE WILLIAM B. HARVARD, SR.

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1995

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise today to pay tribute to a great architect and an even greater man. On December 11, the citizens of St. Petersburg, FL, lost William B. Harvard, Sr., a warm and devoted family man and an extremely talented architect who left his unique mark on the skyline of west central Florida.

William Harvard left his home building business in 1941 to serve his country and fight for freedom during World War II. Upon returning, he reopened his offices in St. Petersburg and quickly established himself as a valued member of the community, joining several church and service organizations.

In 1959, he became a founding partner of Harvard, Jolly, Clees and Toppe Architects. Mr. Harvard and his associates proceeded to design many of the major structures in the St. Petersburg area. Colleagues stated that he was a remarkable man, always considering Florida's environment in his designs.

His environmentally conscious architecture is embodied in his design of the pier in St. Pete, the incredibly unique inverted pyramid, that became the focal point for the view down Second Avenue north towards Tampa Bay. As in all of his structures, people marveled at the uniqueness of the design of the pier.

Though unique, the design was also quite functional. He was quoted as saying that his goal was to ''preserve the open views from pier level and have an open, tropical feeling and yet be protected from the elements.'' Anyone who has seen the pier knows he was successful in this endeavor.

He said his buildings should have a certain uniqueness, ''otherwise they would just be warehouses.'' His design of the Williams Park Bandstand won national awards, including the award of merit from the American Institute of Architects, the highest court of American architecture.

The blue and green glass canopy, designed to provide shelter while letting the natural light shine through, also received the test of time award from the Florida Association of the American Institute of Architects.

Mr. Speaker, William Harvard lost his battle with cancer this week at the age of 84. His legacy, however, will be with us for many years to come, as the monuments he built will stand as a tribute to a man who used his numerous talents to enrich the lives of many.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO U.S. TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

SPEECH OF

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hamilton resolution, and in opposition to H.R. 2770 and H. Res. 302. I, like most Americans, still have concerns about the deployment of United States troops in Bosnia-Herzegovina, but I believe that we need to support our troops.

I visited the former Yugoslavia in 1993. That visit alerted me to the dangers of American involvement in the conflict that has consumed the former Yugoslavia for the last 4 years. The animosities are profound, the terrain is difficult, and the underlying problems are political rather than simply military. Nevertheless, the Dayton Agreement is the last chance for a peaceful resolution of this war, and that Agreement rests on the participation of NATO as the implementation force. As a member of NATO, the United States is faced with a choice between making peace work or letting the contending forces slip inexorably back into the abyss of war.

I believe that the vast majority of Americans want us to choose peace. But they also want us to ensure that our involvement is limited in scope, complementary to the efforts of our European allies and not a substitute for their involvement, militarily prudent, and consistent with our national security interests.

Over the past few weeks, I have expressed these concerns to the administration. In particular, I have stressed the need for a more detailed exit strategy for disengagement of our forces, the need to ensure that we do not shoulder a disproportionate burden, the need to clearly identify our interests in the region and, most importantly, the need to take every reasonable precaution to protect our forces.

The administration has responded with a more focused and compelling discussion of their plans. They have laid out a more detailed exit strategy. They have made a more convincing case that the scale of American involvement is justified by the mission and by the comparative strengths of United States Military Forces versus those of our allies. Although I remain skeptical of claims that our national interest is implicated because our prestige is on the line or the survival of NATO is at stake, I do feel that a resumption of fighting could precipitate an expansion of the conflict. Such a development, with its very real potential to involve Greece and Turkey, would pose a significant threat to our national interest.

The administration and our military leaders have made repeated assertions that the forces are well trained, the mission is well defined, the rules of engagement are clear and permissive of preemptory action, and that more than adequate resources are available for our forces. Moreover, they have stressed that the primary mission of our forces is self-protection. These factors, and particularly the testimony of professional military officers, strengthens the claim that we have taken all reasonable precautions to protect our forces. Nevertheless, given the nature of this mission and the hostile environment of the former Yugoslavia, no one can rule out the possibility of casualties.

Although the foregoing efforts by the administration to justify the deployment of American ground forces have allayed opposition to the commitment of American forces, significant concerns remain. It will be incumbent upon the Congress to ensure that the limited scope and definite duration of the mission is maintained. It will be incumbent upon the Congress to ensure that our forces are continuously protected. These concerns will persist beyond this vote until our forces are withdrawn from Bosnia.

The Hamilton resolution clearly expresses our support for our forces while signaling our concerns. It is the right message to send to our forces and to those in the former Yugoslavia that may wish them harm. It stands in stark contrast to H.R. 2770 which would cut off all funding for United States Forces in Bosnia. This measure would put our forces already in Bosnia at risk. It would end any chance of a peaceful settlement of the conflict. It is a reckless and politically expedient measure unworthy of the American soldiers who are ready to do their duty. The Hamilton resolution is also in contrast to H. Res. 302 which opposes the President's policy while purporting to support the troops. Serious and sincere opposition to a policy requiring the deployment of American forces is incompatible with wishing them well on their mission. Rather, it represents a political straddle.

Finally, it is important to note that today's vote is not about authorizing the commencement of offensive operations by United States Forces. It is about peacekeeping. Our forces are entering a dangerous arena, but one in which the parties have already initiated a peace agreement. The President's constitutional authority to order our forces into Bosnia has not been seriously challenged. Thus, this vote is about our support of peacekeeping and our support of our forces. I believe that both are worthy of our support and, in the days ahead, our hard and unyielding scrutiny to ensure that neither the peace nor our soldiers are sacrificed needlessly.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2099, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1995

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the VA–HUD appropriations conference report.

Unfortunately, the conferees wasted their opportunity to improve this bill and once again present us with legislation that makes dangerous and unnecessary cuts to environmental and housing programs that protect American families and communities.

For example, the bill cuts environmental program funds by 21 percent, crippling the EPA's ability to enforce laws which help ensure the safety of the water we drink and the air we breathe.

The bill also cuts housing program funding by 21 percent, including cuts to many vital public housing programs and homeless services.

The cuts in public housing operating and modernization funds, will significantly hamper the ability for housing providers to deliver safe housing for American families.

Furthermore, by reducing the number of newly available section 8 housing vouchers, the bill increases the potential for increased homelessness among the thousands of families and children who are waiting for housing assistance.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and the potential pain and suffering it will inflict on many American families. Vote ''no'' on the conference report.

OPENING OF EVERGREEN COURT SENIOR HOUSING PROJECT

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1995

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, as of tomorrow, Bergen County will be a better place to live. Our community's quality of life will take another step forward when the Christian Health Care Center in Wyckoff cuts the ribbon and lays the cornerstone on its new 33-unit supportive senior housing project at Evergreen Court. For more than a few people participating in the ceremony, this marks the culmination of a long time dream of the Christian health care community.

We are all very much aware that New Jersey has more senior citizens than just about every other State in the Union. Indeed, the number of Americans over age 65 is the fastest growing segment of our population. With Evergreen Court, the Christian Health Care Center is adapting to meet the needs of our community.

This is an innovative independent living project that allows our older neighbors to maximize the enjoyment and vitality of their later years. From my long work in senior housing and health care reform, I know that independent living enhances the quality of life and

allows older citizens to continue to contribute and enjoy a community of their peers.

And this is truly a community effort. The county of Bergen provided over $1 million through funds provided by U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Home Program. This Federal-county partnership funding included a challenge that the private sources match the funds. Of course, our community responded as it always does, with generous donations and the support of NatWest Bank.

On this occasion, the words of former Vice President and Senator Hubert Humphrey come to mind: ''The moral test of government is how the government treats those who are in the dawn of their life, the children, and those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly.''

With this ribbon-cutting, our community and the Christian Health Care Center, specifically, is meeting this standard. Moreover, these actions should be an example to all civic groups and, I submit, to our national leadership.

In Washington today, we are engaged in a great national debate about the quality of life for our children and their children. In fact, this may be the defining moment for our generation. We all recognize that we can and we must make our government live within its means. But this must not be done at the expense of the most vulnerable in our society—those in the dawn of life and those in the twilight of life.

We can accomplish historic budget reforms, restore good jobs, create a bright future for our children and still show heart to the most needy in our society. To do less would be to violate some of the moral beliefs we hold most dear.

Our Lord, Jesus Christ, warned of the consequences of failure to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and care for the sick. ''Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me.''

Mr. Speaker, the Christian Health Care Center is realizing its dream today with the formal opening of its Evergreen supportive senior housing project. I would urge my colleagues to take note and join me in commending the leadership of the center and the citizens of Wyckoff.

Today, Bergen County is a better place to live because our seniors have another place to call home.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO U.S. TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

SPEECH OF

HON. TERRY EVERETT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, Caspar Weinberger, Secretary of Defense under the Reagan administration, developed a much touted six-point test that must be satisfied before the use of military force is warranted. The first, and perhaps most important point of the test is ''does the United States have vital, national interests at stake.'' The answer in Bosnia is clearly no. The international community has allowed the most recent fighting of this centuries-old civil war to carry on for nearly 3 years before air strikes directed by the United Nations were ordered. Now, some 4 years later, President Clinton has decided to assume Europe's responsibility and help bolster NATO's standing by sending United States troops into a tentative and unwarranted peacekeeping mission.

To conduct a peacekeeping mission successfully and safely, the peacekeepers must be perceived as neutral by the warring parties. How can United States forces be seen as neutral when U.N. air strikes against Serb positions have largely been conducted by the United States for the past year? To add fuel to the fire, President Clinton has promised that the United States would be simultaneously involved in training and equipping Bosnian Moslem forces so that they may be better able to defend themselves against possible Serb attacks.

Other dangers facing American service men and women serving as peacekeepers in the Balkans involves the very real threat of terrorism from Islamic fundamentalists, thousands of land mines—most of which are unaccounted, and the risks of traveling over the snow- and ice-covered mountainous terrain of this area.

Although the President has determined that U.S. peacekeepers will be withdrawn from this mission area in 1 year, I find the exit strategy to be lacking and full of holes that could leave U.S. forces bogged down in this effort for a much longer period of time.

Mr. Speaker, the United States cannot conduct foreign policy by deploying our troops around the globe to interject our morals, values, and way of life upon warring nations. It won't be successful, and we could lose the credibility that we currently enjoy as the lone superpower. There are many ways we can support peace in the Balkans without putting young Americans in harms way. It is not too late to halt any further troop movements to this region, so I urge all of my colleagues to support the Dornan legislation.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1977, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. BARBARA-ROSE COLLINS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1995

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we must recognize mining subsidies for what they are—corporate welfare. In light of the several extremist appropriation bills put before this Congress, cutting back essential programs that improve the quality of life for all Americans; we cannot spend another tax dollar to give big businesses a free ride. This Congress cannot with a clear conscience, stop assisting mothers with buying milk for their infants; while at the same time giving away more than $15 billion worth of publicly owned minerals. How can we claim not to find the funds to protect elderly citizens from going into complete poverty because of out of pocket medical expenses, yet we can give away precious minerals at bargain basement prices?

To eliminate programs that meet human needs and that provide tangible results, under the guise of conserving Government funds, without terminating wasteful programs such as mining subsidies, is hypocritical. This is yet another example of the butchery of social and environmental progress, while corporate welfare is being spared the budget ax. To allow this hypocrisy is not only fiscally irresponsible, it is unforgivable. The American voters will not forget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.