

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, February 25, 1988

The House met at 11 a.m.  
The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Breathe into our souls, O Gracious God, the spirit of peace, open our hearts to the spirit of tolerance, guide our minds with the spirit of truth, and give us the strength to be the people You would have us be. With words of gratitude, O God, for all Your blessings and gifts, we offer this, our prayer. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 107, answered "present" 1, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—272

Ackerman	Boucher	Cooper
Akaka	Boxer	Coyne
Anderson	Brennan	Crockett
Andrews	Brooks	Darden
Annunzio	Brown (CA)	Davis (MI)
Anthony	Bruce	de la Garza
Applegate	Bryant	DeFazio
Archer	Buechner	Derrick
Aspin	Bustamante	Dicks
Atkins	Byron	Dingell
AuCoin	Callahan	Donnelly
Barnard	Campbell	Dorgan (ND)
Bartlett	Cardin	Duncan
Bateman	Carper	Durbin
Bates	Carr	Dwyer
Bellenson	Chapman	Dymally
Bennett	Chappell	Dyson
Berman	Clarke	Early
Bevill	Clement	Eckart
Bilbray	Clinger	Edwards (CA)
Boggs	Coats	English
Boland	Coelho	Erdreich
Bonior	Coleman (TX)	Espy
Bonker	Collins	Evans
Borski	Combest	Fascell
Bosco	Conte	Feighan

Fish	Lujan	Rose
Flake	Luken, Thomas	Rostenkowski
Flippo	Lukens, Donald	Rowland (GA)
Florio	MacKay	Russo
Foley	Manton	Sabo
Frank	Martin (NY)	Salki
Frost	Martinez	Sawyer
Garcia	Matsui	Scheuer
Gaydos	Mavroules	Schneider
Gejdenson	Mazzoli	Schuetz
Gibbons	McCloskey	Schulze
Gilman	McCollum	Schumer
Glickman	McCurdy	Sharp
Gonzalez	McEwen	Shaw
Gordon	McHugh	Shumway
Gradison	McMillen (MD)	Shuster
Grant	Mica	Sisisky
Gray (IL)	Miller (WA)	Skaggs
Green	Mineta	Skelton
Guarini	Moakley	Slattery
Hall (OH)	Mollohan	Slaughter (NY)
Hall (TX)	Montgomery	Smith (FL)
Hamilton	Moody	Smith (IA)
Hansen	Morella	Smith (NE)
Harris	Morrison (CT)	Smith (NJ)
Hatcher	Morrison (WA)	Snowe
Hawkins	Mrazek	Solarz
Hayes (IL)	Murtha	Spratt
Hayes (LA)	Myers	St Germain
Hefner	Nagle	Staggers
Hertel	Natcher	Stallings
Holloway	Neal	Stark
Horton	Nelson	Stenholm
Howard	Nichols	Stokes
Hoyer	Nielson	Stratton
Hubbard	Nowak	Studds
Huckaby	Oaker	Swift
Hughes	Oberstar	Synar
Hutto	Obey	Tallon
Jeffords	Olin	Tauke
Jenkins	Owens (NY)	Taylor
Johnson (CT)	Owens (UT)	Thomas (GA)
Johnson (SD)	Packard	Torres
Jones (NC)	Panetta	Torricelli
Jones (TN)	Pashayan	Towns
Jontz	Patterson	Trafficant
Kanjorski	Pease	Traxler
Kaptur	Pelosi	Udall
Kastenmeier	Pepper	Valentine
Kennedy	Perkins	Vento
Kennelly	Petri	Visclosky
Kildee	Pickett	Volkmer
Kleczka	Pickle	Walgren
Kolter	Price (NC)	Watkins
LaFalce	Pursell	Waxman
Lancaster	Rahall	Weiss
Lantos	Rangel	Wilson
Leath (TX)	Ravenel	Wise
Lehman (CA)	Ray	Wolpe
Lehman (FL)	Richardson	Wortley
Lent	Rinaldo	Wyden
Levin (MI)	Ritter	Wyllie
Lewis (GA)	Rodino	Yates
Livingston	Roe	Yatron
	Rogers	

NAYS—107

Armey	Dannemeyer	Gunderson
Baker	Daub	Hammerschmidt
Ballenger	Davis (IL)	Hastert
Barton	DeLay	Hefley
Bentley	DeWine	Henry
Bereuter	Dickinson	Herger
Bilirakis	DioGuardi	Hill
Bliley	Dreier	Hopkins
Boehlert	Emerson	Houghton
Broomfield	Fawell	Hunter
Brown (CO)	Fields	Hyde
Bunning	Frenzel	Inhofe
Burton	Gallegly	Ireland
Chandler	Gallo	Jacobs
Cheney	Gekas	Kolbe
Coble	Gingrich	Konnyu
Craig	Goodling	Kyl
Crane	Gregg	Lagomarsino

Latta	Penny	Smith, Robert
Leach (IA)	Porter	(OR)
Lewis (FL)	Regula	Solomon
Lowery (CA)	Rhodes	Spence
Mack	Ridge	Stump
Madigan	Roberts	Sundquist
Marlenee	Roukema	Tauzin
Martin (IL)	Rowland (CT)	Thomas (CA)
McCandless	Saxton	Upton
McDade	Sensenbrenner	Vander Jagt
McGrath	Shays	Vucanovich
McMillan (NC)	Sikorski	Walker
Meyers	Skeen	Weber
Michel	Slaughter (VA)	Weldon
Miller (OH)	Smith (TX)	Whittaker
Molinar	Smith, Denny	Wolf
Moorhead	(OR)	Young (AK)
Murphy	Smith, Robert	Young (FL)
Parris	(NH)	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Whitten

NOT VOTING—53

Alexander	Ford (TN)	Miller (CA)
Badham	Gephardt	Ortiz
Biaggi	Gray (PA)	Oxley
Boulter	Hochbrueckner	Price (IL)
Clay	Kasich	Quillen
Coleman (MO)	Kemp	Robinson
Conyers	Kostmayer	Roemer
Coughlin	Leland	Roth
Courter	Levine (CA)	Roybal
Dellums	Lewis (CA)	Savage
Dixon	Lightfoot	Schaefer
Dornan (CA)	Lipinski	Schroeder
Dowdy	Lloyd	Stangeland
Downey	Lott	Sweeney
Edwards (OK)	Lowry (WA)	Swindall
Fazio	Lungren	Wheat
Foglietta	Markey	Williams
Ford (MI)	Mfume	

□ 1125

So the Journal was approved.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## A BIPARTISAN PROPOSAL ON CONTRA AID

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last night the majority withdrew their proposal on what they called a Contra aid bill, ignoring the self-imposed deadline the Speaker had imposed.

Let me remind our colleagues that aid to the Contras ends on Monday.

I do not believe the cause of peace and freedom in Nicaragua will be helped if the House passed just any old bill, just to show that we have "done something."

I believe that the time has come to form a real coalition, bipartisan in nature, of those who really want to help the cause of freedom, as well as peace.

The situation is serious, the need is urgent, the stakes are high.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

I believe that there is a majority in this House who will support a true nonlethal aid bill, one that also provides the President of the United States with a real opportunity to request what he believes is needed at a later date.

I stand here today to say that House Republicans and many Democrats reach out our hands to those who really want to have a bill that will not only aid peace, but aid the cause of freedom as well.

Mr. Speaker, our earlier version failed. Yours apparently has failed for lack of votes. Now, let's succeed together.

Mr. Speaker, that hand is extended to you. I hope you grasp it.

I am including a copy of the substitute amendment which we would have offered had we proceeded as originally scheduled.

#### AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO BE OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof:

#### SEC. 101. POLICY.

(a) **GENERAL POLICY.**—It is the policy of the United States in implementing this Act to advance democracy and security in Central America, and thereby to assist in bringing a just and lasting peace to that region, in a manner compatible with the Guatemala Peace Accord of August 7, 1987 and the Declaration of the Presidents of the Central American Nations at San Jose, Costa Rica on January 16, 1988, and consistent with the national security interests of the United States.

(b) **SPECIFIC POLICY OBJECTIVE.**—In pursuing the policy set forth in subsection (a), it is the objective of the United States to enhance its security as well as that of the democratic countries of Central America by assisting in the achievement of—

- (1) genuine democracy in Nicaragua;
- (2) an end to Soviet, Cuban, and other Communist bloc military or security assistance to, advisers in, and establishment or use of bases in, Nicaragua;
- (3) an end to Nicaraguan aggression and subversion against other countries in Central America; and
- (4) reduction of the military and security forces of Nicaragua to a level consistent with the security of other countries in the region.

#### SEC. 102. TRANSFER OF PRIOR DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR ASSISTANCE.

(a) **TRANSFER AND USE.**—There are hereby transferred to the President \$22,250,000 of unobligated funds, from the appropriations accounts specified in section 105, to provide non-lethal assistance for the Nicaraguan democratic resistance, to remain available until expended.

(b)  **earmark for human rights.**—Of the funds transferred by subsection (a), \$450,000 shall be available only for strengthening programs and activities of the Nicaraguan democratic resistance for the observance and advancement of human rights.

(c) **PROHIBITION ON PURCHASE OF AIRCRAFT.**—Funds transferred by subsection (a) may not be obligated or expended to purchase aircraft.

(d) **INDEMNIFICATION OF LEASED AIRCRAFT.**—(1) The President is authorized to transfer unobligated funds, from the appropriations

accounts specified in section 105, solely for the indemnification of aircraft leased to transport assistance for which this Act provides and non-lethal assistance previously, specifically authorized by law for the Nicaraguan democratic resistance.

(2) Not more than \$5,000,000 may be transferred under the authority granted by paragraph (1).

(3) The President shall transfer the balance, if any, remaining of funds transferred under paragraph (1) to the appropriations accounts from which such funds were transferred under that paragraph when the funds transferred by subsection (a) have been expended.

(e) **PASSIVE AIR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT.**—(1) The Department of Defense shall make available to the department or agency administering this Act passive air defense equipment (including ground-based radio detection and ranging equipment) to ensure the safety of transportation provided pursuant to this Act.

(2) The Department of Defense shall not charge the department or agency receiving equipment under paragraph (1) for such equipment, and shall bear the risk of loss, damage, or deterioration of such equipment during the period of its use under the authority of paragraph (1).

#### SEC. 103. PROHIBITION ON DELIVERY OF LETHAL ASSISTANCE.

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver lethal assistance to the Nicaraguan democratic resistance.

#### SEC. 104. GENERAL AUTHORITIES AND LIMITATIONS.

(a) **RELATED STATUTES.**—The requirements, terms and conditions of section 104 of the Intelligence Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1988 (Public Law 100-178), section 8144 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1988 (as contained in section 101(b) of Public Law 100-202), section 10 of Public Law 91-672, section 502 of the National Security Act of 1947, section 15(a) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, and any other provision of law shall be deemed to have been met for the transfer and use consistent with this Act of the funds made available by section 102 (a) and (d), and the transfer and use of equipment as provided in section 102(e).

(b) **CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO SUPPORT, MONITOR, AND MANAGE.**—The authority to support, monitor and manage activities for which funds are provided under this Act or a law which previously, specifically authorized assistance to the Nicaraguan democratic resistance shall continue until the funds transferred by section 102(a) have been expended.

(c) **CONTINUATION OF LIMITATIONS.**—Sections 203(e), 204(b), 207, 209(b), 209(c) and 216, and the first sentence of section 203(d), in "TITLE II—CENTRAL AMERICA" in section 101(k) of the continuing appropriations resolution for the fiscal year 1987 (Public Laws 99-500 and 99-591), shall apply with respect to funds made available under this Act.

#### SEC. 105. DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACCOUNTS.

The appropriations accounts to which sections 102(a) and 102(d) refer are—

(1) Missile Procurement, Army, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986, as contained in section 101(b) of the further continuing appropriations resolution for the fiscal year 1986 (Public Law 99-190);

(2) Aircraft Procurement, Army, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986, as contained in section 101(b) of the further

continuing appropriations resolution for the fiscal year 1986 (Public Law 99-190);

(3) Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1984 (Public Law 98-212); and

(4) Missile Procurement, Air Force, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986, as contained in section 101(b) of the further continuing appropriations resolution for the fiscal year 1986 (Public Law 99-190).

#### SEC. 106. MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR CHILDREN.

(a) The Agency for International Development is authorized and directed to provide, or to arrange for the provision of, medical assistance to children injured in the conflicts in Central America.

(b) There are hereby transferred to the President \$14,000,000 of unobligated funds, from the appropriations accounts specified in section 105, to carry out subsection (a) during the fiscal year 1988, notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 (relating to authorization of appropriations for foreign assistance).

#### SEC. 107. FUTURE REQUEST FOR AID FOR THE RESISTANCE.

(a) The amendments made by subsection (b) shall not take effect until the day the President determines and certifies, after April 15, 1988, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate that—

(1) at the time of such certification no ceasefire is in place that was agreed to by the Government of Nicaragua and the Nicaraguan democratic resistance;

(2) The failure to achieve the ceasefire described in paragraph (1) results from the lack of good faith efforts by the Government of Nicaragua to comply with the requirements of the Declaration of the Presidents of the Central American Nations at San Jose, Costa Rica on January 16, 1988; and

(3) the Nicaraguan democratic resistance has engaged in good faith efforts to achieve the ceasefire described in paragraph (1).

(b) Effective on the day specified by subsection (a), Section 111 of the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1988 (Public Law 100-202) is amended—

(1) in section 111(j)(2), by striking "Only if a joint resolution approving a request made pursuant to subsection (j)(1) has been enacted into law, the" and inserting in lieu thereof "The";

(2) in section 111(j)(11), by inserting the period after "session" and striking ", except that it shall not be in order to consider such joint resolution prior to July 1, 1988.";

(3) in section 111(j)(12), by striking "September 30, 1988" and inserting in lieu thereof "the end of sixteen days of session after the resolution was introduced";

(4) in section 111(i)(3)(A), by striking "in July, August or September 1988";

(5) in section 111(i)(3)(E), by striking "September 30, 1988" and inserting in lieu thereof "of the day which is seventeen days of session after the resolution was introduced".

#### SEC. 108. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term "lethal assistance" means weapons, weapon systems, and ammunition; and

(2) the term "non-lethal assistance" means assistance other than lethal assistance.



# NEWMAN MEDAL PRESENTED TO COL. MICHAEL A. McAULIFFE

(Mr. HUTTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most prestigious individual awards presented by the Air Force is the Society of American Military Engineers Newman Medal. The Newman Medal is named in memory of Maj. Gen. James B. Newman, Jr., past president of the Society and formerly Director of Installations, U.S. Air Force. The medal is offered as an annual award in recognition of the most outstanding contribution by an individual to military engineering through achievement in design, construction, administration, research, or development.

The 1987 Air Force award winner is Col. Michael A. McAuliffe, who is the Chief of the Programs Division, Directorate of Engineering and Services. Colonel McAuliffe also served as chairman of the facilities panel.

Colonel McAuliffe has developed and implemented more major initiatives to shape the programming, budgeting, and level of funding for Air Force facilities worldwide than any other officer in the Air Force. His initiatives with executive level advocacy for military construction, the military construction allocation model and new mission and current mission differentiation of construction projects will improve funding for construction programs for years to come.

McAuliffe is an exemplary awardee of this Newman Medal, and is deserving of this special recognition by the U.S. House of Representatives.

# SERIOUS FLAWS IN DEMOCRATIC PACKAGE FOR CONTRA AID

(Mr. CHANDLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I agree with our distinguished leader. It would be easy to point to last night's decision to pull Contra aid from today's schedule and make all kinds of partisan charges. But that does not serve the cause of freedom for Nicaragua, and it doesn't serve the cause of peace for Central America.

In fact, for all of their differences, the Republican and Democratic packages have many points in common. One of them is the need to aid children who have been hurt by both sides in this tragic civil war.

In the view of moderates who support Contra aid, however, there are serious flaws in the Democratic package that make it more harmful to the peace process than no package at all.

The biggest problem with the Democratic leadership's bill is its requirement that the humanitarian aid be

transported by the Defense Department. This introduction of U.S. Armed Forces into a combat-support role is exactly what we have been trying to prevent and might even violate the Foley and Mrazek amendments.

The reason the Democratic leadership's proposal has so many fundamental flaws is that it was written in large part by and for Members who do not support any kind of assistance to the Contras. Although I strongly disagree with their conclusions, I respect the conviction of these Members.

So let's not try to hoodwink them into supporting the Nicaraguan resistance. It is clear that there is a significant majority of Members in this body who support an honest, adequate package of aid to the resistance in Nicaragua. Mr. Speaker, you and our leader can draft a truly bipartisan nonlethal aid bill that will give the peace process the support and incentive to succeed that it so desperately needs right now.

# ISRAEL'S EXERCISE OF IRRESPONSIBLE POWER

(Mr. KOLTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today saddened and in shock over the recent actions taken by the Israeli Government to quell the recent upsurge in civil disobedience in the occupied territories.

Edward Bellamy, a noted and well respected American author, once wrote that tyranny is, "an exercise of irresponsible power." No statement could better assess the current actions taken by Israeli forces. Their brutal use of force in an attempt to control and influence a different people and culture is tyrannical.

On February 5, in a small village just outside the West Bank city of Nablus, four young Palestinians were seized and ordered to lie face down in the muddy road that is the entrance to their village.

The Israeli master sergeant in command then ordered the driver of a nearby military bulldozer to bury them alive. Obeying his commander, the driver buried the four youths with a full load of earth.

With that accomplished, the master sergeant then ordered the driver of the bulldozer to run over the four Palestinians buried beneath the soil.

The driver refused. After the soldiers left the village, residents pulled the four unconscious Palestinians from their makeshift grave. All are alive and recovering.

Had the driver of the bulldozer followed orders without question and killed defenseless men buried beneath a pile of dirt, a lot more would have died than four Palestinians. Israel

itself would have been mortally wounded.

It is time to stop the bloodshed. Time to face the inevitable. Israel and Jews all over the world have faced persecution throughout history and have struggled to build a homeland. By continuing irrational acts of violence and persecution, Israel has become its own worst enemy.

Out of persecution, freedom is born. Israel stands as a testament to that fact. However, vengeance, hatred and violence are beasts that grow uncontrollably. If Israel does not soon stop they will have become the very beast from which they fled.

# NATIONAL SCLERODERMA AWARENESS WEEK

(Mr. FAWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which designates the second week of June 1988 as "National Scleroderma Awareness Week." I hope to increase awareness about this rare disorder which affects about 300,000 Americans and can be fatal. Sufferers experience a gradual hardening and thickening of the skin which can progress to their hearts and lungs.

I had the unfortunate experience of learning firsthand about this disease when Marjean Peotrowski, a staff member in my district office, died of scleroderma.

Because the symptoms vary from case to case, many victims must travel around the country to numerous specialists before a proper diagnosis is made. I hope that this joint resolution will increase awareness about scleroderma among members of the medical community and avoid the situation one of my constituents described to me. This gentleman underwent needless surgery before doctors determined the cause of his ailments. Had his diagnosis been reached earlier, proper treatment and therapy may have slowed his progression of the disease.

Mr. Speaker, 42 of our colleagues have joined me today in introducing this measure. I look forward to enactment of "National Scleroderma Awareness Week."

# JAPANESE ARE BUYING AMERICA

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the Japanese are buying America, and if we are not careful, they will own America. Last year they bought CBS Records. They bought the Westin

Hotels and Resorts. They even bought Bank America. They bought the Dunes Hotel and Casino. They bought the Aladdin in Las Vegas. Last week they announced they bought a major Los Angeles bank, and last week they bought Firestone.

In fact, the only buy America program in America is the Japanese.

Now, let us look at it. They are stealing our jobs. They are buying our technology, and we are all laughing down here. If we try to provide some legislation, we are called protectionist.

I would like to say that we are being hurt by the most protectionist nation in world history, Japan. Maybe we won the war, but Mr. Speaker, they won the peace.

Where is our trade bill? Let us put some teeth in it. Otherwise, we are going to have a rice paddy on the east lawn of the White House before this thing is over.

#### INTRODUCTION OF JOB ENHANCEMENT FOR FAMILIES ACT

(Mr. PETRI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, it is time to break the poverty trap—both for America's working poor, and for those on welfare who are trying to get off.

Next week, with the support of Congressmen MURPHY, PENNY, JEFFORDS, and BARTLETT, I plan to introduce major legislation to improve the economic incentives for those on the lower rungs of America's economic ladder.

My Job Enhancement for Families Act would increase the current earned income tax credit, and vary it by family size, providing up to a maximum of 25 hundred dollars for a family of four or more children.

This legislation is designed to help low-skilled people support families by working rather than through welfare.

It would do this by supplementing low wages according to need as determined by family size.

It's better to supplement the wages of low-skilled workers than it is to require these same people to drop out of the work force in order to receive welfare.

Accordingly, I believe the Job Enhancement for Families Act will pay for itself by helping people to get off and to stay off welfare.

It's a good bargain for the poor, for the taxpayers, and for the economy.

I intend to make a major effort for the Job Enhancement for Families Act, and I welcome the support of my colleagues in the House.

#### CALL FOR SUMMIT OF WESTERN HEMISPHERE PRESIDENTS ON DRUGS

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the new Colombian attorney general, Alfredo Gutierrez Marquez, said that his government might want to legalize the selling of cocaine.

I was shocked to learn this. This would be capitulation to the drug barons. This would be surrender to the merchants of death. This would be tantamount to saying the forces of law and democracy have no power to fight them.

The drug dealers are trying to pick off the countries in our hemisphere, one by one: Colombia, Panama, Mexico, Haiti, Peru, Bolivia, the Bahamas.

The new Colombian attorney general replaced Carlos Hoyos, who was assassinated in December—just like over 30 judges, a newspaper editor, and the narcotics police chief were assassinated by the drug cartel.

This time, I agree with the State Department on a drug issue. Assistant Secretary Wroblewski called the Colombian suggestion an outrage.

However, the State Department has no national or international strategy to address this serious national security problem. We need our foreign policy to fight drug trafficking with the same zeal it fights communism and terrorism. Again, I urge President Reagan to call for a Western Hemisphere summit of the Presidents on drugs—so that we can fight and win against the killers of our young, and not surrender.

#### U.S. COMPANIES OPERATING AT COMPETITIVE DISADVANTAGES DUE TO U.S. TAX LAWS

(Mr. INHOFE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight a recent study which concludes that U.S. multinational companies are operating at a significant disadvantage due to present U.S. tax laws. The report was compiled by Arthur Young, Inc., one of the Nation's largest and most reliable accounting firms.

In comparing the tax policies of the United States with those of the Netherlands, Japan, and Germany, the disadvantage was quite apparent. This competitive disadvantage in world markets is present today due to enacted Federal tax policy over the past 20 years, including the 1986 Tax Reform Act. The primary reason this has occurred is due to the fact that many other countries have adopted

tax policies that, to varying degrees, encourage firms to do business overseas. Essentially, the United States has adopted exactly the opposite policy.

It is no wonder we are experiencing record trade deficits with a tax policy that is complex, vague and discouraging to multinational companies. The simple fact is that Congress has failed miserably when it comes to encouraging business to engage in the international market. Instead Congress prefers the easier route of protectionism. We must aggressively seek to change the tax structure so that it is fair and equitable to do business overseas which will then, in turn, reduce our trade deficits.

Though his competitive disadvantage has been accumulating over several years of Federal tax policy, Arthur Young, Inc. has pointed out three very obvious disadvantages of the U.S. multinational companies:

First, when exemptions or deferrals, foreign tax credits and tax treaties are taken into account, the U.S. multinationals most often are at the highest end of the tax rate scale on foreign operations compared to other countries. Even though the 1986 Tax Reform Act lowered the nominal corporate tax rate, many U.S. companies will face increased tax liability on foreign source income.

Second, the United States has no treaty in which it agrees to "spare" U.S. tax on income that could have been, but was not, taxed by a lesser developed country. Many other countries have such a "tax sparing" treaty. The main effect of this absent treaty is that it hinders the U.S. ability to access the low cost labor and raw materials of Third World countries in a way that would enable these countries to compete equally in world trade.

Third, the third reason that puts the U.S. multinational companies at a competitive disadvantage is the extent to which the present Federal tax treaties modify the two above reasons.

This study has made me aware of a very serious problem with our international trade/tax system. In the coming weeks, I plan to solicit the views of top multinational corporations in America on how to address this situation. Only then can we begin to answer the complex questions facing our international trade problems.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

(Mr. FIELDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I was ill with the flu last week and was unable to vote on the Madigan motion to instruct the conferees regarding dial-a-porn. Had I been here, I would have



voted for the motion to instruct the conferees to agree to language that offers a solution to the dial-a-porn problem. America's children deserve protection from pornography. I urge my colleagues to move quickly to adopt dial-a-porn language which ensures that children are no longer subject to pornographers willing to make a quick buck at their expense.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be inserted in the permanent RECORD following the vote on rollcall No. 9.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I was ill with the flu last week and was unable to vote on the bill, H.R. 1054 which would allow active duty members of the Armed Forces to sue the Federal Government for medical and dental malpractice in military hospitals within the United States. Had I been here, I would have voted against the bill. We have a good system now where those who have been injured who have not been treated properly can be compensated. There is no reason to impose such a burden on the military at this time.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be inserted in the permanent RECORD following the vote on rollcall No. 10.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3660

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3660.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARDIN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### SAVE THE C.S.S. "ALABAMA"

(Mr. CALLAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation in the House similar to legislation being introduced in the Senate by our distinguished colleague, Senator HOWELL HEFLIN, that directs the Secretary of State to enter into negotiations with the country of France to reach an agreement that would allow the historic C.S.S. *Alabama* to be raised from the waters off the coast of France and returned to its rightful place in Mobile, AL.

As you may know, Mr. Speaker, the C.S.S. *Alabama* was considered the terror of the high seas during the Civil War. This historic battleship was revered not only in the United States but across the Atlantic as well, and was best-known for her courageous crew and outstanding leadership under Capt. Raphael Semmes.

Hundreds of citizens in my congressional district have joined forces to organize the "Save the C.S.S. *Alabama* Committee." This group wants to raise this prized ship and return it to the United States for all Americans to see and enjoy. They are not asking for any Government financial assistance. To the contrary, they are organizing efforts to raise all the necessary funds for the project through private donors.

Our legislation is simply assisting them by clearing up any misunderstanding between the United States and other nations as to who is the rightful owner of this famous ship. Since we have never relinquished our ownership of the C.S.S. *Alabama*, it is quite obvious that it still rightfully belongs in American hands.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this legislation and return the C.S.S. *Alabama* to its rightful home in Mobile.

□ 1145

#### HEARING HIGHLIGHTS MISSOURI AS PACESETTER IN UNIVERSITY-INDUSTRY COOPERATION

(Mr. BUECHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, over the past year, many of us have been in a desperate search for ways to improve the ability of American firms to compete in the world marketplace. But a recent congressional hearing in my home area at the University of Missouri at St. Louis proved to me that the innovation we need is already going on right here at home.

I came away from the session feeling much as Dorothy did in the "The Wizard of Oz": "The next time I go searching for the rainbow, I won't look any further than my own backyard."

The hearing by the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology highlighted means by which universities and industry can work together to improve productivity and create new products.

The Monsanto Corp., for example, has a pioneering relationship with the Washington University Medical School. Under their agreement, Monsanto funds basic research at the medical school that it may apply later in its pharmaceutical business.

The collaboration has been enormously productive. Dr. Philip Needleman, head of the medical school's department of pharmacology, enthusiastically described how the joint effort had led to swift clinical trials of a chemical that may be useful in regulating blood pressure.

The interaction between Monsanto and Washington University, a tribute to the vision of Dr. Howard Schneiderman, Monsanto's senior vice president, should be an inspiration for the entire country.

Other universities and companies interested in cooperative efforts will want to look at a new model agreement developed by the Government-University-Research Roundtable. Dr. Don Phillips, the group's executive director, testified to the economic importance of such a relationship.

In addition, Dr. Martin Jischke, chancellor of the University of Missouri at Rolla, described his school's center for technology transfer and economic development, which helps small businesses apply existing technology to modernize their products and processes.

Several Federal programs, including the National Technical Information Service, have been helpful in local technology transfer activities as well.

Federal efforts have also aided in increasing the overall level of collaboration between industry and universities. The National Science Foundation's Engineering Research Centers is one program that has encouraged universities and industries to work together.

Mr. Rick Stringley, the executive vice president of Invitron, a new biotechnology firm, described how small business innovation research grants had helped his firm fund university research that led to new products.

In all, the hearing provided a wealth of information on how businesses and universities in Missouri have prospered by working together. I've included a witness list because I think these people are a resource for the entire country.

In addition, I extend my sincere thanks to my colleague, DOUG WALGREN, chairman, of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology, and also Betty Vanum, David Goldston, Maryanne Bach, and Marc Katz.

If more areas follow Missouri's example, we'll soon all conclude that when it comes to innovative ideas, "there's no place like home."

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a witness list of the persons appearing at this hearing who are a resource to the entire country.

#### WITNESSES

1. Dr. Don Phillips: Executive Director, Government-University-Industry Roundtable.
2. Dr. John Moore: Deputy Director, National Science Foundation.

3. Dr. Michael Montague: Manager, Operations and Biological Sciences, Monsanto Corporation.

4. Dr. Donald Ames: General Manager, McDonnell-Douglas Research Labs.

5. Mr. Ross Spicer: President, SBC Technology Resources.

6. Dr. Philip Needleman: Department of Pharmacology, Washington University Medical School.

7. Dr. William Danforth: Chancellor, Washington University.

8. Dr. Arthur Baue: Vice President, St. Louis University Medical Center.

9. Dr. Roger Mitchell: Dean, College of Agriculture, University of Missouri at Columbia.

10. Dr. Martin Jischke: Chancellor, University of Missouri at Rolla.

11. Dr. Marguerite Ross Barnett: Chancellor, University of Missouri at St. Louis.

12. Mr. John Johnson: Manager—High Technology Program, Missouri Department of Economic Development.

13. Dr. Bill Phillips: Science Advisor to the Governor of Missouri.

14. Mr. George Sloan: Vice President for Research and technology, St. Louis Regional Commerce and Growth Association.

#### IN MEMORIAM: MONTGOMERY COUNTY POLICE CHIEF BERNARD D. CROOKE, JR.

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, in 1979 Bernard D. Crooke, Jr., took over a Montgomery County Police Department troubled by dissension. He stabilized the force and turned it into a department of which Montgomery County MD, which I represent in Congress, is justifiably proud.

On Tuesday, Chief of Police Crooke passed away. His sudden death took us by surprise and saddened us greatly. In Bernie Crooke both the police and the citizens of Montgomery County lost a leader and a friend. Chief of a 750-member department, he had come a long way since his days as a D.C. patrolman 32 years ago. His years of police experience showed as he, in his quiet, fair way, helped keep the county's crime rate low despite increasing urbanization and developed creative means of dealing with growing drug problems. He will be missed. We in the House of Representatives offer our condolence to Chief Crooke's family.

#### THE NEED TO UNEARTH THE UNDERGROUND ECONOMY

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, Jules Verne wrote about intrepid adventurers who journeyed to the center of the Earth. Their travels through mysterious channels and byways to the Earth's core is not at all unlike the difficulties an economist

must undergo in trying to find out about the underground economy.

On Tuesday, the Baltimore Sun published the findings of a Johns Hopkins University study, in which Dr. Alex Portes claims the underground economy in the United States accounts for 10 to 33 percent of the overall economy.

The U.S. GNP exceeds \$2 trillion per year; therefore, by using Dr. Portes' estimate, the underground economy is anywhere from \$250 to \$750 billion per year.

By definition, people in the underground economy do not participate in the regular economy like you and I do; in other words, these people do not pay taxes.

We are losing tax revenues in the neighborhood of \$100 to \$200 billion a year, or more than enough to balance the budget.

Somehow we must get these people to pay their fair share whether it is via a fair flat tax or some other means.

It is time we brought the lost world of the underground economy to the surface, because the rest of us can no longer foot the bill for these others who are getting a free ride.

#### WHERE IS THE DEMOCRATIC PACKAGE OF AID FOR THE CONTRAS?

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, you have now proven that you and your majority in this House cannot govern. Having turned down the President's bipartisan approach to Central America, you have now shown that your leftist plan cannot even get to the floor on a timely schedule. Time is not an insignificant factor here.

Because of what has been done, authority for the democratic resistance in Nicaragua, lethal and humanitarian, runs out on Monday. Mr. Speaker, your leftist majority will be permitting support to dry up while capable of doing nothing yourselves, either that or you are consciously committed to doing nothing.

Mr. Speaker, do not assume obligations, foreign and domestic, that you are incapable of fulfilling. Do not make promises that you are unwilling to keep. Do not continue to embarrass this House and this country with the spectacle of irresolute and inaction.

This House's inability to consider Contra aid today is a legislative failure. It is not a minor failure, it is a very major one, and who benefits most from this failure? It is the Communist government of Nicaragua that benefits most from this failure.

#### ENERGY EFFICIENCY TECHNOLOGY EXHIBIT

(Miss SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Miss SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, we have at this time one of the most impressive events to occur in modern economic and industrial development, and that is a turning point in the recognition that the energy efficiency technology that has been developed by the United States can move us successfully into the future. Energy efficiency technology refers to improving the use of our energy in our buildings and our vehicles and also in industry, and it is America's most unsung technological success story.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to take the opportunity to see firsthand this success story in the rotunda of the Cannon Building because there we have an exhibit that represents practically every district in the United States and many of the leading and not well known industries throughout the United States, exhibiting their advancements for energy efficiency technology.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues that we have a great opportunity now to utilize these technologies to reduce the cost to the American taxpayers, to reduce the cost to the American energy consumer, and if we are not more aggressive in our pursuit of utilizing these technologies, we will find that we will be lagging behind in our race for being No. 1 globally.

Mr. Speaker, United States firms will operate at a disadvantage if that occurs because it takes 75 percent more to produce a dollar of GNP than a foreign country like Japan.

Second, we stand to lose the multi-trillion-dollar market in efficiency technology and services such as we have already noticed the loss in the auto industry because we have not been making fuel-efficient automobiles, and we will lose also the potential markets when we look at the developed countries who already have prices much higher than ours for oil, and when we look at those countries that are developing they want products that will minimize the capital requirements so they can invest in other development projects.

Third, we should keep in mind that energy efficiency technology prevents pollution. There are numerous studies on acid rain, global warming trends, and a whole broad spectrum of things that clearly point to the fact that if we use energy efficiency technologies we are not only improving America's productivity, we are not only opening new markets to our export trade, but we are also preventing pollution.

Our level of prosperity is not a fated one, it is a chosen one and we have the



technological know-how to choose a bright and prosperous energy future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to see some of that technology in the Cannon rotunda which will enable us to make these moves.

#### THE TIME FOR BUDGETING IS NOW

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, last year, we passed our concurrent resolution on the budget 2½ months late. We then proceeded to pass only 4 of the 13 appropriations bills before the June 30 deadline. Three of the appropriations bills amounting to 60% of all spending never passed the House individually. The beginning of the fiscal year came and went without one regular appropriation bill reaching the President and the deadline for reconciliation was ignored. As a result we enacted a mammoth, last-minute continuing resolution and went home for the holidays.

The President announced in his State of the Union Address that he will veto any continuing resolutions put before him, and 146 of you have joined me in pledging to uphold his veto. This year will be different.

Two weeks ago, the President released his fiscal year 1989 budget. We need to take a hard look at this budget and press forward on our hearings so we can have our concurrent resolution on the budget completed by the April 15 deadline.

Mr. Speaker, the road to a thoughtful, coherent, on-time budget starts not a few days before next November's election, but right here, right now.

#### MANEUVERINGS OF THE LEFT ON CENTRAL AMERICA

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I think every American citizen can learn a great deal by watching the maneuverings of the left on Central America over the last few weeks. When there was a chance a short while ago to vote to sustain freedom, to vote to help the freedom fighters, to vote to ensure that communism would not win in the Nicaraguan civil war, the left promised Members who were undecided that if they voted "no," if they killed the package proposed by President Reagan, that they would get a vote, they would have a chance to sustain the freedom fighters.

Yesterday the left's package was so bad, it was such a unilateral surrender to the forces of communism, it was such a collapse of the forces of free-

dom that the left came to realize around 6 o'clock yesterday that they could not win.

Now they are maneuvering to use the power they have to get the margin of votes necessary to ensure that freedom dies and communism prevails in the Nicaraguan civil war.

Mr. Speaker, every citizen who watches the maneuvers of the left in this House will understand how power is used on Capitol Hill to ensure that freedom does not prevail and that the side of the pro-American forces does not win in Nicaragua.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1988

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourns to meet at noon on Monday, February 29, 1988.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do so only to try to find out whether or not there is any chance that this House is going to do any business of consequence in the upcoming week before we grant some of these requests.

The fact is we were promised a vote on Contra aid today. We were told by the Democratic leadership that they had a plan ready.

Mr. Speaker, many Members stayed in town awaiting that very important and serious vote because we know that the time is running out. Yet, today we come to the floor and we have absolutely no business on this floor.

Can the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] give us some assurance before we grant this unanimous-consent request that this House is going to get about doing the serious business that we have before us, for instance, saving freedom in Central America?

Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland under my reservation of objection.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] knows, it was anticipated today that there would be time set aside for a vote in regard to the continued aid to the Contras, that after consultation with the minority it was decided to withhold that vote until next Thursday. It is anticipated that there will be a pro forma session only on Monday, that on Tuesday there will be an agenda but it is also anticipated that recorded votes on Tuesday will be postponed until Wednesday.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do I understand the gentleman correctly to be saying to this gentleman that the

House Republican leadership was responsible for putting off the vote today on Contra aid? I will yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] under my reservation of objection.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I said "after consultation with."

Mr. WALKER. After consultation with. Was that consultation where they were told this was going to happen, or was it consultation where they were asked whether or not they thought it was a good idea?

Mr. CARDIN. It is my understanding that yesterday afternoon after consultation between the majority and minority it was decided that the vote on Contra aid would be postponed until next Thursday.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, it is my understanding, I will tell the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN], that our leadership was called last night and was informed that there would be no vote today, that there was no such thing as consultation on this matter, that once again the Democratic majority just decided arbitrarily to cancel the business that we had before us despite the fact that it is extremely serious business, because as the gentleman well knows, the authority for aiding the democratic resistance runs out on Monday. Given the fact that we are not voting today, it means that that aid will dry up as of Monday. Any action that we take after that will have to restore the aid and that is just an absolutely unacceptable position which I do not believe was done in consultation with the minority.

Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] if he has other information.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that it was not until approximately 6 o'clock last night that we received the Republican alternative, and that there was very little time available last night in order to respond and be able to be prepared today in regard to the alternative that was being suggested by the Republicans.

□ 1200

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding, and I would be glad for the Democrats to explain this, but it is my understanding that around 6, in fact each side gave the other their alternative, that the Republican leadership also did not have the full details of the final version as taken to the Rules

Committee by the Democrats until 6 last night.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, further reserving the right to object.

Mr. CARDIN. I think there is some accuracy to that, but let me assure you that there has been consultation between the Speaker and the minority leader and that it is correct that there has just not been enough time for the Democrats, or for the different alternatives to be absorbed by the Members in time for a vote today.

I think in due respect to both sides on this particular issue it was thought the best course of action was to give everyone an opportunity to know what they are voting on and for us to be able to understand what the Republicans would like to offer and for the Republicans or for those on the other side to understand what the proposal will be in regard to the alternative.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, we made our offering about 3 weeks ago and a vast majority of the leftwing of the Democratic Party turned that down. And so that the problem becomes that what has happened here is that you have turned down a proposal while you said during that debate that you had an alternative proposal. We have now waited 3 weeks. There was plenty of time in that 3 weeks to do what the gentleman said.

Now we have come up against a deadline where the actual aid to the resistance gets cut off. Now we are unable to act despite the fact that we have come up against that deadline. I just simply say to the gentleman that that is a very, very irresponsible legislative process.

Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. If I might, I would like to ask the Democrats, if I may understand clearly what they are suggesting, because there are circumstances where we might be willing to wait until Thursday. Do we have a commitment, just as a matter of clarification, do we have a commitment from the Democratic leadership that there will be a substitute in order?

Mr. CARDIN. I am perhaps suggesting that maybe there should not be, because if I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania correctly, we have already had the vote on the proposal that was made from that side that was rejected and perhaps it should not be in order. I am not making any suggestions at this point other than suggesting that this issue will be before the House next Thursday.

Mr. GINGRICH. Well, let me suggest then for a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). The gentleman from Pennsylvania further reserves the right to object.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me further ask of the Democrats then, I have just been informed by our staff having checked with the minority leader's staff that there was no consultation, let me make this clear, there was no consultation with the Republican leadership. I just checked with the leader's office. Let me further ask, then, if I understand the point being suggested by my friend from Maryland, we on our side are being asked to wait an extra week to allow the authorization for helping the freedom fighters to expire without a vote, with no guarantee and no promise that we will even be allowed a substitute, because it now looks, having looked at our substitute, as though we might win.

Now do we have a commitment on your side that we will be allowed a straight vote next week on a substitute?

Mr. CARDIN. It is my understanding, before yielding to the gentleman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania further reserves the right to object.

Mr. WALKER. I do control the time and I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland and then I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CARDIN. It is my understanding that the Speaker has indicated that there will be an opportunity for a vote in regard to the proposal that is being crafted by the minority.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Let me get some clarification here. Now a couple or 3 weeks ago, we had the administration's position on the Contra aid, an up or down vote with about 10 hours of debate, is that correct?

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. HEFNER. Would the gentleman on that side of the aisle agree that would only be fair, if we want to have an up or down vote on the Democratic proposal for the humanitarian aid, would that be a fair assessment that you would not insist on a substitute and allow us an agreement to allow the Democratic package to be voted up or down with a limited amount of debate? Would that sound fair to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WALKER. I would say to the gentleman that we seem to be moving in that direction. I think the fear was that when the Members began to find out that the Democratic leftwing plan called for surrender, reparations and military involvement in Nicaragua, that they feared that that would go down in flames and that is one reason

why we do not have it out here today. And so the problem is that the gentleman raises a moot point. We do not even have—we do not have anything to consider today and I find that very disturbing.

Mr. HEFNER. If the gentleman would continue to yield.

Mr. WALKER. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HEFNER. I think there may be some misunderstanding in both packages, possibly. I understand from what I know on the package that the gentleman's side of the aisle offered, you do not specify what is humanitarian aid and what is lethal aid, there is no discrimination between them. We do not know what is what. But going back to my original premise, does the gentleman think it would not be fair from what the gentleman said earlier since the gentleman had 3 weeks ago an up or down vote on the administration's package, that would only be fair that we have a date certain that the Democrats would have an up or down vote on our humanitarian package? And if that fails then we go from there.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, I might say to the gentleman it would be nice if his leadership would consult with our leadership about that. It would be nice if they would sit down and talk to our leadership about it rather than simply informing our leadership what the patterns will be. The bottom line is that one of our concerns is that we have just been told out here that all of this took place as a result of consultations and we now, checking with the leader's office, find out there were no such consultations.

So I would say to the gentleman if your leadership can convince our leadership of that, I am sure that our side will be very happy to follow what our leadership decides should be done. But I would say to the gentleman that the question here is whether or not we are going to preserve freedom in Central America and it ought not be reduced to gamesmanship. We ought to have a real chance to consider how you best preserve freedom in Central America; that is what this gentleman is trying to accomplish and this gentleman is concerned about the fact that by not doing something today we are allowing the authority for aid to the democratic resistance to run out as of Monday. And we have absolutely no proposal and no guarantee to do anything prior to Monday to help keep the authority for aid to the democratic resistance, humanitarian aid too, alive.

I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HEFNER. Just as a point in the press conference last night, the aid to the Contras does not dry up as of tomorrow night or the 29th, because there is money in that pipeline, there



is lethal aid that is available for the next few months, there is humanitarian aid. So there is not a need on the expiration date that was in the CR, that aid does not absolutely shut down and Contras do not become destitute.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, the gentleman is telling us that despite the fact that the authority does not run out as of Monday, February 28, as of March 1 it was cut off, what the gentleman is saying now is that your side is now saying, OK, a little bit of end run around that process is OK, "because we couldn't get our bill to the floor?" Because we are in the position, in fact, where there was a March 1 cut off.

Mr. HEFNER. Not at all. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Just for 1 moment. I am not saying that at all, because even if the bill had come to the floor tomorrow and had been reconciled and gone to conference with the Senate it would not have been completed by the time that the authorization ran out, certainly I am not saying that. I was just asking the gentleman from the very start that what seems in fairness, if the gentleman's side had an up or down vote on the administration position, would it not seem fair and not heavy handed for us to say that we are going to have an up or down vote on our proposal?

Mr. WALKER. Let me say to the gentleman, I assumed that when the gentleman scheduled the bill for today that he had some plan that was going to get it enacted by Monday. I assumed we were not playing silly games out here, that you in fact had cleared things with the Senate so that we were going to have a process that actually got the job done in a timely manner. If the gentleman is saying to me that that was the wrong assumption then I am really embarrassed by the situation out here, because the fact is we have enacted major bills around here in a 1-day period.

Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I would just like to ask the gentleman: If the House does not act today or tomorrow or Monday what he thinks, what he would suggest is going to happen in Central America? I mean, are the Contras going to pick up and go home over the weekend? Are they a fighting force committed to all the things that you have suggested they are committed to? Or are they just sitting home watching their TV sets to see what is going on here?

Mr. WALKER. Well, I would say to the gentleman, as the gentleman well knows we have a lot of problems around here when authority runs out for even the most minor Federal

agency. We go through all kinds of machinations in order to see to it that that authority does not run out.

I am saying to the gentleman that if the authority for the Contras runs out as of March 1 and we will not have acted, that sends a very, very chilling signal to the people who think that what they are doing is fighting for freedom. And it does in fact provide aid and comfort to the Communist government down there which I think is the exact opposite of what we ought to be trying to do.

Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. I want to ask the gentleman from North Carolina a question if he is still here. I am confused, because the gentleman is on the Appropriations Committee and certainly understands the technical details of spending money far better than I do. Is it not true that if the authorization runs out on Monday that it would be illegal for the U.S. Government to continue to expend funds doing those things and in fact if the executive branch were to willfully continue doing it that it would be the subject of probable congressional investigations and legal processes.

Mr. WALKER. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Well, the gentleman is more into investigations than I am. But it seems to me that you have lethal aid that has probably already been moved into the domain where the Contras have access to it. As far as the humanitarian aid, in the continuing resolution we carried it through to the 29th. Even with your bill, had your bill passed and gone to conference, you would not have had any appropriations made before the deadline came. But there is already money that has been appropriated legally that has not been expended yet. It is not going to be taken back, if the gentleman is listening.

Mr. GINGRICH. Yes.

Mr. HEFNER. The money that has already been appropriated is not going to be taken back. They still have some of that money, just like in other programs. This is no different than any other program.

Mr. GINGRICH. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania further yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] further reserves the right to object?

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. Well, my point I say to my friend from North Carolina, if I understand it, is the legal authorization to spend the money will have ceased at the end of this month on Monday and therefore even if there is

money in the bank so to speak, the money is not expendable by the executive branch and I would ask my friend on Appropriations, is it not true that on other occasions when we needed to keep the Government running we often pass something in 12 hours because we want to be sure the Government does not stop.

Mr. HEFNER. This is different than any other appropriation. If the money has been appropriated and given to the agency or to the Contras it is their money. It can be spent.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, I want to make one point here. I just received word here that Ambassador Briggs, our Ambassador to Honduras makes the point that as of Monday they are closing the hospitals used by the Contras because they have run out of authority. So those hospitals are closed down, those people have no place to go for medical services. So the point being made by the gentleman from North Carolina is just absolutely wrong; as of Monday dire things begin to happen.

Mr. GINGRICH. I want to make clear, because as I understand one of these colloquy and I have seen it occasionally, is the gentleman from the Appropriations Committee saying that in his judgment it is his understanding—I know the chairman of a powerful subcommittee on appropriations is standing next to him and the majority leader is there—is he saying that it is his understanding that the money which is in the pipeline can be expended after Monday even without something new being passed?

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the other gentleman from Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is reserving the right to object.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Let me simply say that Mr. Calero was in my office on Monday, I believe, and we talked for a considerable amount of time and it was very apparent after talking to him that he feels that they have sufficient material and supplies to last about 60 days, no matter what happens today or tomorrow. And with all due respect to the gentleman's understanding of the situation, I think in this instance his understanding of the situation probably exceeds that of either you or me.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me ask one more thing of the gentleman from Wisconsin. The gentleman from Wisconsin is an expert and is one of the brighter Members of the House.

One of the things which has been happening under the U.S. Govern-

ment's authorization, and I would like—one of the things which has been happening, as I understand it, is that intelligence information and communications information has been given to Mr. Calero's freedom fighters by the U.S. Government and that the money which allowed that to happen, and the authorization which allowed that to happen will expire on Monday. Now is it the gentleman from Wisconsin's understanding that we will continue to be able to give intelligence information after Monday or does that expire as of Monday?

□ 1215

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I will simply say that the question ought more properly be directed to a member of the Intelligence Committee. But that question is determined by the Intelligence Act. I think it is section 104; I have forgotten the exact number. I think there is no real sweat on that situation.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, further observing the right to object, the fact is that that they are very seriously impacted if their hospitals are being shut down, if there are problems in terms of even supplying basic needs such as health needs. The people on the ground who should be the experts there are saying that that is in effect going to be the situation as of Monday, and this House will have been in the position of failing to take the action that would allow those hospitals and those facilities to remain open.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, sometimes when things are not well thought through, there can be problems, and I think this is useful for all of us. If indeed the Ambassador is correct and without new authorization those hospitals close, we are talking about something that crosses every party line, and every Member of this House knows that.

If there was one area of unity, it was a concern for the children, it was a concern for the people who are hurt. If that is what the other side of the aisle has wrought with its innumerable assistant secretaries of state there, that is a burden none of us want to place upon ourselves. I would hope that we keep open enough to get this checked totally today, and I ask the majority leader to do that so that we could correct the problem. There is no one in this House, on either side of the aisle, I truly believe, that wants those children unattended and hurt, and if that is what is to happen Monday be-

cause of scheduling inaction, which, as we know, because we here it so often, is the right of the majority, I know the majority would want that changed, too.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me yield to the gentleman later.

First, I understand that the majority leader was in the Intelligence Committee this morning, and I wonder if he could tell us whether the interpretation of the gentleman from Wisconsin was indeed correct, that all of the support that has been flowing to the Contras even after the authorization expires on Monday. Can the majority leader tell us that?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am sorry, but I cannot tell the gentleman about those activities and about such matters in the Intelligence Committee. I think the gentleman knows that.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for responding. But in one case we have it that the subcommittee chairman with major responsibilities in this area is telling us that he cannot respond to a matter before the Intelligence Committee and now the majority leader is telling the Members he cannot respond because he is a member of the Intelligence Committee, and yet we have information from people on the ground that says that we are having facilities shut down. If we are suffering dire consequences as of Monday as a result of the inaction of this House, I think somebody should be prepared to provide some answers.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to comment on the consequences of what the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentlewoman from Illinois are saying, that the Contras are a force as totally dependent on United States aid, without a bit of indigenous support, without a bit of ability to go out and get any support from anywhere else, that if this body does not act today, the whole operation closes, the hospitals and whatever else, on Monday.

I would assert to the gentleman and to the gentlewoman from Illinois that if we truly believe that, we would not be supporting the Contras because if we believe they are a total puppet of this Government and they could not run a fighting force or could not even run a hospital without an immediate transfusion of funds from this Government day to day, minute to minute, week to week, the Contra force would be useless for your purposes, even

though the gentleman disagrees with mine.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation, but, of course, the gentleman, I assume, is going to support the Democratic alternative that was suggesting that the way we were going to deliver supplies to these people was for the first time in the history of this conflict to involve our military. What this gentleman has supported in terms of the Contras was that we were going to avoid having our military involved in the conflict there. So I am very proud that the support we have been giving to the Contras has in fact allowed us to keep our Department of Defense out of that activity.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, just continuing, I think what the gentleman said misstates the case. Right now, even though the aid is being delivered by the CIA, there are not CIA people out there in the field or they are not supposed to be doing things. The same is true with the DOD. That may be a method of delivery. They are not involved in fighting, they are not involved in running the hospitals, they are not involved in training or anything like that. So I do not think the gentleman's point has much water.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman's point does have water. If in fact that is a delivery system that works, why can we not keep that delivery system? Why all of a sudden are we going to switch this to a Department of Defense delivery system, which in effect was an indication that we could have had military personnel involved in it, and for the first time we would be introducing military personnel into a hostile environment?

Mr. SCHUMER. No, that is just what is not supposed to be happening.

Mr. WALKER. That was not what was supposed to be happening, but that is an indication that that is what the gentleman said he was going to provide.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that the alternative the gentleman is discussing provides that the delivery system would be transferred from the CIA to the Defense Department, which simply means that the Defense Department will be the contracting agency. The legislation requires that this be done by contract, and that simply means there will be no military personnel in that operation where they ought not to be, and



the gentleman knows that as well as I do.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and for months the gentleman's party has been out here telling us how wasteful the Defense Department is, so the gentleman is now going to transfer the operation to that Department, which he regards as the most wasteful department in the Government. It is either that, or the gentleman intends to have the operations run with military personnel involved. It was one of the two, and I would say to the gentleman that if the operation is working, it is absolutely incongruous to me why the gentleman suggests it ought to be taken out of the hand of the CIA, where it is monitored and where everybody agrees the intelligence is doing a good job.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I think I have the answer to the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The gentleman may recall during one of the Contra aid debates 2 or 3 years ago the former gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Barnes, came to the floor and said, "No, we can't use the CIA to dispense the money; no, we cannot use U.S.-aid to dispense the money. We will set up a new agency in the Department of State to dispense the money to the Contras."

The money was spent, and the Department of State was not equipped to audit where the money went, and the same gentleman from Maryland came to the floor after the money was spent, saying, "We can't track all this money, and that shows the money was not used for the purpose Congress intended."

Now we are setting ourselves up in the same trap. The Defense Department is not in the business of disbursing aid to foreign nationals. Yet the legislation apparently that the Democrats are going to bring to the floor will dispense aid to foreign nationals.

Where is the auditing capability on that? Who is going to audit it within the executive branch? Or are we going to come back here after this money is spent with some of the same Members who pushed this bill through saying that the people down south of the border stuck it in their pockets? I think that is the issue.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I think on this whole debate we are getting into over this issue, the question really comes down not to just the format that may be out here on the

floor, but the issue the gentleman first brought up when he raised his objection is critical, and that is that we are not going to get a vote until after apparently the aid provisions expire and there is going to be some lapse of the delivery system, at least from what we know as Members generally, and we have had represented to us that perhaps that is not so, that maybe there is some way for it to be delivered. But it is critical that we not let the Contras have a lapsing period of time if we are going to keep the heat on.

It seems ridiculous that we are getting to the posture of having a provision for the only vote we could have that would continue in any way any kind of assistance and then have a period of time in which the law is in a nebulous state.

That is worse than when we get into the budget cycle where we come up at the 11th hour and close the Government down for a while. This is far too critical, and I think it is a very sad situation. Based on my Contra experience in that Iran-Contra Committee, I particularly think it is a terrible thing.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, unless I heard wrong last night, I do not wish to be argumentative, but the President of the United States himself said last night in his press conference that there was no immediate danger of the moneys for humanitarian or lethal aid for the Contras running out immediately, that there was some time in there where they could have the luxury. So there is money that has been appropriated if they had all other agencies in the Defense Department. If we went under the assumption the gentleman is going under, every year before authorization we would have to stop all the contracts with our defense contractors for everything.

The gentleman can correct me if I am wrong, but the President of the United States last night did not express any concern in the short run for humanitarian aid and for lethal aid to the Contras. If I am wrong in that, the gentleman can correct me.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, the situation is that the authority to deliver further materials and aid to the Contras runs out as of Monday. The question is, and the question raised by the gentleman from Georgia was, that one of the things we are doing is delivering help to them on a daily basis, such as intelligence help, and so on. If that runs out, that is a major problem.

Ambassador Briggs, who is on the ground there, says they are going to have to close the hospitals as of Monday. That is what this gentleman

is referring to. The President obviously feels that though there is some aid in the hands of the Contras that will help them, the fact is that there are also impacts on the Contras which are adverse.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle what they think the psychological impact on the resistance forces is of a lapse of American support and American commitment. What do they think the psychological impact on the Sandinistas is of a lapse of support of American commitment? What do they think the psychological impact on America's allies all over the world of a lapse of American support is?

Is anyone willing to answer that question? Obviously not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). The Chair will state that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] has a pending request that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an explanation of my missing the vote on the approval of the Journal this morning. I missed that important Journal vote because of a hearing in my subcommittee, and I regret it deeply.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

□ 1230

#### AN AVIATION WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION BILL

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

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide protection

for employees of air carriers who engage in whistleblowing activities relating to air carrier safety.

The need for this type of protection was brought to my attention at a Government Operations Subcommittee on Government Activities and Transportation hearing on October 27, 1987. Testimony at that hearing indicated that employees at a major airline were being pressured not to report safety problems and were even fired for doing so. In addition, witnesses indicated that the names of individuals reporting safety violations had been revealed to their employer by the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA].

At that October hearing, I stated my intention to introduce this bill to protect aviation whistleblowers.

In drafting my bill, I considered whether the responsibility for investigating whistleblower complaints should be vested in the Department of Transportation [DOT] or the Department of Labor [DOL]. I decided that the Department of Labor was preferable for several reasons.

First, although the primary reason for protecting aviation whistleblowers is safety, resolving a whistleblower complaint is primarily a labor-management issue involving a determination of good faith. With its other responsibilities, the FAA is likely to be perceived as taking sides in a dispute rather than serving an adjudicative function.

Second, the FAA has a basic conflict of interest. Since it is responsible for ensuring the safety of commercial aviation, the FAA may be inclined not to side with whistleblowers who are reporting safety problems that the FAA, presumably, should have discovered.

Third, DOL already performs this function for whistleblowers in the nuclear industry, for truckers and for hazardous waste workers.

Last, good public policy requires that the responsibility for private sector whistleblower protection be assigned to a single agency. The Department of Labor is the best single location. This view is supported by the conclusions of a report recently issued by the Administrative Conference of the United States. This report, entitled "Federal Protection of Private Sector Health and Safety Whistleblowers," recommends that:

Congress should enact omnibus whistleblowing legislation to replace all existing Federal private sector health and safety whistleblowing provisions; and

The Department of Labor should be assigned investigative responsibility for all private sector health and safety whistleblowing retaliation cases.

Fortunately, there are not many reports of discrimination against airline employees for reporting safety violations; however, this is a growing problem. It is one of the unpleasant side effects of the increased pressure on airlines caused by deregulation. Nonunion employees who have no protection from unwarranted dismissals are particularly hard hit.

I believe this type of legislation is most timely and am optimistic that it will receive active consideration this year.

## INTRODUCING THE FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES REFORM ACT OF 1988

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce the Federal Prison Industries Reform Act of 1988.

This bill would authorize Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, to borrow funds as approved by its presidentially appointed Board of Directors within limits provided in the annual budget, and to employ the funds for purposes approved by the Board of Directors within the limits delineated in the bill.

Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated [trade name UNICOR], is a wholly owned, self-sufficient, Government corporation formed by an act of Congress and Executive order in 1934. The Corporation operates 75 prison industries factories in 42 Federal correctional institutions—including the factories that were in operation at the Atlanta and Oakdale facilities prior to the November 1987 riots. Its mission is to provide employment and training opportunities for inmates confined in those institutions.

Federal Prison Industries' need for borrowing authority is clear. As we all know, the inmate population in Federal institutions has grown dramatically over the past several years and now stands at over 44,000. This figure represents operational levels of 162 percent over capacity. It is anticipated that the population in the Federal prison system will double within the next 10 years. This growth will result in large part from the implementation of successful law enforcement initiatives such as the Anti-Drug Enforcement Act of 1986 and the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines in 1987 both of which increase the emphasis on incarceration options.

The successful management of the burgeoning population in our penal facilities has been due, in large part, to the success of UNICOR's industrial programs. These programs presently employ 45 percent of the working population of the Bureau of Prisons on a full schedule of meaningful work. The employment programs are critical in reducing idleness and the potential for disturbances which are associated with prison overcrowding.

Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated traditionally has funded all capital expenditures from retained earnings. Because of the unprecedented growth of the inmate population over the past several years and the concomitant demand for additional industrial programs, UNICOR has undertaken a much needed construction and expansion program. In addition, the UNICOR Program has suffered tremendous financial casualties as a result of the uprisings at Atlanta and Oakdale.

The continuation of the UNICOR expansion program will necessitate steady cash flows by the Corporation. These cash flows cannot be sustained through retained earnings alone, in part, because of the magnitude of the expenditures required, and, in part, because of the cyclical nature of UNICOR's sales which reflect the spending cycles of its Federal agency customers. In addition, the UNICOR program has suffered tremendous financial

casualties as a result of the uprisings at Atlanta and Oakdale.

There are two potential sources for additional funds for UNICOR: direct appropriations by Congress or access to borrowed funds from the Treasury. In view of the congressional intent that Federal Prison Industries be self-sustaining, and consistent with UNICOR's demonstrated ability to manage resources and expand programs without relying on direct appropriations, conferring borrowing authority on UNICOR is the preferred method of financing expansion and the method provided for in this bill.

The bill further authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the obligations of the Corporation as public debt of the United States and to invest surplus corporate funds.

Finally, this bill restricts the use of UNICOR funds to uses directly related to the construction and operation of UNICOR facilities, prohibiting any expenditures related to the construction or operation of general prison facilities or camps.

For these reasons I urge all Members to consider giving their full support to this bill which I believe forward the important goals of curtailing idleness in a rapidly expanding Federal prison population.

Any persons with interest in this bill should contact the Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties and the Administration of Justice, 2137B Rayburn Office Building, Washington, DC 20515, (202) 225-3926.

## INTRODUCTION OF THE SIKES ACT REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to reauthorize the Sikes Act for an additional 5 years. The Sikes Act was enacted by Congress in 1960 to provide for cooperative wildlife management on military reservations and it was later expanded to include public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The act authorizes these agencies, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and State fish and wildlife officials, to carry out a program of planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of fish and wildlife conservation on military reservations and other public lands.

Agencies affected by the Sikes Act control over 600 million acres of habitat for fish, wildlife, and plants. The prudent management of these lands and their resources is therefore of great importance to the Nation's wildlife resources. During the previous Congress, the Sikes Act was amended to improve the cooperative planning program, to ensure that trained professionals are actively involved in fish and wildlife conservation activities on military lands, and to ensure that revenues generated from renewable natural resource programs on military lands are dedicated to resource management.



The Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, which I chair, plans to hold a hearing on the reauthorization in March. During the hearing I intend to review the implementation of the amendments adopted last Congress to determine whether the fish and wildlife resources on military and other Federal lands are being managed properly and to assess if the hunting and other recreational activities associated with these wildlife resources are being properly utilized. I look forward to the reauthorization of the Sikes Act and welcome the support of my colleagues for it.

### BRING ORDER TO PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATING PROCESS

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

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 4004, legislation aimed at bringing a measure of order to the present chaotic way we nominate candidates for President of the United States.

When I served on the Democratic Leadership Council's task force looking at this and other issues, it became very clear that our system of nominating Presidential party candidates merited reform.

The way we have elected the President of the United States has evolved over two centuries. The nominating of Presidential candidates has also undergone profound evolution. In our own time, Presidential preference primaries and grassroots caucuses have come to play a major role in choosing the Presidential nominees. This has contributed to the popular election of the members of the electoral college, who now essentially rubber-stamp the results of the popular vote in the Presidential election.

The chaotic element comes from the competition between the various States for the honor and the business benefits of having early primaries, which extend the primary period and exhaust the candidates, and from the local caucus system which puts a premium on special interest activists who turn out for the caucuses and lay claim to bits of the candidate's political soul. The result can be the nomination of an exhausted candidate, who has been running all over the country to campaign in widely scattered primary and caucus States, and a candidate who has been forced to take positions that prevent him from offering mainstream leadership to the American people.

We need a major change in the way we choose our chief executive—to move from the chaotic Presidential primary and caucus system of recent years to an orderly system of regional Presidential primaries.

This bill would set five dates on which Presidential primaries or caucuses could be conducted, beginning with the first Tuesday in February of an election year and continuing at 4-week intervals into June. It would divide the country into 10 regions and provide that primaries or caucuses be held in 2 of the regions on each of the 5 dates. The dates would be decided by lot and the regions conducting primaries or caucuses on a particular

date would not be contiguous, assuring diversity in the regions voting on each primary date.

The States could decide, with the respective national and State party committees, on whether to have a primary or a caucus or to choose their national convention delegates in some other way. But the dates of primaries and caucuses would be specified according to lot and would be limited to the five dates separated by 4-week periods. Candidates would then be able to concentrate on the States in two areas, instead of running all over the country in a frantic effort to meet primary and caucus schedules set by competing State legislatures.

To encourage States to conduct Presidential primaries, I have provided in my legislation for Federal funding of such preferential and delegate-selection primaries.

At this point in the RECORD, I am inserting the text of H.R. 4004:

#### H.R. 4004

A bill to provide for regional primary elections and caucuses for selection of delegates to political party presidential nominating conventions and for Federal funding of presidential primary elections

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Regional Presidential Primary and Caucus Act of 1988".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) presidential preference primaries, popular election of delegates, and caucus selection of delegates have become integral parts of the process of electing the chief executive of the land;

(2) orderly regulation of the process is necessary to fulfill the Constitutional requirement for the Congress to determine the time of choosing presidential electors and the manner in which they cast their votes; and

(3) establishment of an orderly system of conducting presidential primaries and caucuses is necessary to promote the general welfare and insure domestic tranquility.

#### SEC. 3. REGIONAL PRIMARY ELECTIONS AND CAUCUSES.

(a) **SELECTION OF DELEGATES TO CONVENTIONS.**—The delegates to each national convention for the nomination of candidates of a political party for the offices of President and Vice President shall be selected by primary election or by caucus, as provided by State law. Such State law shall conform to the requirements of the national political executive committee and the national nominating convention of the political party involved.

(b) **TIMING OF PRIMARY ELECTIONS AND CAUCUSES.**—The primary elections and caucuses referred to in subsection (a) shall be conducted—

(1) in 10 regions (comprised of entire States), with primary elections and caucuses to be conducted in 2 regions (selected by lot by the Federal Election Commission) on each day referred to in paragraph (2); and

(2) in 2 regions on the first Tuesday in February of each presidential election year and in 2 regions at the end of each of the next 4-week intervals.

The Federal Election Commission shall assure, to the greatest extent practicable,

that primary elections and caucuses are not conducted in contiguous regions on the same day.

(c) **ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONS.**—The regions referred to in subsection (b) are as follows:

Region 1. Alaska, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana.

Region 2. Hawaii, California, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, and Guam.

Region 3. North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, Nebraska, and Colorado.

Region 4. New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana.

Region 5. Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Ohio.

Region 6. Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky.

Region 7. Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island.

Region 8. New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.

Region 9. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and the District of Columbia.

Region 10. Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

#### SEC. 4. FEDERAL FUNDING OF PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTIONS.

The cost of each presidential primary election conducted under this Act shall be paid from the general fund of the Treasury. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the preceding sentence.

#### SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

The Federal Election Commission shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

#### SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act, the term "State" means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Territory of Guam, and the Territory of the Virgin Islands. Any other jurisdiction entitled under the rules of a political party to delegate representation at the national presidential nominating convention of that party may conduct a presidential primary or caucus on any one of the five dates established in Section 3(b)(2).

### THE POVERTY OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S POLICY FOR CENTRAL AMERICA

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

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, the points highlighted in the recently concluded debate reflect on the poverty of the Democratic Party's policies for Central America. This lapse in authorizing assistance for the Nicaraguan Contras is a devastating psychological blow to those who are out in the field and it may have practical implications, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out, in the closing of hospitals in Honduras where young resistance fighters, some in their teens, are going for medical treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my discussion to a comparison between the policy of the Democratic Party regarding the freedom fighters in Af-

ghanistan and the policy regarding the freedom fighters in Nicaragua. Everyone in this House agrees that our program of military assistance to the Afghan Mujahideen is significantly responsible for our success in holding back the Soviet-backed government in Afghanistan and countering Soviet troops in Afghanistan. It is a covert program, but everybody knows about it and discusses it openly. Without that military assistance, the Mujahideen could never have accomplished what they have done. We have supplied the Mujahideen since the invasion. The policy began with President Carter under the able guidance of the National Security Adviser, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and it has been continued by this administration in a bipartisan fashion.

As a matter of fact, it was congressional pressure that caused the administration to take a more upfront, more aggressive stance on aiding the Mujahideen in Afghanistan, and provide Stingers antiaircraft weapons in order to neutralize Soviet helicopters and warplanes.

How in the world, given a situation right astride the Panama Canal, right south of an unstable set of fledging democracies, right on the border of the hemisphere's oldest democracy, save that of our own, that we can adopt a policy which takes away the military component of fighting a Soviet presence in Nicaragua. Let us face it. Everybody knows that the Sandinista directorate is one out of Havana and that Fidel Castro and the Cubans have been the motivating forces in the Sandinista Communist government. Everybody knows that. There are no illusions even on the part of the Democrats here in the House who have been active in this debate. The know what is going on behind the scenes.

How in the world we can allow the massive military buildup that the Soviets have conducted, the extraordinary amount of military aid that the Soviets have been pouring in, to continue, while we unilaterally remove our military assistance, is beyond this Member.

How we can conduct a policy to contain Soviet aggression which involves military assistance to freedom fighters in Afghanistan 12,000 miles away, and then pull the rug out from under those who are fighting for the exact same thing, to get rid of the Soviet presence, the Communist presence in Nicaragua, is really strange. How we can pull the rug out from under those people is really beyond me.

You know, it is interesting, there were reports that in January and February it looked as if the Democratic Party would unilaterally disarm the Contras fighting communism in Nicaragua. As this appeared more and more possible, what happened? The

Soviets doubled their arms shipments to Nicaragua.

I think there is a great contradiction here, Mr. Speaker, and if there are any Democrats in this House who can explain that contradiction, I am one that is very much willing to listen.

The freedom fighters in Nicaragua are so close to the ideals of democracy and pluralism, western democratic ideals—that is democracy with a small "d". The Afghans are attempting to forge an improved democracy after hundreds of years of semidemocratic rule. How we can support one and not the other needs an explanation. The American people need an explanation.

#### BIG BROTHERS/BIG SISTERS APPRECIATION WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COATS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, I take this special order to commemorate an organization that deserves our highest commemoration. The week of February 21 to 27 is "National Big Brothers/Big Sisters Appreciation Week."

I think it is a very fitting time for us to honor the thousands of volunteers who make this organization the organization that it is. If I could give Members a little bit of history as to how this organization came about, I think they will gain a greater appreciation for its service to the youth of our Nation.

As far back as 1902, the first recorded Big Brother/Little Brother match was established in Philadelphia. From that time the idea grew whereby a man and a boy could form a partnership and provide support to each other in dealing with the problems that our youth have to deal with. That idea spread throughout the country and then in 1917 a federation, a loose federation of Big Brother/Little Brother agencies was established across the country. The idea became so popular that in 1946 a national organization, Big Brothers of America, was formed, headquartered in Philadelphia. That umbrella organization now has served as the lead organization for a truly remarkable story of service to young people.

In 1970 Big Sisters of America was formed, and in 1977 these two agencies, Big Brothers of America and Big Sisters of America, joined forces and today we have an agency called Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America, that has affiliates established in communities across this country, in 49 States, plus the District of Columbia, 465 agencies in total serving more than 100,000 children across this land.

Those agencies range from just a few matches to more than 800.

The purpose of the organization is perhaps best stated by the honorary

chairman of Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America, former President Gerald Ford, and I would like to quote from a statement that he made that appears in the current annual report of that agency, and I quote the former President:

Children look to adults for many things. For guidance, for emotional support, for help in mastering needed skills and knowledge. But above all, they look for friendship and acceptance. They want someone who thinks that they are important, that what happens to them matters. And they want someone whom they can count on, someone to trust. They will then develop the self-confidence and self-esteem they need to become emotionally healthy, contributing members of society. They will strive to be everything they can be, to realize their full potentials.

Many children lack such adult friendship. They live in single-parent households, in which even one adult may not always be available when needed. That's when a Big Brother or Big Sister can help.

These carefully selected volunteer adults, under the guidance of trained caseworkers, provide understanding, counsel, and friendship on a one-to-one basis. Even though the volunteers may spend only a few hours each week with a child, they are never far away. Children matched through the Big Brothers/Big Sisters program know that their adult friends will not let them down.

Mr. Speaker, the concept behind Big Brothers/Big Sisters is a simple, but a very profound one. It recognizes the truth about the times and the truth about children. It recognizes the truth that not all children are privileged to grow up in a two-parent family. It recognizes that in recent years the incidence and increase of one-parent families has been dramatic, and that there are many children in this Nation who do not have the ability to look to both father and mother for the emotional support and guidance and training and leadership that they need.

The real truth is that children, especially young children, often spell love t-i-m-e. Often that time is not available because of work demands on the parents, because of a breakup in the family which has tragically separated children from the support of the two parents, from the demands on a single parent mother, the head of a household, who has no option except to work to support that family.

So many children crave the simple presence of adults, both as role models and authority figures, of course, but also just for the simple fact that the presence of one person to that young person is what really counts and the time they could spend with them.

My own involvement in this agency comes from personal experience. I became a volunteer for Big Brothers of America, the Greater Fort Wayne Chapter, in 1972 and have subsequently served as a Big Brother to two little brothers.

I had the privilege of serving as a board member on that agency for a



number of years and then serving as board president for the agency for a 2-year period of time. I now serve on the advisory committee; so for the past 16 years or so I have had an intimate involvement with the agency in Fort Wayne, and an association with the national organization through my activities as a board member and board president and advisory member with the Greater Fort Wayne office.

The director of that agency, Frank Zirille, who started the agency in 1972, and the board president at the time, Don Wolf, who later went on to serve a distinguished number of years as national president of Big Brothers/Big Sisters, pointed the way toward I think what Big Brothers and Big Sisters is all about. They currently serve more than 400 children in our community, the greater Fort Wayne area, including a number of surrounding counties, and that service is provided, yes, with some trained caseworkers and staff, but the real service comes from the more than 400 men and women of the Fort Wayne area and surrounding area who give up time each week to serve as Big Brother or Big Sister for needy little brothers and little sisters in our community. They are carefully screened before they are selected. They are given intense counseling and training before the match is made, and the match is just that. It is a matching of the needs and talents and abilities of the little brother and little sister with the needs, talents, and abilities of the big brother, the big sister.

There are some heart-warming stories. Some remarkable stories about the kind of love and time and attention that has been given to these children and about the bonds that develop between the big brothers and big sisters and their little brothers and little sisters.

Agencies across the country have repeated the Fort Wayne story. They meet under the auspices of the national organization to share methods of raising revenues, of matching children, of providing services through a series of regional meetings and an annual meeting that takes place each year. Agencies and those who serve those agencies are brought together to share this information and to further improve the services that they offer to young children.

□ 1245

The role models that they can provide, the guidance and emotional support that the Big Brothers and Big Sisters can provide, we cannot put a price tag on it. We cannot quantify it. I suppose we can commission some studies to determine what some of the effect might be, but who can really quantify, who can really say what changes have taken place in the lives of youngsters throughout this country

because of the time and effort spent, because of the associations developed and the bonds that have grown between Big Brother and Big Sister volunteers and the young children who they serve?

It is probably impossible to measure but yet I think if the true story could be known and told, it would be a story of young people becoming and serving as productive members of their communities, avoiding some of the problems of dependence on illegal substances, avoiding the problems of juvenile delinquency, realizing that the possibilities of being a productive, healthy, contributing member of society exists, seeing that life does not have to be time spent without the association of a role model—male or female, learning the self-esteem and self-confidence that can come from associating yourself with an older adult.

I want to commend the Big Brother/Big Sister organization and all the affiliate agencies throughout the country, all those directors of those agencies, professional staff of the agencies, volunteer board members, because this is a voluntary organization, both at the national level and at the local level. The real key to this organization is that it is a volunteer agency. Volunteers are not paid, board members are not paid, and they often make substantial contributions both financially and of their time to make this program work.

The key to its success is I think that those who are serving are serving because they feel a call to serve or a need to serve and they have a willingness to serve on a volunteer basis. They are giving up their own time to provide friendship and support for these young people.

Tom McKenna, the national director of the Big Brother/Big Sister organization, and Joyce Black, the national president, deserve a real round of support for their efforts in directing what I think is one of the finest social service agencies in this country today, but most of all, I want to commend those Big Brothers and Big Sisters across this country, the more than 50,000 of them who are serving nearly 100,000 children. They are unsung heroes, their names will not be printed up, they will not get recognition on a public basis for their efforts, but it is their efforts that make this program possible and it is their efforts that make a difference for more than 100,000 young people across this land. They are the ones that are to be ultimately commended, they are the ones who make the program work. It is their time, their sacrifice and their dedication that bring this love and friendship to so many young people. They are the ones who we honor today in this recognition of "National Big Brother/Big Sister Appreciation Week."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that we bring some needed recognition to an agency that is really doing a great job for our young people.

Mr. BRENNAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America during the "Big Brothers/Big Sisters National Appreciation Week." I join my colleagues in recognizing the dedication and commitment of these outstanding volunteers.

1988 marks the 84th year of the Big Brothers/Big Sisters movement in our Nation. Congress showed its support of the organization's mission—to match adult volunteers with children of single parent homes—by granting Big Brothers/Big Sisters a Federal charter in 1958.

Today 477 local agencies in 49 States are matching 50,000 boys and girls with adults who are helping take the place of the missing parents.

In my State of Maine four Big Brothers/Big Sisters organizations operate—in Augusta, Bangor, Boothbay Harbor, and Portland, facilitating the matching of 295 Maine children with adult volunteers.

I am proud to note that the Portland branch, which serves York, Cumberland, and Sagadahoc Counties, recently recognized two individuals for their outstanding service: Maureen Riley, who was awarded the Barbara Goodbody Award, and Joe DeMarino, who was awarded the James Harrington Award. These two individuals exemplify the spirit of volunteerism that the organization represents.

Even with this great commitment, there remains a need to do more. 50,000 children are still waiting to be matched with adult volunteers. In the State of Maine, 200 adult volunteers are needed to serve as Big Brothers and Big Sisters.

At this time I would like to ask my fellow colleagues to join me in honoring these fine individuals for their unselfish dedication and to stress the organization's need for more adult volunteers.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give sincere and heartfelt praise to the women and men of this country who give of their emotional and material resources to provide stability to thousands of little boys and girls who grow up in single-parent families.

The Big Brothers and Big Sisters of America have become a vital link in the effort to bring support and continuity to children, who for various reasons, cannot find that stability in the home.

In the beginning of this decade it was predicted that 40 percent of all children born since 1970 can expect to live 5 years or more with only one parent.

Recent estimates indicate that one out of two children can expect to be in a single parent home at some point in their life. Not every child from a single-parent family needs a Big Brother or Big Sister.

Many can rely on a traditional extended family support system. But the single parents who work and maintain a household, often do not have time and energy to fulfill their child's needs.

Coupled with the reality that this administration's shortsighted policies have propelled an increasing number of single parent house-

holds below the poverty line, the desperate situations of one parent households are becoming magnified. It is no small wonder that the demand for this service is growing.

When we look at the increasingly complex and confusing demands of our society, and the impact this has on children it is easy to see the need for this program. The normal troubles of childhood, if badly handled or ignored, can develop into something more serious.

Big Brothers and Big Sisters give the kind of additional support that a child needs to get through the difficult and formative years. The sensitivity and simplicity of the Big Brother/Sister relationships can provide the balance needed for a child to grow into a healthy, productive adult.

It is impossible to estimate the amount of good and the number of lives that have been changed by this program, but if the success of a program can be measured by the demand for its services then Big Brothers and Big Sisters of America can be considered a major triumph. In Los Angeles County alone there are as many as 500 children waiting to be matched with a Big Brother or Big Sister.

I am certain that the demand would be even greater if more children knew of the benefits of the program. On many occasions a Big Brother, when visiting the home of a child, is asked by the neighborhood children to become their Big Brother as well. I wish that all children who want a Big Brother/Sister could receive their wish.

Finally, let me say that where this administration has consistently and knowingly ignored the needs of our children, the Big Brothers and Big Sisters of America have stepped in and filled a part of the void. I thank them for their dedication, and pledge my continued support.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, recognizing that children are our Nation's greatest resource, today I join a majority of my colleagues in the House of Representatives in saluting the thousands of volunteers who serve as Big Brothers and Big Sisters.

This week is "National Big Brothers/Big Sisters Appreciation Week" and I pay special tribute to the hundreds of men and women in the Los Angeles area who have unselfishly given their time and energy to develop a one-on-one relationship with a needy little brother or little sister.

For over 80 years Big Brothers/Big Sisters has provided adult companionship for thousands of boys and girls. The men and women who volunteer as Big Brothers and Big Sisters are carefully selected and serve under the guidance of trained social workers.

These dedicated individuals are committed to spending 3 to 6 hours once a week for at least 1 year sharing experiences and listening to the child's concerns. Enduring relationships are formed which often have a dramatic effect in changing the course of a young person's life.

This helping hand given to little brothers and little sisters has contributed to improvement in their relationships at home, in school and in their communities.

Little brothers and little sisters are children aged 6 to 17, many of whom come from disadvantaged environments, broken homes or

have lost a parent through death or divorce. Too often the dreams and aspirations of children from disadvantaged environments are overlooked. Big Brothers and Big Sisters serve as role models who present stability, guidance, new options and opportunities for these young people.

In the absence of an extended family or adequate adult support, the little brothers and little sisters are provided with the understanding, support and the strengthened sense of self worth many of them need to grow and mature in a positive way.

The spirit of voluntarism exemplified by the Big Brother/Big Sisters organizations in Los Angeles and around the Nation is an investment in this Nation's future. As President Franklin Roosevelt so aptly observed:

We cannot always build the future for our youth, but we can build our youth for the future.

Childhood can be one of the most challenging times of life and it is gratifying to know that so many adults have taken an interest in making disadvantaged children feel needed and appreciated and in preparing them to be the future productive citizens of this Nation.

I am proud to join my colleagues in honoring the contributions of the staff and volunteers of the Big Brothers/Big Sisters organizations around the Nation and wish them continued success in their service to the community.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, this is a unique opportunity to salute the work of the Big Brothers/Big Sisters Program with its network of more than 50,000 volunteers nationwide who serve at-risk children. As the fastest growing youth-serving movement in the United States, the agency has nearly doubled in the last 4 years.

In the 14th Congressional District of Illinois, the Family Counseling Service Program in Aurora, which operates a Big Brothers/Big Sisters Program, is hard at work, finding those wonderful people who share time with children to promote healthy personality development through strengthening support systems.

Just recently, this particular agency was selected as a pilot site for the Big Brother/Big Sister of America Phase II Minority Recruitment Campaign.

In recent years, the increase in female-headed households has resulted in a corresponding increase in the number of children who could benefit from the support and mentor relationship of Big Brothers and Big Sisters. In black and other minority communities, this increase has been particularly dramatic.

By 1990, it is expected that the proportion of black children living with one parent will represent almost 60 percent of all black children, whereas only 27 percent of the entire child population will reside with just one parent.

The minority recruitment campaign will be piloted in 32 affiliated agencies across the country representing a broad cross-section of these programs. Following the pilot period, the campaign will be evaluated and then implemented throughout the network of 471 affiliated agencies throughout the United States.

The primary focus of this campaign will be on black men since young black males represent a disproportionate number of children on

agency waiting lists. The secondary focus will be on Hispanic men since many agencies are experiencing an influx of young Hispanic males who need Big Brothers.

Unfortunately, in many communities with existing Big Brothers/Big Sisters programs, the racial composition of children who need and want Big Brothers or Sisters is not reflected in the volunteer pool. As a result, many minority children remain on waiting lists—some for as long as 3 to 4 years. The problem is especially acute for young black males where waiting lists often number in the hundreds.

As the number of single-parent households continues to increase, I am encouraged and proud of the efforts that are being made by committed volunteers to help children one at a time to build a better future.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, this week our Nation recognizes "Big Brothers/Big Sisters Appreciation Week." I would like to take a moment to express personally my great appreciation to the more than 50,000 volunteer men and women who are currently participants in the Big Brothers/Big Sisters Program.

As a member of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, I am acutely aware of the problems facing our Nation's young people. We live today in an increasingly complicated world, where growing up can be a confusing and difficult process for children. This process can be even more difficult for children growing up in single-parent households.

Big Brothers of New York was formed at the turn of the century to help guide the city's fatherless boys into manhood through the friendship and understanding of a 1-to-1 relationship. In 1970, the program began serving girls. Since its inception, Big Brothers/Big Sisters of New York City has recognized and worked tirelessly to address the unique needs of children living in single-parent families.

There are over half a million single-parent families today in New York City. While some children may have minor problems related to delinquency or emotional adjustment, most youngsters are simply in need of an adult's friendship, guidance, and support.

The volunteers who make the Big Brothers/Big Sisters Program work, exemplify some of the most meaningful aspects of the human spirit—compassion, dedication, and a strong commitment to caring for others.

They recognize that today's children are tomorrow's leaders. They are our future and we must provide them today with the love and support necessary to guide them to adulthood.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to participate in "Big Brothers/Big Sisters Appreciation Week." I commend both the organization and the volunteers for all that they have done, and pledge my continued support for their wonderful program.

Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today. A number of Members had requested time to speak on this subject but with the sudden change in our schedule today, a number of them were caught



short and not in a position to be able to drop what they were doing and get over to the floor to make their statement in person.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. CARDIN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

### CARGO PREFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to correct some very erroneous observations and statements made by some of my colleagues before this body last November when we debated the merits of the Torricelli amendment to the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1987.

The Torricelli amendment was a very good amendment as it was originally drafted and presented. It provided an accounting mechanism to ensure American citizens that the \$2 billion in tax revenues given to recipient nations in the form of cash transfers will be spent here in the United States, benefiting our own economy.

It would have also helped to support U.S. maritime industries, which sorely needs assistance due to the dismantling of its support system since 1974.

However, there are those Members in the House who view cargo preference as being antiagriculture. That simply isn't true. We had the support of some segments of the agricultural community, those segments which realize that under the old cash transfer program their tax dollars were being used to buy foreign products, including agricultural products.

They view the Torricelli amendment—as I and many of my colleagues do—as an instrument that would serve to bolster U.S. agriculture exports.

If the Torricelli amendment had been adopted as it was originally drafted, it would have, in my opinion, generated additional U.S. agricultural sales, or at least identify those nations who are using cash transfer moneys for that purpose; and it would have guaranteed 50 percent of those purchases for U.S. ship operators.

Mr. Speaker, I believe many of my distinguished colleagues were misinformed and, perhaps, misled, regarding the cargo preference provision of the amendment, and I cannot rest until the record is corrected.

Statement (Mr. BEREUTER): "If the Torricelli cargo preference language remains in this bill, U.S. agricultural products will decline significantly. The Torricelli language in this bill would force cash transfer recipient countries to choose between either paying a large portion of their cash grant to U.S. maritime shippers, or to spend the money on other products which do not have to be shipped on U.S.-flag ships."

My response, Mr. Speaker, is that prior to passage of the Torricelli amendment, there was absolutely no accountability of the cash transfer moneys distributed to recipient nations. No one in this Chamber, no one in the entire administration can identify with even the slightest degree of certainty a single cash transfer dollar spent by these countries in the United States.

On the contrary, there is widespread belief that our taxpayer dollars are being spent abroad, with foreign suppliers—competitors of our own businesses and farmers.

The charge that recipient nations will buy others products, rather than U.S. agricultural, was nothing more than a scare tactic and, unfortunately, it worked.

Members from the Farm Belt fear going back to their districts and having to explain to their constituents why they are not able to take advantage of the improved economic market and increase farm exports.

I would like to know how these same concerned Members explain away to their constituents the fact that their tax dollars are being given away to foreign countries which are using them to buy agricultural products from their competitors in other producing countries.

I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that the hard-working taxpayers of the United States would like to know which countries were receiving these \$2 billion cash transfers absolutely free, with no strings attached. They are: Cambodia, Chad, Caribbean Regional, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Belize, Bolivia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Jamaica, Liberia, Panama, the Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, Somalia, the South Pacific Regional, Thailand, and Turkey.

Only Israel has signed a side letter agreement to spend their cash transfer grants in the United States. The other 26 countries, and any others that may receive cash transfers in the future, should follow Israel's example. If they had, the debate in which we engaged in last November would not have been necessary. This division between farm interests and maritime interests on the floor of the House would not have occurred.

Statement (Mr. BEREUTER): "U.S. commodities for developing countries is effectively reduced by the additional cost of U.S.-flag shipping required by the cargo preference statute. The average rate for U.S.-flag vessels (\$49.50) is over twice the rate charged by foreign-flag ships (\$22.90) to haul agricultural commodities."

My response, Mr. Speaker, is to acknowledge that ocean freight rates on U.S. vessels are higher. I and my colleagues who support the U.S. merchant marine have never attempted to distort that fact. We have a very high standard of living in this great country

and the cost of doing business—all business—in the United States is higher than most countries of the world.

I, for one, make no apologies for that.

According to the Agency for International Development, Israel, under its side letter agreement with the United States, purchased 1.5 million long tons of U.S. agricultural products during fiscal year 1987 using cash transfer funds. Fifty-four percent of that tonnage was shipped on U.S.-flag colliers; and the average price per ton for U.S. ocean transportation was \$33.24. The cost today has been reduced to \$27 per ton on U.S. ships and \$18 a ton on foreign vessels.

The price differential has been reduced to a mere \$9 a ton, and no one can stand up here and call that exorbitant. As I stated before, the price of doing business with the United States is higher. It will always be higher. The only factors that should be taken into consideration is: "Is the price fair and is it competitive?"

The answer to both questions is: "Yes."

Statement (Mr. DE LA GARZA): "Now is not the time to mess with it (the farm bill). As a matter of fact, I think that we have as level a playing field as we now need, with all the necessary tools, exporting enhancements, the safety net for the farmer, the income support, all of that is coming into play."

My response, Mr. Speaker, is: How can opponents to the Torricelli amendment possibly construe the facts that farmers are competing on a level field when they cite a litany of Federal programs totaling \$52 billion that are keeping the American farmer from falling on their collective faces.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. agricultural industry is falling behind in the world marketplace. And, we have no one to blame but ourselves.

Beginning in the late 1970's and early 1980's, the United States developed and exported to countries throughout the world more durable grain seeds, better fertilizers, and other agricultural technology that has improved the producing capabilities of these countries. European and Far Eastern countries, which once purchased great quantities of grains from the United States, have now begun producing sufficient volumes of products, not only for their consumption, but they have now become exporters, competing against the United States with the very technology we developed.

As a result of all of this activity, the United States is increasingly becoming a marginal supplier for agricultural commodities.

In short, we are destroying our own markets.

This is a classic example of how not to become an exporting nation.

I have just learned of a very disturbing development on our gulf coast, where entrepreneurs are now importing Thailand-produced rice, repackaging it and exporting to other countries. These entrepreneurs are not just visionary businessmen trying to fill a need, they are American rice farmers who are part of a cooperative known as American Rice Inc.

These farmers, who are importing rice for export to other countries, most notably in the Caribbean Basin, are reaping huge financial benefits in the form of subsidies, along with credits and other inducements, to under-produce and to allow their U.S. acreage to lie fallow.

Who, exactly, is benefiting from these subsidy payments.

According to a GAO study, the biggest benefactor in the State of Texas, for example, was the Farms of Texas Co., a farming partnership owned by Crown Prince Hans Adam of Liechtenstein and International Paper Co. They received \$2.2 million in 1986, the largest single payment made in Texas.

The heir apparent to the throne, owns 50 percent of Farms of Texas, which has 22,000 acres in Brazoria County, 17,000 acres east of Dallas in Hopkins County and 9,500 acres near Texarkana.

It is ironic that the Prince's tiny kingdom is smaller than his holdings in Brazoria County, alone.

The Prince's partners, International Paper, is one of the world's largest natural resources companies, with holdings of more than 6.3 million acres of timberland primarily in the southeastern United States.

The Prince of Liechtenstein and International Paper are not the only "farmers" who are pocketing taxpayers' dollars.

Payments to foreigners and institutional "farmers" undermines the entire farm subsidy program, which was intended to help the ailing family farmer.

There is something terribly wrong with our system to allow this to happen.

Supporters of U.S. agricultural subsidies cry foul whenever U.S. merchant marine interests attempts to secure their existence by mandating that U.S. commodities, which are part of foreign aid programs, be shipped on U.S.-flag ships.

Our merchant marine has never been allowed to play on a level field, even when Federal assistance programs were in place. Now that they have been greatly dismantled, where is the merchant marine's "safety net."

The Torricelli amendment in no way attempted to dismantle farm subsidies. Yet, anticargo preference members continue to dismantle the U.S. merchant fleet by ignoring its needs and, equally important, its role in the defense of this country.

Cargo preference should not be looked upon as two dirty words. It is a legitimate attempt to protect a valuable asset.

The President's Commission on Merchant Marine and Defense recognizes the need for cargo preference requirements. In their list of recommendations, the Commission suggested: "The executive branch and the Congress should strengthen and expand existing cargo preference programs and legislation to include all Government or Government-impelled cargo in order to increase cargo availability for U.S.-flag ship operators and to stimulate merchant ship construction in the United States."

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Commission recommended that the "administration and Congress should \*\*\* amend the cargo preference laws to require that all Government and Government-impelled cargo, including cargo resulting from foreign aid cash transfers, be carried on U.S.-flag ships. \*\*\*"

The Commission felt it important to note that it "strongly believes" that all Federal agencies should comply "fully, consistently, and without question" with both the letter and the spirit of the cargo preference laws, particularly those governing shipment of defense-related Government cargoes.

Mr. Speaker, this latter statement by the Commission concerns itself with a very serious problem that I find myself having to expend a great deal of my time addressing.

I find it increasingly difficult to grasp the rationale used by our own Government, particularly the Navy, in circumventing the cargo preference laws. The Navy, more than any other branch of the service or any agency within the Government, knows the true value of the U.S. merchant marine in defense of this country.

Yet, despite their past and present glowing acknowledgements regarding the merchant marine, they continually execute procurement orders that deny U.S. ship operators the cargo volume they rightly deserve.

It is a well established fact that our merchant marine is currently the weak link in our national defense capabilities. The President's Commission noted with alarming concern that U.S. maritime industries are only "marginally adequate."

You can rest assured that our adversaries will take full advantage of our weaknesses; and should we lose a conventional war in the future, U.S. farmers will not be tilling their fields for their own economic welfare, or the welfare of the United States. Instead, they will be working for a conquering government, which will be shipping domestically produced products, especially agriculture, to their own people.

There are those Members who will scoff at this scenario, but it is certainly possible. We need only to look at the history books.

Statement (Mr. MADIGAN): "Organizations like the Farm Bureau support the Smith amendment because they are concerned about the size of the budget deficit, the size of the agricultural expenditures within the deficit, and they recognize that the way we are going to deal with that is to increase our exports and Torricelli will prevent us from being able to do that."

Mr. Speaker, my response is: If the agricultural community is so concerned with the U.S. budget deficit, let's begin addressing the deficit problem by eliminating the \$52 billion in farm subsidies U.S. taxpayers are spending to artificially support U.S. farmers.

Statement (Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska): "This bill would smash that agreement (the farm bill compromise) by extending cargo preference to USDA commercial programs—the credit guarantee and export enhancement programs, for example—especially exempted by the farm bill agreement. It would also take the dangerous step of extending cargo preference—for the first time—to commercial cargoes."

My response, Mr. Speaker, is that these allegations are falsehoods. During our debate last November, it was made perfectly clear, in concise language, that the cargo preference requirements under the Torricelli amendment would apply strictly to cash transfer purchases.

No other programs, whether they are credit guarantees or export enhancements, would be affected. Cash transfer purchases are not commercial transactions. This is a Federal foreign aid program, with the recipient nation using U.S. tax dollars to make these purchases.

Statement (Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska): "At a time when U.S. agriculture is making every effort to improve its position in an incredibly competitive world market, we are thwarted by the merchant marine interests, who see no harm in forcing the payment of shipping subsidies to bolster their creaky, failing industry—even if subsidies result in lost markets for American farmers."

Mr. Speaker, my response is: Yes, much of our merchant marine industry is creaky and failing, but only because the United States has turned its back on an industry that is so vital to both commerce and national defense.

We have turned our backs on U.S. shipping, while every foreign nation with a merchant fleet has taken positive steps to protect their fleets through subsidies, trade agreements, or actual Government ownership.

One could only wonder how creaky and failing the U.S. agricultural industry would be today if it were not for Federal aid programs.

Today, the U.S. agricultural industry is being supported by \$52 billion in Federal subsidies and other support programs. By comparison, the U.S.



merchant marine receives \$372 million in Federal support. That sum is—now let me describe this in a term that my Farm Belt colleagues will readily understand—that sum is chicken feed compared to what farmers are receiving.

If farm subsidies were eliminated, and I assure my farm colleagues that I am not advocating that, grain prices would be set at a level dictated by worldwide economic conditions—supply and demand.

The end result of such an action, in all likelihood, would be dramatic price increases for U.S. agricultural products, as well as a reduction in the number of operating U.S. farms—similar to the devastating reductions experienced by the U.S. merchant marine.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot view cargo preference in the narrow scope of it being limited to a special interest group. We must take the broader view of it being pro-American, because of the extremely important role our merchant marine plays in the overall defense posture of the United States. That point cannot be over emphasized.

We must take a strong stand in support of our maritime industries, now—tomorrow may be too late.

If a national emergency develops overnight somewhere in this increasingly smaller world in which we live, we will not have the luxury of time to rebuild our maritime and industrial base.

We must maintain an adequate level of maritime preparedness through an active merchant marine in order to respond quickly, efficiently, and effectively.

To be less prepared, could result in a national disaster.

□ 1315

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARDIN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### THE VOTE ON THE NICARAGUAN RESISTANCE: EXAMINING OUR ASSUMPTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McEWEN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, it was anticipated that in today's session we were going to consider economic assistance to the democratic resistance in Nicaragua and it is to that message that I would like to address my remarks.

There is an article in this morning's Washington Times by the noted nationally syndicated columnist, Mr. Carl Thomas, and I would like to begin this special order this afternoon by sharing it with my colleagues. It says:

On Feb. 10, Salvadoran government soldiers killed an insurgent they believed to be a courier of intelligence information. When the body was searched a document was discovered which strips away any pretense the communists in Central America want to join House Speaker Jim Wright and his colleagues in giving peace a chance.

A copy of the document, which has just been declassified, was provided to me by a senior administration official. The official contends the manual outlines the strategy for communist domination of the region, beginning with Nicaragua and El Salvador.

In a segment of the document dealing with U.S. policy toward Central America and internal Salvadoran political matters, there is this: "For revolutionary states and in the area of socialism, negotiation is an expression of victory. To force the United States to negotiate shows that the U.S. administration is politically weak and cannot mobilize all its efforts and that its policies are internationally isolated. Imperialists, during negotiation, try to make concession on weak points and try to preserve the other. The concrete expression of this, in our case, is that there is U.S. congressional bipartisan support for El Salvador, but in the case of Nicaragua there are deep divisions. The unity of the U.S. Congress in relation to aid to El Salvador will only be broken through strategic advance of the revolutionary movement. The time of the U.S. elections is the most propitious moment to favor this division."

I wish to make an aside to remind you that this is an internal revolutionary document in Central America being carried by a courier from Nicaragua to the Marxist insurgents in Nicaragua discussing how they can effect their Communist revolution effectively with assistance here in this country.

The memo continues, outlining a strategy that has been repeatedly advocated by the Reagan administration, but which has fallen on deaf ears in the Democratic congressional leadership: "The defeat of the Contras would be a grave strategic defeat for the United States, especially if we take into account the impact of failure in Vietnam and the geopolitical position of Central America. The failure of the Contras and the acceptance of the Nicaraguan revolution for the United States can be a total global strategic change. It would also affect the U.S. counterinsurgency policy and support to the Salvadoran government."

A few non-pragmatists in the White House are trying to persuade the president to pull out all the stops in a campaign for renewed military aid to the Contras, but there is considerable doubt that they will be able to prevail prior to the Feb. 29 cutoff of military assistance. The senior administration official told me, "If military aid is not resumed to the Contras, the Reagan doctrine is dead, and what the left all over the world will see is that the United States has been defeated in her own back yard. It will be another Bay of Pigs, only worse."

If Mr. Reagan accepts the humanitarian aid package proposed by the Democrats in the face of continuing massive Soviet aid to the Sandinistas, the loss of Nicaragua and

possibly the rest of Central America to communism will be his legacy.

Peace has had its chance in Nicaragua—and now it is time to fight. History has shown what the Soviets do when they feel threatened in their back yard: they invaded Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Afghanistan. They get away with murder to protect their fellow Communist governments from those who yearn for freedom. How sad it is to see the United States refusing to assist those in its own back yard who want to be free from Communist oppression.

Jim Wright and his Pollyanna colleagues remind me of those who play the lottery—always anteing up their dollars bills, hoping for the one big score that will make them rich, which never comes. Soon they run out of money and realize they have been played for fools.

We're about to squander our last chance for freedom in Nicaragua and perhaps all of Central America. Will the president make every effort to achieve his goals, or will he surrender to the pragmatists who have nothing but failure to show for their past efforts?

The captured Salvadoran document shows the resoluteness of the communists. Coupled with other documents and numerous statements by Sandinista leaders, it shows there can be no doubt about the intention of communists in the region.

There is now considerable doubt about the intentions of Jim Wright and his colleagues. They are no longer giving peace a chance. They are giving communism a golden opportunity.

Thus completing the article this morning in this morning's Washington paper.

Referring back to a page 1 article of Monday, the headline "Ortega Threatens To Crush Contras," an article by John McCaslin, I would like to relate the article by Mr. McCaslin.

Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega told hundreds of Marxist government officials if the Central American peace process fails, he has a plan that will "crush" the Nicaraguan Resistance.

"We have already prepared a strategy which will lead to the crushing of the Contras," Mr. Ortega said in a speech Saturday in Managua, announcing a new Sandinista campaign against so-called "counterrevolutionary speculators."

The Nicaraguan commandante provided no other details of what that strategy might be, but his harsh rhetoric came one day after a second round of cease-fire negotiations between the warring sides broke down Friday in Guatemala City.

The mediator in the cease-fire talks, Catholic Cardinal Miguel Obando y Bravo, blamed the latest failure on the Sandinista regime for its lack of sincerity in approaching the negotiations.

Intelligence sources in Managua said earlier this month that Sandinistas were preparing a "final offensive" against the rebels, code-named Operation Monimbo.

It was still too early to tell what impact Mr. Ortega's harsh words of Saturday might have on any congressional aid vote this week. Supporters of Mr. Ortega on Capitol Hill, including House Speaker Jim Wright who is guiding the development of a "humanitarian-aid-only" package for the Resistance, have cautioned him against using such militant language.

The current aid package for the Resistance, passed by Congress in 1986, expires at the end of this month.

Mr. Ortega in his Managua address also leveled a warning to the opposition *La Prensa*, which only recently resumed publication, saying its editors had better watch the newspaper's content.

*La Prensa* "thinks the people are about to rebel against us, but they should be careful with their attitude they can provoke an insurrection would destroy them," he said.

Other "counterrevolutionary speculators" receiving warnings from Mr. Ortega Saturday included Managua's merchants who refuse to sell their products at prices regulated by the government.

In Washington yesterday, Resistance representative Ernesto Palazio voiced optimism that a new round of cease-fire talks would resume this week, but he also was fearful the Sandinistas would continue their policy of "stalling."

"Why should the Sandinistas be that eager for a cease-fire when in the long run, because of the Feb. 3 vote in Congress, they're going to get a de facto cease-fire anyway?" Mr. Palazio said in a telephone interview.

He was referring to this month's vote in which the House narrowly rejected an administration proposal to provide the rebel force with both military and humanitarian aid. Without ammunition and other lethal assistance, the rebels say they cannot remain a viable fighting force.

Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned at the tack that this issue has taken in recent hours. It has become publicly discussed that one of the proposals that we were to consider today and might be considered early next week would be for assistance to be delivered in Central America, in a new tack, the American military would be involved. In fact, the Speaker's package as I understand would like to involve the Pentagon and American Armed Forces in delivery of blankets and other "humanitarian" assistance. This is an action which I believe is totally unwarranted and extremely unwise. Presently there are those who are willing to fight for their own independence and their own freedom. All they ask from us is the tools with which to defend themselves. The Democratic majority in this House has chosen to deny them that and now seeks to introduce American troops into the region. I cannot understand it. I sense the unwisdom of it and protest against it.

Mr. Speaker, the majority has delayed the vote on their Nicaraguan resistance bill which was originally scheduled for today. However, I would like to comment on the logic of their proposal, insofar as information is available regarding its present configuration. Implicit within it are some assumptions which undecided Members should examine carefully.

First, the bill's terms invite the Sandinistas to drag out for 4 months negotiations which easily could be completed in no more than 1 month if they were serious. This undercuts Cardinal Obando's efforts to mediate a prompt solution and his threat to suspend

talks if there is no progress. Even should negotiations soon fail, there will not be a vote on lethal aid for over 4 months. And because the resistance in any case will run out of critical weaponry before this deadline, the bill makes them vulnerable and sets a political trap for Honduras, to which fighters and their families must flee.

Even if they husband their equipment, after 2 to 3 months both the number and military capability of the peasant revolutionaries within Nicaragua must decline sharply. Just as during previous aid cutoffs, Nicaragua will take advantage of forced resistance manpower reductions in the field by concentrating troops and military engagements at politically sensitive border zones along the resistance's line of retreat. As before, the Sandinistas also will have the opportunity to initiate "sweep" actions in resistance strongholds to keep them off balance and separate them from any weapons caches they may have saved. The Sandinistas can again roll up the exposed civilians who have supported the democratic resistance. If lethal aid is resumed, the resistance once more will have to recover from these setbacks, but they will be criticized for lack of quick progress.

Honduras will be accused of violating its peace accord obligations by harboring revolutionaries who had to fight their way out of Nicaragua because of declining supplies. Although Honduras is determined that the resistance will not be given safe haven during the remainder of the negotiating process, it lacks the military capability to turn back or evict armed fighters. The likelihood of significant flight from Nicaragua therefore sets up Honduras as the "fall guy" for failure of the accords. The Sandinistas may also use alleged Honduran failings to justify renewed incursions across the border. Honduras already has forcefully stated that it will be the United States responsibility to deal with this prospective influx of fighters and refugees. Even now being criticized because of a resistance presence and having repeatedly been left out on a limb by United States vacillation, it is unlikely that Honduras will ever again cooperate with the United States as much as before.

Second, once more to remove CIA from the program reveals appalling managerial stupidity. It also reflects the pervasive distrust of U.S. intelligence and of covert action which is nursed by these who controlled drafting of this legislation. Once before, Congress was warned not to place humanitarian aid under an agency unfamiliar with the program and distribution techniques in Central America. The House majority insisted, however, on forcing a reluctant State Department to create the NHAO [Nicaraguan Humanitarian Assistance Organiza-

tion]. When predicted problems did materialize, the majority attempted to make political hay over them rather than acknowledge its own responsibility.

Subsequently, even more stringent accounting and oversight procedures were imposed on the program's operations, sometimes to the point of the ludicrous. Who but the United States, for instance, would actually issue identity cards to guerrilla resistance fighters who normally strive to hide their identity, just so we could make sure a few dollars were not being misappropriated? Amazingly enough, after we imposed such measures so the program was above reproach, the majority now proposes to undo the whole thing.

It is interesting, moreover, that many of those same persons who now complain about excessive United States military personnel and exercises in Central America are now proposing to send United States troops to manage the resistance program. Those of us supporting the democratic resistance argue that our goal is above all to avoid the future necessity of sending American boys to fight in Nicaragua. But prominent critics occasionally have responded that if Nicaragua is so important to us, we should just send in the marines now rather than dealing through the Nicaraguan resistance. Is the Bonior bill their foot in the door?

Although these were concerted attempts to implicate CIA in the Iran-Contra scandal, as an institution the Agency emerged from the investigation with fairly high marks, despite the actions of a few employees who did not adhere to internal guidelines. I see no excuse, therefore, to repeat demonstrated past errors by taking the program away from CIA. And while 4 months is enough time to endanger the Contras, it is not enough time to justify completely disrupting a program by giving it to another agency for that interim, whatever one's views on the Iran-Contra issue. Oversight will be exercised like a smothering blanket, and the Agency knows it. This provision must go.

Third unless the Bonior proposal is merely a subterfuge for abandoning the democratic resistance, it assumes this is a propitious moment to negotiate. Logically, this must be either because Sandinistas are freely willing to allow meaningful political participation or because sufficient pressure already has been exerted against them.

At least there has been one positive development in this policy morass. We now seem to have achieved a congressional consensus that, as the Washington Post recently editorialized, substantial Nicaraguan democratization is essential to long-term peace in Central America. Debate now largely revolves



around how best to achieve that political broadening.

But I cannot believe that those who continually have criticized the resistance for alleged ineffectiveness now believe their pressure has been sufficient to achieve an adequate settlement. No, the sponsors persist, despite a multitude of contrary evidence, in postulating some reservoir of Sandinista good faith.

How this can be rationalized I do not understand. Our evidence to the contrary is as direct and convincing as it could be.

Maj. Roger Miranda was moved to defect and tell the truth because of Sandinista plotting to exploit the peace process, a process still being hailed today as the route to salvation. Miranda said the Sandinistas initially were surprised by Central American agreement on a peace plan. He attended a meeting of the Sandinista Assembly called upon President Ortega's return to Nicaragua. There the peace plan was described as a weapon the party should use "to strengthen the political plan of the revolution and eliminate" the democratic resistance. Far from believing that conditions are so bad they must negotiate, the Sandinistas, Mr. Miranda stated, believe they can wipe out the resistance over the next few years.

After the guerrilla threat is eliminated, he said, they will raise their armed forces to a level of 500,000 men by 1995. Miranda said help to foreign Communist guerrillas has continued, although its profile has been lowered because of the need for discretion. Such aid is coordinated by a group called The Bureau, headed by top ideologist Bayardo Arce and falling under the Sandinista Directorate of International Relations. The Sandinistas' No. 1 target is El Salvador, although they give to other movements as well. Even after the peace accord was signed, they have continued such aid, for they have decided that "the best defense for the revolution is to expand it." And while they brand the Contras as mercenaries who easily can be defeated, Miranda visited the field to observe for himself and concluded that the rural poor no longer back the government. "What we have really been fighting all these years is a peasant insurrection," he said. "Whole families have taken up arms against the Sandinistas."

Major Miranda was the top aid to Defense Minister Humberto Ortega, whom many believe is even more powerful than his brother, President Daniel Ortega. Within Nicaragua, Miranda's ranking was the equivalent of a brigadier general, and most of Humberto Ortega's orders were administered through him. The Defense Minister, while denouncing Miranda as a "worm" and a "traitor," confirmed many of his most important revela-

tions, except to reveal that the defector had actually understated the planned military buildup: " \* \* \* we want to arm hundreds of thousands \* \* \* up to 600,000 Nicaraguans if we can," he said.

One would think those planning to vote against aid to the resistance would have retaliated for Sandinista betrayal, but instead they sought to belittle Miranda's revelations. One prominent congressional leader stormed that Humberto Ortega's speech was counterproductive, apparently because he actually acknowledged the Sandinista plans rather than because of their existence. Miranda's revelations were dismissed as unimportant, since the real issue is now summit negotiations with the Soviets over their aid to Nicaragua.

All our own intelligence agencies consistently assessed Sandinista intentions regarding the negotiations to be insincere, even before Miranda verified this. Yet we willfully ignore them as well. Were the administration to dismiss intelligence projections and court a foreign policy debacle in this way, it would court a major scandal. But Congress apparently plays by a set of rules distinct from those whereby it judges the Executive.

Even before the Miranda revelations, multitudinous Sandinista statements and actions over several decades demonstrated their true long-term intent.

Their writings and history as guerrillas clearly indicated what the Sandinistas were—a Marxist-Leninist movement nurtured by the Cubans who momentarily shifted tack in order to secure their final ascent to power. Despite pledges to install a democracy, the Sandinistas soon declared that elections would be delayed for 5 years. When voting finally was scheduled for November 1984, the Sandinistas were saying it served only to "confirm revolutionary power." In calling the sham 1984 elections, Daniel Ortega proclaimed the Sandinista revolution to be "already an irreversible process."

Things have not changed. Bayardo Arce, who shares to leadership with the Ortegas, continued to affirm these views last month: " \* \* \* we reiterate, that the Sandinista Front will never relinquish power, because we do not usurp the rights of the people; it is the people who are in power." Arce previously said the Sandinistas had accepted the August peace accord because it would produce "a peace which accepts that in Nicaragua there is and will be a revolution." For, as Tomas Borge, responsible for keeping an iron grip on the population, observed last year, "Why would we lose 50,000 lives to surrender the revolution?" Thus President Ortega was merely reinforcing a well-established doctrine in his famous December 13 comment that "In the hypothetical case that the Sandinista

Front lost an election, the Sandinista Front would hand over government, not power."

Even since the initial takeover by treachery, the Sandinistas have never kept solemn pledges. For instance, shortly after assuming power, they issued a decree promising to stop confiscations of private property. Confiscations soon resumed, as if the decree never existed. In 1984, they arranged a secret swap with civic leadership under which Sandinistas were allowed to control the Council of State in return for calling municipal elections and sharing control of television broadcasting. After the civic leadership kept their part of the deal, the Sandinistas reneged. After the government arrested almost all leaders of the opposition coalition last month, Adolfo Calero was prompted to comment:

How is it possible to announce amnesty on the one hand, and to arrest the entire civic opposition on the other? That's appalling. How can that be explained?

How indeed, except as yet another in the long trail of broken treaties?

The Sandinistas also have plenty of experience with their own version of Orwellian doublespeak, which renders questionable not only their intent to fulfill promises, but also what those promises meant to them in the first place. For years, Daniel Ortega claimed there was freedom of expression in Nicaragua, even while newspapers were censored and radios shut down. While ostensibly releasing some formal controls on political expression, the Sandinistas simultaneously resurrected the dormant "turbas" or "divine mobs" who again threaten and attack dissidents ranging from mothers protesting the draft to the media to politicians. Daniel Ortega has openly claimed that this merely reflects the regime's right to demonstrate, just as the opposition now exercises such a right. As Vice President Ramirez perhaps too candidly put it last fall:

If there's peace and we open a political struggle, we have many powerful, strictly political weapons. We don't fear that someone will be more persuasive than we are.

Thus the Sandinista Party admittedly has no intention to relinquish control of the Army, the turbas, the neighborhood committees or any of the other instruments of their leverage and control. Daniel Ortega reassured his functionaries in December that the Sandinistas would not give up revolutionary power or allow domestic opposition groups to become an internal front of the Contras. Warning the media to act with responsibility regarding their new freedoms, he declared the Sandinistas would "Mobilize the workers of all companies to go to combat" if necessary. "We cannot accept a civic opposition," he said,

"that becomes a representative of counterrevolution and imperialism in our country. \* \* \* The government and the Sandinista Front can have a little more patience, but the people can lose patience very rapidly." Moreover, "If an elected opposition party tried to roll back workers' advances since the Sandinista revolution of 1979, there would be an insurrection and the Sandinista Front would lead it." An elected opposition party could govern only "as long as it respected the established power."

I think journalist Georgie Anne Geyer has put it well: The Sandinistas have never hidden what they are. They are Communists of the militarist variety. "And yet it is profoundly bewildering that so many intelligent people \* \* \* choose willfully to exist in ignorance of this revealing history of the Sandinistas and their constantly re-proven intent."

#### CONCLUSION

Similarly, some chose to believe the Vietnamese Communists were peasant reformers rather than totalitarians. And still seared on our brains is the image of the last United States helicopter lifting off from the Saigon Embassy roof, with hapless Vietnamese clinging to its runners while panic-stricken mobs swarmed below seeking to escape Communist retribution.

That image since has been supplemented by pictures of tens of thousands of boat people still, 12 years later, being pushed back into the sea by Thai officials overburdened with the refugees from ruthless totalitarianism and the economic disaster accompanying it.

Will much the same happen once again in Central America, where the democratic resistance has been willing to fight for itself rather than seeking American troops? Will the flotsam of the disaster this time wash up on U.S. shores? Of even greater significance, what will happen to the already soiled U.S. reputation for dependability?

Perhaps the best insight comes from the Salvadoran Communists, who quickly put United States political developments to effective propaganda use. Although congressional critics like to claim the answer for Central American problems lies exclusively in economic assistance, those same persons later are unhelpful in securing passage of such aid. Recently, congressional budgetary issues and resistance to foreign aid forced the administration to slash aid to 30 countries, including El Salvador. In response, the Communist guerrillas' Radio Vencemos chortled on February 1:

It is clear that the [Salvadoran] Armed Forces are in for hard times since Duarte's Army operations rely on U.S. aid. \* \* \*

\* \* \* Americans think that their money and economic stability come first: this is why they chose to sacrifice an ally who will inevitably be defeated. The Reagan govern-

ment's decision to cut aid to Duarte can best be described by the words of one U.S. Government official, who said: "Our government has no friends, but it has interests." When Reagan cut aid to Duarte, he must have thought, sitting in his White House office, that for them, \$1 in the hand is worth more than 100 Duarte's in the bush.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. BENTLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes, on March 8.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes, on March 15.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes, on March 16.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes, on March 17.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes, on March 22.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes, on March 23.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes, on March 24.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KLECZKA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUDDS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NELSON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. McEWEN, for 60 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. BENTLEY) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. SHAYS.

Mr. DAVE.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mrs. BENTLEY.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. BROOMFIELD in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. COELHO in four instances.

Mr. MARKEY in two instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. STUDDS.

Mr. WEISS in three instances.

Mr. DYSON.

Mr. STALLINGS.

Mr. HOYER in two instances.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. DIXON.

Mr. MINETA.

Mr. PANETTA.

Mr. TALLON in three instances.

Mr. SHARP.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 29, 1988, at 12 noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2977. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the 1985 annual report on current practices and methods of cigarette advertising and promotion, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1337(b); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2978. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's report of actions taken to increase competition for contracts during fiscal year 1987, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 419; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2979. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting notification of a proposed new Federal records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2980. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the agency's annual report of its activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1987, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2981. A letter from the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting a proposed plan for the use of the Navajo Tribe's judgment funds in Dockets 69 and 299, 256-9 and 377-70, and 588-83L before the U.S. Claims Court, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 1402(a), 1404; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2982. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to direct the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to require alerting and locating equipment, including emergency position indicating radio beacons, on United States uninspected vessels and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2983. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for October through December 1987, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 639(d); to the Committee on Small Business.



1984. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development, and Acquisition), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to grant the Secretary of a military department, or his designee, authority to loan without reimbursement materials, supplies, and equipment to foreign governments for the purpose of cooperative research, development, testing or evaluation; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. COELHO, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. LOTT, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. CARR, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. TALLON, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HILER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DYSON, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, and Mr. SPRATT):

H.R. 4014. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit undetectable firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Colorado (for himself and Mr. GREGG):

H.R. 4015. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 which imposed employer Social Security taxes on cash tips; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALLAHAN:

H.R. 4016. A bill to urge negotiations with the Government of France for the recovery and return to the United States of the C.S.S. *Alabama*; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FROST (for himself, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. OLIN, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. LELAND, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. WILSON, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. ECKART, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mrs. LLOYD, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. TALLON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. DELAY):

H.R. 4017. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the disclosure of billing amounts and practices by providers of message services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

H.R. 4018. A bill to provide for reconciliation of discrepant earnings records under the Old Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Program under title II of the Social Security Act, to provide restrictions against future consideration of legislation reducing benefits under such program and the Supplemental Security Income Program under title XVI of such act, and to establish the Social Security Administration as an independent agency, which shall be headed by a Social Security Board, and which shall be

responsible for the administration of such programs; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Rules.

By Mr. HUCKABY (for himself, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. COELHO, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ESPY, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. ROSE, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. VOLKMER):

H.R. 4019. A bill to revise the price support level, and implement a marketing loan program, for the 1988 through 1990 crops of soybeans under the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAUB:

H.R. 4020. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt small manufacturers from the capitalization rules added by the Tax Reform Act of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 4021. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to permit Federal Prison Industries to borrow from the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

H.R. 4022. A bill to require the Federal depository institutions regulatory agencies and federally insured depository institutions to take additional actions to protect the interests of consumers of financial services; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KLECZKA (for himself and Mrs. COLLINS):

H.R. 4023. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide protection for employees of air carriers who engage in whistleblowing activities relating to air carrier safety; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. LELAND (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MFUME, and Mr. LOWRY of Washington):

H.R. 4024. A bill to alleviate homelessness by expanding and preserving the permanent supply of affordable and decent housing; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 4025. A bill to enable the Postal Service to restore recent cutbacks in postal services and to meet its obligations for certain health benefit payments in accordance with the Postal Reorganization Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 4026. A bill to promote the interests of consumers in securing financial services; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE (for himself, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DERRICK, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. TALLON):

H.R. 4027. A bill to expand the boundaries of the Congaree Swamp National Monument, to designate wilderness therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STALLINGS (for himself and Mr. CHENEY):

H.R. 4028. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain National Forest System lands in the Targhee National Forest; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 4029. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act of 1980 for fiscal years 1989 and 1990; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 4030. A bill to strengthen certain fish and wildlife laws; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 4031. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out conservation programs on military reservations and public lands for fiscal years 1989 through 1993; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMAS of California:

H.R. 4032. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the passive loss limitations will not apply to deductions and credits attributable to rental real estate activities of a taxpayer who is primarily engaged in real estate trade or business activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LELAND, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. PEASE, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 4033. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to address the medical needs of working welfare recipients; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BORSKI (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. APLEGATE, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COELHO, Mr. COURTER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. EARLY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FROST, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MANTON, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. SABO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STRATON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WALGREN, Mr.

WEISS, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. WORTLEY):

H.J. Res. 475. Joint resolution to designate October 1988 as "Polish American Heritage Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FAWELL (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DAUB, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mrs. ROUEKMA, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WEISS):

H.J. Res. 476. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning June 12, 1988, as "National Scleroderma Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H. Res. 388. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for the expenses of investigations and studies by standing and select committees of the House in the 2d sess. of the 100th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. WEISS introduced a bill (H.R. 4034) for the relief of Inna Hecker Grade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 39: Mr. STOKES.  
H.R. 190: Mr. MFUME, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, and Mr. SCHUETTE.  
H.R. 241: Mr. HOWARD.  
H.R. 276: Mr. PURSELL.  
H.R. 903: Mr. MANTON, Mr. RODINO, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ROE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, and Mr. LaFALCE.  
H.R. 1007: Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. McCLOSKEY, and Mrs. SAIKI.  
H.R. 1240: Mr. GALLEGLY.  
H.R. 1336: Mr. DARDEN.  
H.R. 1430: Mr. MURPHY.  
H.R. 1531: Mr. FRANK.  
H.R. 1632: Mr. CHANDLER.  
H.R. 1699: Mr. MINETA and Mr. RODINO.  
H.R. 1708: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 1782: Mr. PACKARD.  
H.R. 1842: Mr. COELHO, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. KASICH, Mr. MANTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. PENNY, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. STARK, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 2134: Mrs. BYRON, Mr. COYNE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. PEPPER.

H.R. 2419: Mr. KOLTER.  
H.R. 2508: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 2522: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. LEHMAN of California, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 2605: Mrs. ROUEKMA.

H.R. 2883: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, and Mr. REGULA.

H.R. 2928: Mr. WOLF, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 3054: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 3142: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. OLIN, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 3187: Mr. KASTENMEIER.

H.R. 3332: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.R. 3334: Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut and Mr. BIAGGI.

H.R. 3392: Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ESPY, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mrs. SAIKI.

H.R. 3397: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 3455: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 3506: Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. DAUB, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 3509: Mr. WHEAT, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. FLORIO, and Mr. STRATTON.

H.R. 3510: Mr. WHEAT, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. FLORIO, and Mr. STRATTON.

H.R. 3517: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3523: Mr. COBLE, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 3543: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 3565: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. ROBINSON.

H.R. 3577: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. COURTER, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, and Mr. INHOFE.

H.R. 3593: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MILLER of Washington, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 3603: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.R. 3607: Mr. FISH, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. OWENS of New York, and Mr. DAVIS of Michigan.

H.R. 3612: Mr. RITTER and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 3619: Mr. TALLON, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. GUARINI, and Mr. PRICE of Illinois.

H.R. 3627: Mr. KYL, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. WORTLEY.

H.R. 3754: Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 3769: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 3800: Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 3814: Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 3825: Miss SCHNEIDER and Mr. AUCCOIN.

H.R. 3830: Mr. OWENS of Utah and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 3844: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BRUCE, and Mr. FRENZEL.

H.R. 3850: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. MAZZOLI, and Mr. NICHOLS.

H.R. 3858: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 3883: Mr. STUDDS, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. COURTER, and Mr. HUBBARD.

H.R. 3892: Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. ROE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. YATRON, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. RAY, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. PENNY, Mr. DYSON, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 3893: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ROSE, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. GRAY of Illinois.

H.R. 3936: Mr. MACKEY, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. NELSON of Florida.

H.J. Res. 148: Mr. BATES, Mr. MACK, and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.J. Res. 333: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. COELHO, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUGHES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.J. Res. 371: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. WEISS.

H.J. Res. 383: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.J. Res. 398: Mr. BOSCO, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 415: Mr. HEFNER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DYSON, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ANNUNZIO, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.J. Res. 417: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. St GERMAIN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CONTE, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 418: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. KASICH.

H.J. Res. 445: Mr. MINETA, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. WISE, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. HOWARD.

H.J. Res. 447: Mr. CLAY, Mr. MICA, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. COELHO, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Ms. SNOWE.

H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. ATKINS.

H. Con. Res. 162: Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut.

H. Con. Res. 169: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. NIELSON of



Utah, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. WELDON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. STUMP.

H. Con. Res. 223: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BE-REUTER, Mr. BEVILL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. DELAY, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. HILER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mr. WOLPE.

H. Con. Res. 232: Mr. LIVINGSTON and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Con. Res. 241: Mr. SAXTON.

H. Res. 242: Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. LENT.

H. Res. 300: Mr. BUECHNER and Mr. SEN-SENRENNER.

## DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3660: Mrs. BENTLEY.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LITTLE KNOWN FIRM HAS  
BECOME THE ENVY OF OP-  
TIONS INDUSTRY

## HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise today to honor a good friend of mine, Mr. Joseph Ritchie, the founder, chairman, and chief trader of the Chicago Research and Trading Group Ltd.

Since Joe started CRT 11 years ago, it has become the world's largest options trading company with \$2.5 billion in trades daily and over \$225 million in capital. One of the secrets of the firm's unprecedented success is its sophisticated computer trading model which squeezes small profits out of each of a high number of trades each day.

The second secret of CRT's success is Joe Ritchie himself—he developed the firm's trading model, and he carries out the calculations used to evaluate each options contracts.

The third and final secret to the firm's success is Joe's management style. He treats his staff of almost 600 more like family than like employees, providing them with free meals prepared by the firm's resident chefs. His staff is encouraged to work together for the good of the whole firm, rather than to compete with one another for individual glory. Teamwork is the rule rather than the exception. This unique management style has been responsible for the high degree of job satisfaction among the firm's staff members and has facilitated CRT's high profit margins.

In this era of insider trading and other stock market scandals, Joe Ritchie and the Chicago Research and Trading Group stand as a beacon of hope in the night. Joe has demonstrated that a firm can follow ethical business practices, can treat its employees extremely well, and can still be successful. Just as importantly, he has also shown that the spirit of innovation that allowed the United States to attain its preeminent position in the international economy is still alive and well today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend Joe Ritchie for his accomplishments, and wish him continued success in the future. In recognition of the lessons these accomplishments hold for the rest of the American business community, I ask that a recent article about Joe that appeared in the Wall Street Journal be reprinted here in the RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 8, 1988]

LITTLE-KNOWN FIRM HAS BECOME THE ENVY  
OF OPTIONS INDUSTRY  
(By Scott McMurray)

CHICAGO.—Joseph Ritchie knows his math. No mere statistician, he solved the often-frustrating Rubik's Cube by turning the

puzzle a few times, then figuring out the algorithm on which it was based. When competitors were relying on mainframe computers, this options trader punched a 243-step program into a hand-held calculator.

And while Wall Street's top computer jockeys have been hamstrung by the controversy over program trading—particularly its role in the Oct. 19 stock-market crash—Mr. Ritchie and the little-known company he heads, Chicago Research & Trading Group Ltd., are miles ahead of their rivals.

CRT's secret is a computer system that uses one of the most sophisticated trading models in the securities industry. By monitoring monetary differences in options and futures prices, the model—developed mainly by Mr. Ritchie—helps the firm execute more than \$2.5 billion in trades each day.

"It's like picking up dimes in front of a bulldozer," says a CRT trader. "You can make a lot of money, but you have to keep your eye on the bulldozer."

## IMPORTANT PLAYER

CRT has done both. In the 11 years since it was founded, it has become the world's largest options-trading company and the envy of the industry.

The firm's initial \$200,000 stake has grown to \$225 million in capital. Trading solely with its own money, CRT at times is the biggest single player in the most important futures and options pits: It often accounts for more than 5% of the multibillion-dollar trading volume on the Standard & Poor's 500-stock index and Treasury-bond futures, and 30% to 40% of the volume in most exchange-traded options markets here and abroad.

Though broadly similar to program trading's technique of profiting from small price differences between related investments, CRT's system is highly refined. The company was one of the first firms to give program trading between stocks and stock futures an electronic whirl, but abandoned it a few years ago as profit margins grew too slim.

At the heart of CRT's computer model are closely guarded mathematical formulas used to calculate the value of options contracts, depending mainly on the market's volatility and the time remaining until the contract expires. Most options traders use some type of formula to evaluate options, but CRT's is one of the best, traders say.

## A BANG FOR ITS BUCK

Its computer programs decipher complex changes in price relationships, enabling traders to lock in minute profits and move on before most pit traders even notice the price shift. The firm trades simultaneously among scores of futures and options markets from Singapore to Chicago, aiming with trades of dizzying complexity to get the biggest bang for its buck.

That can baffle its rivals. Says the head of a competing firm: "I've seen their financial statements, and I still don't understand how they operate."

That suits CRT just fine.

Like a behemoth in ballet shoes, CRT glides through international financial markets but leaves few footprints. Almost un-

known to the investing public because it trades exclusively with other professionals, CRT is at the forefront of an emerging generation of high-tech traders who increasingly are dominating world markets. Its strategies not only eliminate the risk of betting on the direction of the markets but also enable it to cope with—and even profit from—growing market volatility.

## CHECKING THE BLOODBATH

Before most investors even understood what was happening on Black Monday morning, CRT had stanchied its losses. Within an hour, the company reversed thousands of transactions. While many competing firms took days to unscramble their trading and lost hundreds of millions of dollars, CRT knew its exact holdings as it continued to trade. It lost less than \$10 million—a mere nick for a firm its size.

And while regulators kept a round-the-clock vigil at some options-trading firms, they were satisfied that CRT was shipshape after a quick visit.

Central to CRT's success is the 41-year-old Mr. Ritchie, the firm's chairman and head trader. When he and three friends started the firm, Mr. Ritchie was so strapped for cash that he wore a borrowed business suit to meetings and laid an old door across two boxes for a desk. A tomato-juice can stuck in the doorknob hole doubled as a pencil holder. Even today a desk at one end of a conference room constitutes his office, and he still arrives for work most days in corduroy pants and an open-necked shirt. A suit—bought, not borrowed—gathers dust in a nearby closet.

Mr. Ritchie, who majored in philosophy at nearby Wheaton College after a three-year stint at an Oregon Bible school, also is responsible for the calculations needed to evaluate options contracts.

Using computer-generated charts, CRT's traders pair off one trade against another—buying Treasury-bond options, for instance, while selling Treasury-bond futures—and lock in a paper-thin but nearly riskless profit.

The profit on a single \$100,000 Treasury-bond option trade, for example, typically is less than \$4.50. But that amount multiplied by the 100,000 trades CRT executes daily makes the firm a low-margin, high-volume money machine.

One morning in CRT's trading room overlooking Lake Michigan, Mr. Ritchie, surrounded by six casually dressed traders in their 20s and 30s, calmly reviews possible foreign-currency options trades. The company's elaborate computer systems have updated valuation charts for traders in each market during the night. A team of computer programmers works all night if necessary to adjust CRT's complex software programs. The face on a clock in the department reads: "One, Two, Three, Four, Who Cares?"

Compared with the dozens of screaming traders crammed into most Wall Street trading rooms, the company's nerve center is remarkably subdued. CRT's octagonal trading desk—which could easily be overlooked if placed in the cavernous trading

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



rooms at Salomon Brothers Inc. or First Boston Corp.—has banks of multicolored computer screens that carry the firm's confidential trading information.

Each pit trader has a specific amount of money allocated to his market. A trader in Treasury-bond options, for example, will buy when the market price drops below the line on his valuation chart and sell when it moves above the line. New charts are printed and rushed to the pits when prices change rapidly. Others at CRT are responsible for coordinating the hedging of one trader's positions against another.

The system also calculates CRT's consolidated risk position for all markets and shows how that position would change if the markets became more or less volatile. Since Black Monday, CRT has enhanced the system to calculate its total risk position on an unprecedented minute-by-minute basis.

Mr. Ritchie leads the currency-options group through 45 minutes of complex options valuations without once touching a pencil. CRT trades about 700 yen options and more than 3,000 Treasury-bond options in less than an hour after the group has broken up to monitor other markets.

A system designed to squeeze small profits out of each trade doesn't keep CRT from hitting the jackpot now and then. In the first few trading days of this year, CRT made nearly \$5 million on several thousand foreign-currency options trades as the dollar rose sharply and most foreign currencies plummeted.

In mid-December, CRT's oil options and futures traders made nearly \$1 million as oil prices dropped sharply. And last July, following the release of poorer-than-expected British trade figures, CRT traders made over \$500,000 in a few hours on a \$3 million investment in British government-bonds options. CRT's \$3 billion in margin money controlled about 10,000 options valued at \$750 million.

The company's charts aren't the whole secret to CRT's success. Just as important is the company's unusual culture, an outgrowth of Mr. Ritchie's homey style. CRT encourages an informal, family atmosphere, including free meals served by five on-staff chefs. While many corporate executives pay lip service to their "team," the soft-spoken Mr. Ritchie, who considers Walt Disney "my hero for the 20th century," is genuinely uncomfortable talking about his role as the company's leader. "I could've made a lot of money going off and trading for myself," he says, "but I'm prouder of the group we have here than of the money we've made."

CRT's nearly 600 employees work in teams and are rewarded for their contribution to the firm, rather than for outshining one another. CRT also puts most recruits through an exhaustive series of interviews that focus on their psychological profiles as well as apparent trading talent. (No system is foolproof, however, Jeffrey G. Donnelly, a former CRT stock-index futures trader dismissed in 1986 for allegedly diverting profits from the firm, is under investigation by a federal grand jury here for possible criminal trading violations, according to people familiar with his case. Mr. Donnelly declines comment.)

CRT requires most professional recruits to take a pay cut to join the firm to ensure that money isn't their only motivation in changing jobs. Once on board, however, top employees can quickly earn six-figure salaries.

But as it expands, the firm has been forced to adopt a more corporate structure.

Last year Roderick Smith, formerly a managing director of Hongkong & Shanghai Banking Group in London, joined CRT in the newly created position of chief executive officer. Though it is aimed in part at giving CRT principals more time for other pursuits, a more corporate form could dampen its vaunted esprit de corps and reduce productivity.

The growth is also taking CRT into riskier dealings. It is expanding into over-the-counter options trading, which exposes the firm to greater risks than trading on exchanges, where a clearinghouse guarantees against defaults.

In late December CRT was named to the select group of 42 primary government securities dealers who trade directly with the Federal Reserve Board. The move to primary-dealership status is aimed at increasing revenue from government securities trading, which CRT entered in 1986 by buying a small dealership, and at attracting clients in Europe and Japan.

Another market crash seems to be the least of the firm's worries. Mr. Smith, the chief executive, says that morale at the firm is higher than ever following the crash. He is more concerned about the effect of a steep recession. "The thing we need as a machine is activity," he says. "Our biggest worry is a slow bleeding to death if the markets dry up."

#### AMERICAN HEART MONTH

#### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to remind my colleagues that by congressional resolution and Presidential proclamation, February is "American Heart Month." I join in recognizing the American Heart Association's [AHA] progress toward its goal of the "reduction of premature death and disability from cardiovascular diseases and Stroke."

As a result of the research, education and prevention programs of the American Heart Association, the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute [NHLBI], and the National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke [NINCDS], this Nation has experienced a remarkable reduction in coronary heart disease and stroke. The AHA reports that from 1976 to 1986 the death rate from coronary heart disease has declined by 27.9 percent and that stroke has fallen by 40.2 percent. According to AHA, this downward trend is directly related to the increased focus on the prevention of cardiovascular diseases by controlling its risk factors including smoking, high blood cholesterol, high blood pressure and diets rich in saturated fats and cholesterol.

Despite this progress, AHA estimates that in 1988 heart attack will strike 1.5 million individuals, killing about 540,000. Stroke will claim 500,000 victims, killing approximately 155,000. I am particularly concerned about the incidence of stroke.

Stroke, a cardiovascular disease that affects blood vessels supplying oxygen and nutrients to the brain, is the third largest killer in the United States behind heart attack and

cancer. According to the AHA, stroke is the leading cause of long-term disability. Although they estimate that stroke survivors number about 2 million, many of them confront extraordinary medical expenses. AHA reports an estimated figure of \$12.9 billion for 1987 stroke associated health care costs.

Research has shown that black Americans have more than a 60-percent greater risk of death and disability from stroke than whites. Since hypertension constitutes the most significant risk factor for stroke, many attribute this alarming statistic to higher occurrence of high blood pressure in blacks than in whites. The more efficient control of hypertension has been called the chief explanation for the declining death rate of stroke in the past 10 years.

In addition to progress with hypertension, the AHA cites other important improvements in the prevention and treatment of stroke. They include the identification of other controllable risk factors: Diabetes, heart disease, high red blood cell count and transient ischemic attacks—a series of little strokes that sometimes precede a major stroke; the reassessment of neurovascular procedures; improved diagnostic and monitoring techniques; and the development of new methods for immediate administration after stroke to hopefully reduce its debilitating effects.

During "American Heart Month," I draw special recognition to these advancements and thank the American Heart Association, the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, and the National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke for their contributions. Since stroke predominantly strikes the elderly, as our aging population grows, we must continue to invest resources in stroke research, treatment, prevention and education.

#### ENERGY AWARD TO MASSACHUSETTS

#### HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate the people of the State of Massachusetts for achieving the highest rank among all the States of this Nation for outstanding commitment to the environment and clean energy. For that effort, Massachusetts this week received the second annual State of the States award from the Fund for Renewable Energy. It shares this top ranking with the State of Wisconsin.

Massachusetts has achieved an unsurpassed record of energy efficiency and energy-related pollution control. In 1987, the State passed laws providing strong conservation standards, effective "least-cost" utility regulations, energy-wise building codes and targeted renewable energy tax incentives. It is a record that makes us proud and sets high standards for the entire country.

I am particularly proud to see the State enact tough energy efficiency standards for energy-guzzling appliances that go beyond the nationwide standards adopted by Congress

last year. By working with Governor Dukakis and other State leaders in Massachusetts, we were able to push forward with Federal standards on major home appliances, while not compromising the State's interest in adding tough lighting standards at the State level. Lighting remains a major national opportunity for additional energy savings.

Massachusetts also pressed forward with renewable energy tax incentives in the face of the administration's hostility to all nonnuclear energy subsidies. In addition to the renewable tax credit, we are pursuing conservation, cogeneration, hydroelectricity and clean burning coal. Finally, the State is leading the way on acid rain research and control, pesticide reduction and intelligent land-use planning.

It is for those reasons that the State of Massachusetts is to be commended for its energy and environmental accomplishments and for helping to provide national leadership in this critical area for our Nation.

#### ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

##### HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, On February 24, Estonians all around the world celebrated the 70th anniversary of Estonia's short-lived independence of 22 years.

At this point, we do not know how this major milestone was marked inside Estonia. Soviet authorities have closed Estonia to all foreign diplomats and journalists. But, based on past experience, I am sure that the courageous men and women of Estonia will find a fitting way to make their views known. Indeed, that is why the Kremlin has imposed a temporary blockade on Estonia.

It is not surprising that Soviet officials feel threatened by open expression of genuine popular sentiment in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. After all, for the past 48 years, the Soviet Government has illegally occupied those Baltic territories. The Soviet occupation of the three Baltic States is the result of the secret Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact between Stalin and Hitler. The United States Government has never recognized the Soviet annexation of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia.

Over the years, Estonians have suffered as a result of the continuing Soviet occupation of their country. In 1940 and 1941, over 40,000 Estonians were forcibly sent to Siberia. After World War II, many thousands more Estonians followed. The last President of independent Estonia, Konstantin Pats, died in a Stalinist camp. In recent years, thousands of Estonians, young and old, have participated in demonstrations to protest various Soviet policies in their country: Russification, Slavic settlement in Estonia, ecological damage, declining living standards, and, of course, military occupation. Arrests of Estonian human rights activists have been frequent; today, two courageous and committed Estonians, Mart Niklus and Enn Tarto, are still imprisoned. Tragically, another Estonian dissident, Mart Niklus, died in labor camp in 1981.

Dissent seems to be accelerating in Estonia today, with more demonstrations and protest

declarations being issued. Testifying before the Commission, Estonian activist and former political prisoner Tiit Madison said that the June 1987 demonstration in Riga, at which some 5,000 demonstrators and bystanders gathered to place flowers at Riga's Monument of Freedom and to denounce Stalin's crimes, "were like a torch which helped flame sentiments throughout the Baltic."

For the first time, the Estonian press has called on Russians living in Estonia to learn Estonian. Four Estonian intellectuals have even drawn up a plan to make Estonia economically self-sufficient. Sixteen Estonian dissidents have organized the Estonian National Independence Party.

In the wake of major riots in Kazakhstan, Gorbachev stated at the Central Committee plenum in January 1987, that the nationality issue had not been dealt with seriously enough. Then, in February 1987, the Soviet Government announced an early release program under which 200 political prisoners—many imprisoned for nationalist activities—were eventually released. More recently, in February of this year, General Secretary Gorbachev said at a party plenum that nationality problems were a fundamental vital issue for Soviet society. Comparatively speaking, the present Soviet leadership has responded more flexibly to nationality demands and seems to be more willing to address the nationality issue more realistically.

Mr. Speaker, the Helsinki Final Act in its Third Basket stressed the important contribution of national minorities and regional cultures to give concrete expression to the rights of minorities guaranteed under Principle VII. In addition, of course, Principle VIII of the final act addresses the crucial issue of national self-determination.

No nation has a perfect record in dealing with and resolving the divergent interests and demands of its minority groups or of its various nationalities. The Helsinki Commission urges the Soviet Union to give concrete expression to the commitments it made with regard to protecting the rights and freedoms of all of its citizens—and to permit referendums on self-determination.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO WINNERS OF WESTINGHOUSE SCIENCE TALENT SEARCH

##### HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to bring to your attention three of our Nation's brightest and most promising high school students.

Aurika Wanda Checinska, Chetan Nayak, and Brian Lee Zuckerman are winners of this year's Westinghouse Science Talent Search. All three are residents of New York's 17th District, which I have the honor to represent.

The Westinghouse contest honors students for their inquiring and intelligent minds and their motivation to pursue science and mathematics. It is the oldest and most prestigious competition for teenage scientists.

I am very pleased that of the 40 winners chosen nationwide, 16 are from the State of New York. In fact, no other State can boast more winners than the district I represent.

At a time when our Nation's educational system is being criticized and our technological competitiveness is slipping, these young men and women are a great source of pride and inspiration.

I congratulate Aurika, Chetan, Brian, and all of the other participants and wish them success in their future endeavors.

#### COMMEMORATING ESTONIA'S 70TH INDEPENDENCE DAY

##### HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today we mark the 70th anniversary of Estonia's Independence Day. While we friends of an independent Estonia celebrate this most auspicious day in the United States and in many other countries around the world, the Estonians themselves can celebrate only in the privacy of their own hearts because Estonia continues to be a captive nation held under the tyranny of the Soviet Union.

On February 24, 1918, the people of Estonia declared their independence. This country was well received among the community of nations, and in 1921 became a member of the League of Nations. During this period of independence, Estonia and her people thrived economically, socially and culturally.

In 1939, Estonia became a pawn in the struggle between larger nations. Hitler and Stalin secretly agreed to partition Europe, giving all three Baltic States to the Soviets. The Soviet Government moved quickly to establish its domination over Estonia. Using a pattern we have seen the Soviets use over and over again—a pattern of "mutual assistance" pacts, ultimatums, installation of Communist puppet governments, staged one-party elections, compulsory nationalization, house searches, mass arrests, deportation, summary executions and terror—the Soviet Government consolidated its control over Estonia and its sister Baltic nations of Lithuania and Latvia.

Many years have passed since Estonia first declared its independence, and from the time when Estonians fought the Soviet occupation in the 1940's. We have seen a new generation of Estonians grow up under Soviet domination, and we have seen that even in this new generation as Estonian adults continue to cherish the dream of a truly free and independent Estonia. This past summer in Tallinn, Estonians for the first time, participated in a mass demonstration calling for their independence. How many more such demonstrations will be allowed by the Soviets is unknown. Even the one last summer showed the world that the yearning for independence continues to burn brightly.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that all who cherish freedom and independence join in spirit with the people of Estonia to demonstrate both our concern for their situation and our hope that they will once again join the



community of nations as a truly independent member. I congratulate the people of Estonia on the 70th anniversary of their Independence Day, and look forward to the time when it can be celebrated in Estonia as openly as it is celebrated in the United States and the other democracies of the world.

### TRIBUTE TO THOMAS S. RAGSDALE, JR.

#### HON. ROBIN TALLON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to pay tribute today to a citizen of my district, Thomas S. Ragsdale, Jr., of Lake City, SC. Mr. Ragsdale is president of the T.S. Ragsdale Co. He was recently named one of Tobacco International magazine's seven "Men of the Year." Mr. Ragsdale is the first independent tobacco dealer ever selected for the award.

I would like to commend Mr. Ragsdale for his outstanding contributions to the tobacco industry. He has been a pioneer and an innovator in the production and processing of tobacco. I would like to share with you the following article, reprinted from the December 1987 edition of Tobacco International.

**TOBACCO INTERNATIONAL NAMES THOMAS RAGSDALE JR., IN TOP SEVEN "MEN OF THE YEAR"**

For Thomas S. Ragsdale Jr., there was never any doubt that he would become a tobacco man. He grew at his father's side fascinated by tobacco auctions, studying processing procedures, and roaming the T.S. Ragsdale Co. plant in Lake City, South Carolina. Thomas S. Ragsdale Sr. spent countless hours teaching the son who would lead his company, how to buy competitively, to process effectively, and most importantly, to insist on quality while always looking for ways to improve . . . to do the job better . . . to become more efficient.

"My father taught me that tradition was a challenge to excel, not a reason to relax," reflects Ragsdale, president of T.S. Ragsdale Co. "He spent his entire career building a company that was committed to providing the best for its clients."

After serving in the U.S. Army Air Force, the younger Ragsdale officially joined the company in 1948. As it grew, T.S. Ragsdale Co. earned a reputation for sound capital investments in equipment to insure the best possible product at the lowest possible price. The company was the first dealer in the U.S. to go to 100 percent electronic picking and threshing. By 1973, computers were being installed to monitor the picking of tobacco. When others were reluctant to modernize, Ragsdale built a state of the art tobacco factory equipped with the finest combination of Cardwell and AMF equipment backed up by vibrating shakers. Today, Tom Ragsdale is convinced that the commitment to progress is one reason for his company's success.

"We have always given a tremendous amount of personal attention to the processing and handling of our customers' tobacco. We commit our management to closely monitor every detail. When we see a way to improve quality and to cut cost, we make the investment," states Ragsdale. "In 1956,

there were 15 tobacco processors in South Carolina. Today, there's one . . . T.S. Ragsdale Co. That's testimony to both our insistence for the highest quality and our commitment to modernization."

Long before diversification became an industry trend, Ragsdale started searching for business opportunities that would complement the seasonal nature of the tobacco business. In 1957, he led the company into the charcoal briquet industry. This diversification enabled the company to utilize its labor, warehouses, and equipment on a year-round basis. This Ragsdale diversification has translated into lower costs for its tobacco customers. Today, the Embers Charcoal Division annually produces in excess of 70,000 tons of charcoal briquets for 14 million outdoor barbecues. Embers is the third largest charcoal manufacturer in the United States and the leading exporter of briquets to Europe.

"Our company's main objective is maximum efficiency in order to generate lower overhead and lower costs," asserts Ragsdale. "We don't diversify just for diversification's sake. Each company in our organization must complement all the other companies. Our most recent diversification, Ragsdale Transportation Brokerage Co. and Embers Express Trucking Co. allow Ragsdale customers the benefit of precise tobacco movement as well as offering extremely competitive freight rates."

Today, T.S. Ragsdale Co. employs over 200 full time employees with an additional 100 during the height of the tobacco season. While the company has grown considerably over the last 20 years, Ragsdale is still actively involved with all levels of the corporation.

"Tom understands that good people are essential to success. He demands, excellence, and he expects results; however, he is extremely loyal to his people," states Dick Clayton, vice president of leaf sales and purchases. "And, no one in the tobacco industry works harder than Tom Ragsdale. For Tom, good enough is never really good enough."

"Tommy is always doing something," reflects Carol Ragsdale. "It doesn't matter whether he's working or hunting or playing with the grandchildren, he's totally involved." Ragsdale has been both an Elder and a Deacon at the Lake City Presbyterian Church. He has served on the Board of Directors of Coker College and the St. James School. He is on the Board of Directors of Atlantis Airlines and has chaired the Management Committee.

"No one knows the tobacco business like Dad," says Smith Ragsdale, executive vice president. "When we were kids, he always took the time to involve us in the company." Both T. Smith Ragsdale III and Charles S. Ragsdale have followed their father into the family business. Tom's daughter, Caroline Reutter, serves on the Board of Directors.

As he looks to the future, Ragsdale is confident. "In the near future, the domestic and international markets will be more competitive. Our company will continue to be aggressive," he asserts. "We will continue to search for methods to keep our costs low to our customers. We will maintain our commitment to the two things that have made us successful—quality product and service excellence."

"From the time I was a young man, I just knew I would spend my life in tobacco. It's an exciting, challenging industry that's changing every day. And, at the same time, there is a wonderful tradition based on in-

tegrity and trust," observes Ragsdale. "There's just no business like the tobacco business."

### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

#### HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1988

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in recognizing the 70th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day on Tuesday, February 16. The Lithuanian people have displayed tremendous courage in their fight for self-determination and we cannot ignore their valiant efforts to maintain their national identity.

On that date in 1918, the Council of Lithuania declared itself a nation state which became a free and sovereign state. Lithuania flourished economically, politically, and religiously. However, as we know, the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939 spelled the end of these freedoms when Germany ceded its territorial claims to Lithuania to the Soviet Union. The following year, the Soviet Union began its forceful occupation of the nations in the Baltic region including Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. The Soviets then attempted to assimilate the Baltic nations into the Soviet Union while tens of thousands of people, whose greatest crime was the desire for freedom, were murdered or sent into internal exile.

It is a great testament to the will of the Lithuanian people that they withstood such harsh measures of repression and acculturation, and yet continued to maintain a language, culture, and religion unique to themselves. For 48 years, the Lithuanian people have shown a resilience and a tenacity that demonstrates their unwavering commitment to the right of self-determination.

The freedoms enjoyed by the Lithuanian people during that nation's short-lived independence were lost, but were not forgotten. To this day, all the free nations of the world share the dream of Lithuanians; to create a homeland and a nation that is truly their own to ensure the survival of their rich heritage. The challenge before us is to ensure that the struggle of the Lithuanian people is never forgotten so that once again their national identity shall never perish.

### BLACK HISTORY MONTH

#### HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1988

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay honor and tribute to Black History Month, and to acknowledge those black Americans who contributed greatly not only to African-American culture and history, but to world history.

Since 1976, February has been celebrated as Black History Month, but the origins of this event date back to 1926, when Dr. Carter G.

Woodson set aside a special period of time in February to recognize the heritage, achievements and contributions of African Americans.

There have been countless individuals who have made important contributions to the lives of African Americans and other minorities. Many of those contributions, however, would not have been possible if it were not for the tremendous efforts of a much smaller number of persons. Male and female, their courage, determination, integrity and talents were unmatched. Because they possessed such qualities, doors that were once closed are now opened. They are the ones who made a difference, they are the movers and shakers that helped make the world better for blacks.

Dating back to colonial times with Crispus Attucks, blacks have made great progress in many areas of American life. They have made practical and significant contributions to the fields of science and invention, to medicine, to the arts, music and entertainment, to education and government, and to business.

Scientists like Dr. Charles Drew and Dr. Daniel Hale Williams have helped to save numerous lives with their contributions to medicine and to the lives of all peoples. Dr. Drew, a black man, developed the first blood plasma bank, which saved numerous lives and enabled hospitals to store blood for longer periods of time. And, Dr. Daniel Williams, a surgeon, was the first black man to perform a successful operation on the human heart.

Political figures, educators, and scholars like Andrew Young, Mary Church Terrell, Benjamin Mays, Barbara Jordan, Shirley Chisholm, Mary McLeod Bethune, Harold Washington, and John Hope Franklin have all contributed tirelessly and unselfishly to the political and mental growth of black Americans. And, so many of our own colleagues, including Ron Dellums, John Conyers, Mickey Leland, and John Lewis, a hero of the civil rights movement who fought at the side of Martin Luther King, have also contributed their efforts and time to our great Nation.

And, let us not forget about those who have provided us with great literary works and pieces like Gwendolyn Brooks, Phillis Wheatley, Zora Neale Hurston, Toni Morrison, and James Baldwin. Nor those who provided musical, dance, and theater entertainment like operatic diva Leontyne Price, musical geniuses Quincy Jones, Michael Jackson, and Steve Wonder and premiere female artists like Diana Ross, Lena Horne, and Dorothy Dandridge. Further, we should acknowledge those who have presented an even stronger impact on the African-American community within the past 3 years. Those like Redskins Superbowl quarterback Doug Williams, Olympic ice skater Debbie Thomas, former Miss America Vanessa Williams, Radio City Music Hall Rockette Jennifer Jones, fashion designers Willie Smith and Patrick Kelley, National Security Advisor Colin Powell, Jr., and space shuttle astronaut Ron McNair. Each has contributed something of note to the long upward climb of black people in not only America, but in Europe and in other parts of the world.

But, in applauding the significant strides and contributions these blacks have provided, let us not forget about the plight of the brethren in South Africa, of the continued starvation among those in Ethiopia, or of the recent es-

calation of race related incidents here in the United States. One should also remember that pride and awareness in one's culture and history should not be celebrated only 1 month a year, but should be highlighted in the lives of all, all year around, as a tool of inspiration for the continued growth and development of the race. Let all people work together in one body so that all cultures may be able to learn, accept and appreciate the distinguished role people of all races, nationalities, and cultures have contributed to society.

#### OUR FRIEND TAIWAN

#### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to pay tribute to an important political figure and good friend—Chiang Ching-kuo. Most Members now know that Chiang Ching-kuo recently passed away, ending his 10-year reign as President for the Republic of China on Taiwan. I have visited Taiwan on numerous occasions since 1970 and I have always been impressed by the hospitality of its people and the outstanding success it has experienced since its formation.

During the last few decades Taiwan has experienced much economic growth. Between 1970 and 1980, Taiwan's economy grew about 10 percent each year, making Taiwan into an economic power. The ROC currently is the sixth largest United States trading partner. Indirect trade between the ROC and the mainland exceeds \$2 billion annually. Economic growth throughout this country is clearly abundant, and it truly reflects favorably upon the leadership of the Republic of China.

Taiwan is also a bastion of freedom. We only hear about citizens from the Peoples Republic of China risking their lives to immigrate to the Republic of China. We never hear of Taiwanese citizens attempting to flee to the mainland. Citizens of Taiwan are free to run their own businesses; they are free to immigrate; they are free to practice religion; they are free to criticize the government. Chiang Ching-kuo deserves much of the credit for the many freedoms that the people of Taiwan now have.

I urge my colleagues to read the following article written by Dr. Frederick Chien, representative for the Coordination Council for North American Affairs. Dr. Chien gives a detailed review of President Ching-kuo's life and the many accomplishments for which he was responsible. It is important for Members of Congress to remember that Taiwan is one of our best friends and that we will all benefit from understanding the accomplishments of its most recent President.

LEGACY OF PRESIDENT CHIANG CHING-KUO  
(Presented by Dr. Frederick F. Chien, Representative, Coordination Council for North American Affairs Chicago Committee, Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, Feb. 9, 1988)

I consider it a great privilege to be with you today. The Chicago Committee of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations is one of this country's most prestigious forums. I

am honored that you extended an invitation to me and gave me this opportunity to discuss with you momentous events which are occurring in the Republic of China today.

As many of you probably are already aware, my country lost its great leader and President, Chiang Ching-kuo, less than four weeks ago. He was an immensely popular figure—a populist by nature—and his death was mourned not just by those holding positions of leadership in government and business but, as you say in America, by "the man on the street," who forms the bedrock of our society.

It may be pertinent to note in this regard that an annual public opinion poll conducted by the Public Opinion Research Foundation shortly before President Chiang's death showed his approval rating in 1987 at 85 percent. This was up seven percent from 1986, reflecting the overwhelming support he received from the citizens of my country for his bold democratization program initiated last year. An 85 percent approval rating would cause most American politicians to turn green from envy, I suspect, and indicates that Chiang Ching-kuo must have possessed unusual qualities of leadership.

This should come as no surprise. He was schooled in leadership by his father, President Chiang Kai-shek. As the eldest son, Chiang Ching-kuo learned his lessons well and earned the high offices he held. He was elected to the presidency only after more than 40 years of service in various government and party positions, including six years as premier.

It was my personal privilege to know well both President Chiang Kai-shek and our late President Chiang Ching-kuo. I served as President Chiang Kai-shek's secretary for ten years and was privy to many of his meetings with world leaders. I saw firsthand how skilled he was in the art of diplomacy. Likewise, I knew President Chiang Ching-kuo for some 30 years and during his term as premier, I served as his official spokesman. That was a great experience for me, and I shall never forget how President Chiang Ching-kuo instructed me when I assumed my duties.

President Chiang said, "Fred, you are now my spokesman. I know you are a man of integrity and would never say anything which is untrue on your own account. Never think that you have to tell a lie on my account. Always be straightforward and tell the truth, and I will be well-served."

So, I can tell you without reservation that President Chiang was a man of high moral principles and integrity. In short, he said what he meant and he meant what he said. This characteristic, perhaps more than any other, allowed him over the years to inspire confidence and to make an indelible mark on the history of the Republic of China.

But let's not get ahead of ourselves. Let's look back to President Chiang's earlier accomplishments. Then we can appreciate even more the service he rendered his country and the vision he had for the future of the Republic of China.

I said earlier that President Chiang Ching-kuo was a "populist." He was comfortable in the presence of the powerful, but I earnestly believe he was happiest in the company of working people. He moved easily among the people he served and took pleasure in trips to factories and farms and visits with shopkeepers and laborers. He appreciated the contribution they made to creating a modern society on Taiwan and he wanted them to know it. He was determined



that policies of the government would result in a continuously higher standard of living for them and greater participation in the processes of government.

He availed himself of every possible opportunity to attain those goals for the Chinese on Taiwan. As chairman of the Vocational Assistance Commission for Retired Servicemen, he understood the needs of those who had served their country on the battle field and had to make the transition to private life. Just as you created special training and employment programs for veterans in the United States, Chiang Ching-kuo did so on Taiwan. We Chinese are known for our extended families and for making sure that relatives are cared for in their old age. But many soldiers had been unable to bring their families with them to Taiwan. In their old age, they found themselves alone. President Chiang made sure they were not forgotten by the country they had served; they were cared for.

And as he understood the peculiar problems of the old, he understood the needs and ambitions of the young. As director for more than 20 years of the China Youth Corps, he knew that China's future depended upon the development of its young people. He had the ability to instill in them his own intense nationalism, his devotion to Dr. Sun Yat-sen, who founded the Republic of China, and his dedication to the principles of democracy and free enterprise which are the foundation for what many call the "miracle" which has happened on Taiwan. He knew that young people had to keep busy. Corps projects and summer camps became outlets for the constructive energy of hundreds of thousands of young Chinese who now hold my country's future in their hands.

Let me pause for a moment to say that the Republic of China would not be the international economic power that it is today without careful planning over the years. Throughout the world, we have seen what has happened when developing countries set out helter-skelter to try to improve their lot. Not only are they not successful, usually they take steps backwards. Economic woes are followed by political woes and, all too often, domestic unrest degenerates into violence, anarchy and bloodshed.

Thanks to the vision of such persons as President Chiang, Taiwan's progress has been planned and orderly. Social and political progress have kept step with economic progress. We are always flattered when scholars hold up Taiwan's experience as an example to other developing countries.

President Chiang had the long view, and that long view is a great part of his legacy. When he became premier in 1972, the country was beginning to understand its potential as a major exporting nation. But it lacked the infrastructure necessary to achieve that goal. Times were not so good then, either. Because of the international oil crisis, the treasury was depleted and the government was operating at a deficit. The future was unsure, and the faint-hearted were arguing for retrenchment. It was in this economic climate that then Premier Chiang Ching-kuo proposed the "10 Major Construction Projects," which, while necessary to establish a viable infrastructure, would require tremendous public expenditures. He was willing to take the risk to insure Taiwan's place in world trade in the decades to come. He prevailed and all China shall be forever grateful, for he laid the foundation—carefully, block-by-block—for the "economic miracle" which was to follow.

Chiang Ching-kuo knew that Taiwan could not be a major manufacturing country unless it could easily move raw materials and finished goods about the island. So he built major highways to keep domestic commerce flowing. Taiwan could not ship its goods to world markets without deep water ports and modern shipping facilities. So he built two new world-class ports. Taiwan could not make the transition from light to heavy industry without the ability to produce a vital raw material—steel. So he launched Taiwan's modern steel industry. Taiwan could not produce goods without energy to turn the factory wheels. So he built new power plants. And Taiwan could not entice foreign investment to the island without a major new international airport. So he built one.

Piece by piece, he put the program together so each project complemented the other and formed a solid foundation for a dynamic export economy. He was not alone in his undertakings. The free Chinese on Taiwan were with him. He called for national sacrifice and the support of all the island's citizens. He got both, and his detractors shook their heads in disbelief as the projects were begun and successfully completed.

But neither he nor the country could afford to rest upon its laurels. Other countries in Asia were making progress also, though not at the same rate. It was clear that Taiwan would not be a leader for long if it were content to remain primarily a producer of labor-intensive products and be a captive of traditional industries.

When Chiang Ching-kuo took the oath of office for the first time as President in 1987, his work was cut out for him. High-tech was just around the corner. The handwriting was on the wall: any country which could not upgrade its economy would be out of the game. Developing countries would be forced to play in the minor leagues and compete against themselves. Countries such as Japan, Germany and the United States would play in the majors.

President Chiang was not willing to accept minor league status for the ROC. He urged the people on Taiwan to shift toward a technologically intense economy. We made a conscious decision to cede part of our share of such markets as plastics, textiles, and other inexpensive consumer goods for the opportunity to move with the major industrialized nations into the new age of computers and high-tech. As you know, that has proved to be a wise decision.

The Republic of China on Taiwan is now the fifth largest trading partner of the United States in the world. Last year two-way trade between our countries was \$31.2 billion. Building the foundation for a major manufacturing and exporting nation and developing that nation into what is now one of the world's healthiest economies was no small task. It is a legacy that few leaders have ever been privileged to leave with their people.

Today, the signs of prosperity and economic well-being are evident throughout Taiwan. Today per capita income has risen dramatically to about \$5000, one of the highest in Asia. A study of the distribution of wealth has showed that the gap between the top and bottom of the income scale has narrowed to one of the best ratios in the world. On Taiwan, the ratio of the average per capita income of the top 20 percent and the bottom 20 percent is an amazing 4.4:1. Another survey showed that a great majority—85 percent—of the people consider themselves "middle class," a sign of econom-

ic and social stability. Symbols of affluence and creature comforts—cars, refrigerators, televisions—are common. The fruit of Taiwan's progress has been shared by all its citizens.

President Chiang was never satisfied. The words he had written in his diary on his 70th birthday at the beginning of this decade were always fresh in his mind. He had said then, "Time flies. I know I have done too little to express my gratitude to my father or to fulfill even a small fraction of the expectations of my compatriots." He could not rest until, in his words, "Anything that must be done for the good of the people (has been) done." He still had mountains to climb.

I have mentioned that as premier he spearheaded the "10 Major Construction Projects." They had provided a solid foundation for Taiwan's economic development but, when he became president, he knew, it was time to bolster that foundation. And he felt compelled to look for ways to improve the quality of life of the almost 20 million people of the Republic of China.

Working closely with the country's leadership and highly trained young Chinese professionals—now a mainstay of our development efforts—he proposed a 14-point program designed to insure Taiwan's continued progress and touch every life on the island.

So even in his 70s and in ill-health—he had long suffered from diabetes—President Chiang still possessed great energy and determination. His agenda was that of a man half his age. And remember, too, that at the same time he was having to deal each day with the serious problems resulting from the ROC's trade imbalance with the United States; maintaining a strong defense system to deter the mainland's designs on Taiwan—he was a former minister of defense; and the day-to-day problems of running a government.

But the last chapter still was not written. And it is that chapter which may be most memorable. To paraphrase the words of the American poet Robert Frost, Chiang Ching-kuo still had promises to keep—to his father and his compatriots—and miles to go before he slept.

President Chiang looked about him and saw a prosperous economy. He saw an educated citizenry. He saw hundreds of thousands of persons traveling abroad each year, expanding their horizons and their expectations. He saw a pluralistic society where people were eager to learn more about democracy and the science of self-government. Looking around him, he saw a country that was more secure than at any time since the government relocated on Taiwan in 1949. And he realized that the task before him—perhaps his last major task—was to perfect the country's democratic institutions and insure future generations of free Chinese maximum involvement in their government.

He proposed that the Emergency Decree, which had existed for 38 years, be lifted, removing the last vestiges of "martial law" on Taiwan. In fact, the decree had little effect on the citizens of my country and a survey showed that it was near the bottom of their list of concerns. But the specter of "martial law" continued to be raised in the international community and President Chiang wanted to remove it and settle the matter once and for all.

Opposition candidates had been clamoring for some time for the right to form a party and run a slate of candidates under a single banner rather than running individually as independents against the ruling party. The

restrictions on the formation of new political parties were lifted, and the door was opened for a multi-party political system to challenge President Chiang's own KMT. Interestingly enough, when the first elections were over, the KMT still polled about the same percentage it had polled in previous elections (70 percent), giving a vote of confidence to the KMT and its leadership in its first head-on challenge.

Restrictions on newspapers were eased. Already licenses have been granted for the publication of new newspapers, and established newspapers have the right to expand their coverage. An educated population is an inquiring population, and Taiwan's newspapers now will be a greater source of news and opinion. The war of words has begun, for as the English writer, John Milton, said, "Where there is much desire to learn, there of necessity will be much arguing, much writing, many opinions, for opinion in good men is but knowledge in the making."

On Taiwan, we believe, quite sincerely, that democracy must be learned. We have looked to the United States above all others as our teacher in this area just as we have looked to you repeatedly for lessons in free enterprise and market economy. The United States has outstripped every other country in the world in developing democratic institutions and creating prosperity for its people. We are grateful, and our imitation is intended as the most sincere form of flattery.

Last of all, President Chiang tackled the problem of how to make our legislative body more representative of the people of Taiwan without abandoning the Republic of China's claim to represent all China and its ultimate goal of reunification with the mainland. Revitalizing the structure of the national law-making body and admitting new, younger blood has just begun, but it took a bold leader to focus the attention of his countrymen on this sensitive problem and, we hope, pave the way for an ultimate solution.

President Chiang Ching-kuo's democratization program, viewed broadly, as I noted, as a "display of courage and confidence in the people to whom he had brought unprecedented prosperity," drew accolades from throughout the world. And the citizens of my country have talked of little else since these dramatic reforms were proposed and, one-by-one, began to become reality.

There is one more important part of President Chiang's legacy which I think I should discuss with you.

For seven decades, members of the Chiang family—first president Chiang Kai-shek and later his son Chiang Ching-kuo—have been prominent figures in both the Kuomintang (Nationalist party) and the government of the Republic of China. Despite efforts by President Chiang Ching-kuo to dispel speculation, rumors persisted that he would somehow pass the mantle of leadership to another member of the Chiang family. Obviously, some observers did not understand his populist nature. Now, history has proved his sincerity.

Because President Chiang was in ill health for a long while, questions concerning succession constantly arose. He often pointed to the constitution and said firmly that succession would be orderly and in accord therewith. When he died January 13, there was no doubt on Taiwan what would happen. In accord with the constitution adopted in 1946, Vice President Lee Teng-hui, a native of Taiwan province and proven administrator, was sworn in immediately. Government in the Republic of China pro-

ceeded without a hitch. President Chiang's insistence that there was no place in Taiwan's modern democratic government for a family dynasty is now an important part of his legacy.

It is important to note that President Lee, who became vice president in 1984, is the first Taiwan-born president of the Republic of China. His succession blunts much of the criticism which opposition leaders have made about the participation of Taiwan-born Chinese in the government of the Republic of China. The truth is that President Chiang worked hard to make the KMT an inclusive, rather than an exclusive, political party. Today more than 80 percent of the members of the KMT were born on Taiwan and about half of our cabinet ministers. Any person who wants to participate in the party can do so and the height to which he or she can rise depends only on the limits of their own energies, ambitions and abilities.

President Chiang Ching-kuo, shortly before his death, dictated a last testament which was witnessed by several government leaders, including then Vice President Lee. He called upon the people to continue to seek reunification with the mainland, oppose communism and, importantly, to "actively carry constitutional democratic development forward without interruption." Upon assuming the office of president, Dr. Lee Teng-hui called upon the citizens of the Republic of China "to follow without fail the final exhortations of President Chiang . . . with one heart and mind in a united effort." The torch was passed.

President Chiang's leadership will be deeply missed. But, he was a wise man. He knew he would not stay on the scene forever and planned carefully for our future. His legacy actually has two parts: unprecedented economic progress and democratic reforms he initiated during his life, and the clear path he marked for the Republic of China's democratic development after his death.

One editorialist summed up by stating, "Taiwan, which first showed Third World nations how to use capitalism, free trade and export-led growth to turn a third-world peasant economy into a sophisticated exporter with a flourishing middle class, now appears bent on demonstrating how democratization can be made to follow economic success."<sup>1</sup> In the long run, the extraordinary economic success and the democratic reforms instituted during President Chiang Ching-kuo's last years will be equally treasured by the citizens of the Republic of China.

#### COMMEMORATION OF BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1988

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, this year, in commemorating Black History Month, I would like to share with my colleagues information which has been brought to my attention by Alton Yates—senior administrative aide to Jacksonville Mayor Tommy Hazouri—about the history of Free Blacks in Florida. The following is an excerpt from an article, "The

<sup>1</sup> The Ledger-Star, Norfolk, Virginia, January 5, 1988.

Free Negro in Florida", written in 1965 by historian Leedell W. Neyland.

The emergence of the free Negro as a distinct group in Florida is indebted to a series of problems created by fugitive slaves from the nearby English colonies of Georgia and South Carolina who took refuge in the Spanish colony of Florida. When English authorities demanded their return, the Spanish responded by keeping the fugitive slaves and reimbursing the English claimants up to 200 pesos per slave for their losses. On April 12, 1731, the Council of the Indies in Madrid, Spain, decided that no negroes who escaped to Florida should be returned nor should any more be paid for in the future.

During the seven year span from 1731 to 1738, Negro fugitives came into Florida with increasing rapidity. Since they did not consider themselves chattel slaves, they soon began to demand their freedom. Consequently, on May 31, 1738, Governor Montiano reported that various Negroes, fugitives from the English colonies held as slaves by citizens of St. Augustine, appeared before him, and demanded liberty on the strength of royal cedulas. He decreed that their appeal be granted. The decision to grant freedom to the slaves was not an easy one to make, for it was made over the violent protests of slave owners.

Inasmuch as the newly liberated freedmen had no place to live nor any adequate means of livelihood, Governor Montiano set aside a special area as a settlement for them on the northern outskirts of St. Augustine. During the Spanish rule, this settlement was known as Garcia Real de Santa Teresa de Mose; however, under British rule after 1763, it was known simply as "Moosa" or Moosa Village. This place no doubt became the first free Negro settlement in what is now called the United States. To aid this settlement in its growth and development, Governor Montiano provided both spiritual and economic assistance. In late 1738, he secured the services of a priest, Reverend Joseph de Leon, to instruct the settlement of thirty-eight families in the Catholic doctrine and in good customs. Furthermore, he supplied the colony with food and supplies until they harvested their crops. When the settlement was in danger of being overrun by the English in 1740, Governor Montiano withdrew the Negroes from "Moosa" and reestablished them in St. Augustine for their own protection. After the threat passed, the Negroes were returned to "Moosa", and another public announcement was made stating that all other fugitives arriving at the settlement would be freed. Over the years, "Moosa" received a high degree of independence."

#### THE NORTHEAST-MIDWEST HEARING ON PLANT CLOSINGS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important hearing held earlier this week by the Northeast-Midwest Congressional Coalition. The hearing, entitled "Forum on Worker Dislocation in the Automotive Industry," provided an opportunity to closely examine the devas-



tating impact of auto plant closings on communities.

Recently, the Chrysler Corp. announced that it plans to close its stamping and assembly operations in Kenosha, WI, by the end of the 1988 model year. If Chrysler goes ahead with its proposed shutdown, 5,500 workers will lose their jobs.

At Tuesday's hearing, two labor representatives from Kenosha testified on the impact of this decision on Chrysler's workers, their families, and the entire community. The two witnesses were Ed Steagall, president, UAW Local 72 in Kenosha, and Roger Bybee, editor, the Racine Labor, Racine.

I want to thank Ed and Roger for helping to focus national attention on what Chrysler has done to the city of Kenosha. Their testimony follows, along with a statement I submitted at the hearing:

**TESTIMONY OF ED STEAGALL, PRESIDENT,  
UAW LOCAL 72, KENOSHA, WI**

In 1973 I attended a UAW School for Workers and at that seminar it was stated that the United States auto makers and United States Steel would have to do something for the future. At that time President Leonard Woodcock of the UAW told Washington, D.C. that the American auto and steel industries would be having a huge problem and they would have to take action now. Washington has not responded, and we now have to fix a two-decade-old problem.

What can be done for Americans, for the American work force, because imports continue to bombard our shorelines? My membership is being put out of work because American companies are allowed to invest profits made in America into the economies of other countries, where they can take unfair advantage of cheap labor, no benefits and sub-standard working conditions. Legislation has to be passed that makes U.S. companies like Chrysler, which has been profitable, invest in the American companies so they remain modern, efficient and will produce job security to the American worker.

Chrysler has a new engine operation in Mexico, while Kenosha, after 89 years of service, are being told they will no longer be employed by Chrysler. This is not fair when you look where Chrysler's private profits originated. To invest in Mexican markets is a crime. Why didn't Chrysler invest into an established work force in Kenosha which produces the best quality vehicle in the Chrysler family? Why is Chrysler allowed to invest in Red China as published 2-17-88 Chrysler Motor Times. (See exhibit No. 1.)

Americans should have received that work. A new V10 is being developed at this time by Chrysler and that work is going to be placed in Mexico. That is wrong, when the Kenosha work force is being terminated! Please help us, not just union members, but for every job that is directly affected by a layoff in the plant, one job from the community is also lost! Our population in Kenosha is approximately 80,000 people. Sixty-five percent of those laid off live in Kenosha so multiply 14.2 for the average family X every worker affected, equals 27,300 directly affected and probably another 27,300 from the community. (See exhibit No. 2.)

This is devastating to our state's economy when people have to use Unemployment Compensation and welfare while trying to get replacement jobs or retraining. People will lose their homes, cars and children's educations and all that has been saved from

prior years of employment. The single worker will not receive half as much because social programs are directed to family services. (See exhibit No. 3.)

Our law enforcement agencies are already concerned about economic depression where families will be broken up and more severe discipline will have to be enforced in our community. Please think of the single individual so that programs and monies become available to them where their families do not have to suffer because of economic crisis at home and so the law will not have to be broken in order to provide shelter and food for their children's table.

Our plant has been making money for the Chrysler Corporation but because of economic injustices between countries, Chrysler chooses to develop new products for China, Mexico, slave labor countries and other non-American countries. Legislation has to be passed that will protect our shores from imports. Legislation must punish American businesses that do not treat their employees with dignity and respect and fail to provide long-term security to the workers and their families.

It is wrong to open up new plants with new partners and dislocate workers who have long-term service with the company. Therefore, I am asking that this Congressional body develop the means to force Chrysler Corporation to become a responsible American company and protect our jobs in Kenosha, or face the consequences, which could cause them to lose crucial government contracts.

**TESTIMONY OF ROGER BYBEE, EDITOR, THE  
RACINE LABOR, RACINE, WI**

I am Roger Bybee, Editor of The Racine Labor Newspaper in Racine, Wisconsin. I want to thank Congressman Aspin and the Northeast-Midwest Coalition for inviting me to testify on some issues of burning importance.

When Chrysler announced on January 27 that it planned to close its Kenosha operations, the company was simply removing a pin from its map of corporate facilities. For Chrysler Chairman Lee Iacocca, he was simply shutting down a plant for the 31st time.

But for the People of Kenosha, Racine, and other communities in southeastern Wisconsin and Northern Illinois, the announcement came as a shattering blow to their lives and their dreams. Chrysler's announcement came as the social equivalent of an atomic bomb, whose "radioactivity" can be measured in unrealized hopes, in lives wasted in despair, alcohol and drug abuse, family violence, in homes that are foreclosed, cars that are repossessed and in huge numbers of people forced to rely on public assistance. The mushroom cloud of social devastation will reach far beyond the 5,500 families directly affected by one of the largest plant closings in recent years: Its effects will be felt also by workers at local parts suppliers, the owners of small businesses whose customers draw their livelihoods from Chrysler, and area taxpayers who will be forced to pick up the pieces of lives shattered by Chrysler's decision.

The plan by Chrysler to end auto production in Kenosha represented a sudden repudiation of previous and extensive promises made by Chrysler with the express purpose of eliciting major concessions from the union, city, county and state. In both oral and written pledges, such as the June 26, 1987 letter from Chrysler to the city of Kenosha, the company committed itself to

maintaining auto production for 3 to 5 years. Many hundreds of families made critical decisions based on these pledges: Workers quit jobs at other plants to return to Chrysler; their families bought homes, and incurred other debts. Moreover, the workers responded to Chrysler's promise of job security by setting several records for quality production.

Chrysler officials may argue that no formal contract exists which requires them to maintain production in Kenosha. But they should be reminded that their fast statements were not mere "projections" or "predictions" that were uncontrollably determined by changes in the market; those statements were pledges aimed at gaining concessions from other parties. The union, the state, and local governments kept their word, but Chrysler has not. As one observer noted, the Chrysler warranty on the deal has expired in 7 months, instead of 5 years. Perhaps that means that someone has doctored the odometer reading on the deal.

Chrysler's plan to shut down its Kenosha operation (with the exception of its engine line) leaves an enormous crater that local and state government resources cannot possibly fill. The shutdown will mean a loss of about \$171 million in wages, for which there are no foreseeable substitutes. Retail development along I-94 and Highway 50, and marina-related development in both Racine and Kenosha are touted by some who believe that the area can rebound. But we should remember that retail and service development is based on a foundation of consumer buying power created by goods production, and that foundation for southeastern Wisconsin is being swept away with little warning and less concern for the victims. When unemployment in Kenosha surges up toward 15, 18, 20 percent, how much retail investment will the area attract?

What we're seeing here is that the impact of a plant shutdown not only causes widespread devastation, but also removes an area's capacity to respond. For example, the shutdown will cost some \$10 million in lost state tax revenues, which means fewer resources to pay for training, for alcohol and drug abuse clinics, shelters for battered women and children and other needs that are the social costs of decisions made unilaterally in Chrysler's boardroom.

Local government agencies are responding as rapidly as they can to prepare for the consequences of the Chrysler shutdown. In both Kenosha and Racine, where 1,277 of the affected workers live, task forces have been set up by the county executives to assess the impacts of the shutdown. The effects will be deep and varied: Along with huge increases expected in AFDC and general assistance programs, there will also be increased demands for a wide array of other services. (One surprising example is an increased need for the services of the local game warden, because people will have less money to spend for hunting and fishing licenses, and because desperate dislocated workers will attempt to supplement their families food supply by poaching.) To confront the multifaceted impacts of the shutdown, the task force in Racine is working in subcommittees to develop impact statements and plans in each of several areas: Health and Human Services, which covers family violence, the needs of uninsured families, counseling, etc; economic development efforts, which involve retaining existing firms and recruiting new businesses; two sub-groups, one focusing specifically on

UAW Local members and one on the other dislocated workers hit by the shutdown; and a government liaison committee to coordinate activities between different levels of government. In addition, the State Department of Industry, Labor and Human Relations has outlined a series of steps to assist in expedited registration for and distribution of unemployment compensation benefits, better linkages of jobless workers to existing job openings, the establishment of effective new job-search groups for laid-off workers, and other moves designed to soften the impact of the shutdown's impact on southeastern Wisconsin.

While I have been impressed with the alertness and sincerity of public officials in responding to this crisis, we must remember that these efforts are swimming against the tide of Administration policy. The social safety net in the U.S., always the flimsiest of any advanced democracy, has been further shredded in recent years. For example, only 28 percent of the jobless now receive unemployment compensation, compared with 67 percent during the 1974-75 recession. Similarly, the federal Job Training Partnership Act, the main training program, provides no income supplements to support dislocated workers and their families while they attempt to make a transition to a new field of work.

Now, some hopes have been raised by Chrysler's announcement that it would be willing to contribute its 1988 profits from Wisconsin to a trust fund for the victims of its shutdown in Kenosha. Apparently, there has been much more excitement about the plan the further the distance from southeastern Wisconsin. As UAW Local 72 members immediately pointed out, the trust fund plan is tied directly to Chrysler sales which have been hit disastrously by the public outrage to Chrysler's planned shutdown. The workers tend to see the proposal as a public relations gesture in another sense; as Local 72 Chairman Rudy Kuzel put it, the plan is like a bank robber tossing a few dollars from his saddlebags as he high-tails it out of town, so that the posse stops chasing and starts fighting among itself over the few dollars. I think that the plan needs to be looked at critically for two other reasons: First, it is a mere drop in the bucket in comparison to the scale of human need. Weighed against the \$171 million loss of wages, the \$20 million generated by the trust fund (if Chrysler sales were to return to past levels) would barely scratch the surface. Let me also suggest measuring the \$20 million another way; Lee Iacocca suggested the trust fund as a means of helping to provide for the needs of 5,500 families. That sounds like a generous offer, until you consider that Lee Iacocca brought home \$20.5 million for his own family in 1986.

Given these realities the workers and communities of southeastern Wisconsin feel that there is no alternative but to resist the shutdown every step of the way. To do otherwise is to welcome an economic and social holocaust for the area.

By way of conclusion, I want to stress that the only means of preventing social devastation across our nation's industrial cities is to fundamentally change the rules of the game. Presently, corporations like Chrysler are free to move capital around and close profitable plants at will, engaging in a callous form of human strip-mining leaving supposedly used-up workers and discarded communities on a giant slag-heap. Major corporations are able to pit community against community, like Kenosha against

Detroit, drawing public resources from already-squeezed declining communities to subsidize private profit, while playing off American communities against each other, investments outside our borders. Chrysler, for example, now has five plants in Mexico, where it can take advantage of low wages (\$1 an hour or less) and favorable trade rules to export more than \$1.2 billion worth of goods back to the U.S.

We must radically alter the rules of the game, because we face not only a continuing de-industrialization, but also a de-democratization as corporations increasingly dictate terms to local governments and act without any accountability to the democratic will of the public.

#### TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN LES ASPIN

I want to express my thanks to Congressman Kildee, Congresswoman Johnson, and to the Northeast-Midwest Coalition for inviting me to participate in today's important hearing. Over the past decade, communities across the Northeast and Midwest have been devastated by major plant closings. I welcome the opportunity to study this tragic problem in depth, to explore the impact of these closings on communities, how communities have reacted and rebounded, and how the federal government can play an increased role in providing assistance to dislocated workers and their families.

On January 27 of this year, the Chrysler Corporation announced that it would be closing its stamping and assembly operations in Kenosha, Wisconsin, by the end of the 1988 model year. While 1000 workers will remain at the plant to build Chrysler engines, 5,500 will lose their jobs. Kenosha has lived with an auto plant longer than any other community in the nation. The Kenosha plant was first opened in 1902. The impact of this announcement on the Kenosha community, and on the entire state of Wisconsin, has been profound.

The City of Kenosha is now facing its greatest challenge, to carry its residents through the difficult period of adjustment which lies ahead, to find jobs for its displaced auto workers, and to diversify and expand its economy. The strain on city services, ranging from job training programs to drug and alcohol abuse counseling, will be enormous.

Kenosha and the State of Wisconsin have reacted swiftly to Chrysler's announcement. Kenosha County Executive John Collins and Kenosha Mayor Eugene Dorff have taken the lead in coordinating the city's response to the shutdown. Three task forces, focusing on aid for dislocated workers, community health and social services, and economic development, are being established. Area colleges, including Gateway Technical College, Carthage College, and the University of Wisconsin-Parkside, are developing programs to educate and retrain displaced workers. The State is also planning programs to assist workers and to spur economic growth in Kenosha County.

As local and state officials continue to formulate a recovery strategy for southeastern Wisconsin, now is an opportune time to push the federal government to play a key role in providing assistance to the community. There is a growing consensus in Congress that the Reagan Administration has not played a sufficient role in helping workers and communities adjust to major layoffs and plant closings. The federal government can and must do more to assist these communities. It must provide increased funding

for worker retraining programs and economic development. And it must encourage states and communities to respond quickly to a plant shutdown so that workers and their families can readjust as soon as possible to a new way of life.

The federal government runs two major programs designed to aid dislocated workers, the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program and Title III of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). Both programs would be expanded and improved under various provisions of the omnibus trade bill, which is now in a House-Senate conference committee. As Kenosha and other cities across the country struggle with the consequences of mass layoffs, now is the time to make positive changes in these critical programs.

The Trade Adjustment Assistance program provides aid to workers who lose their jobs due to imports. Workers become eligible for TAA after the Department of Labor certifies that their employer has been hurt by foreign competition. Under the program, workers receive up to 52 weeks of cash assistance, called a Trade Readjustment Allowance (TRA), when their unemployment compensation (UC) runs out. The payment is roughly equal to a UC check. TRA has been a big help to many eligible workers in southeastern Wisconsin.

Once workers become eligible for TRA, they can apply for job training assistance through the state job service office. Unlike TRA, which eligible workers automatically receive, training funds are awarded on a cash-available basis. In recent years, the well has run dry and workers enrolled in qualified training programs have been denied funds. Both the House and Senate trade bills include provisions to provide all workers eligible for TAA up to \$4000 for remedial education and retraining programs. The training portion of the program essentially would be made into an entitlement. This is an excellent improvement that would guarantee that workers receive job training funds.

The House trade bill also includes an important provision aimed at helping displaced workers who find new employment at a lower wage. This section would provide a supplemental wage allowance to raise the worker's current pay up to 80 percent of the previous wage.

Another proposal in the House bill would require state agencies to provide full information to workers about the TAA program at the time they file for unemployment compensation. This would help to eliminate the considerable confusion about the availability of the program and deadlines for filing petitions with the Department of Labor.

The Senate bill includes a provision that would extend TAA coverage to workers in parts and supplies industries, a subject which will be discussed at greater length at today's hearing. This proposal would bring a deserving group of workers that have been neglected in the past under the TAA program.

The House and Senate must work out differences in the TAA provisions of the trade bill. Some are technical and others are more serious. The most controversial issue concerns how the expanded program will be funded. Despite differences, however, the two sides are pretty close together. There is a clear consensus that this program needs adjustment and improvement.

Apart from the TAA improvements, the omnibus trade bill would create a new \$980



million worker readjustment program under Title III of the Job Training Partnership Act. Title III of JTPA provides funds for job retraining programs to the states and localities. Programs are coordinated by local private industry councils (PICs). Workers covered under Title III do not have to show that their displacement is a result of foreign competition.

The new worker aid program would grant increased funds for job training, education, job search assistance, and counseling. The federal government currently provides about \$200 million annually for the Title III budget, so the new proposal represents a significant expansion. Both the House and Senate bills include similar versions of the worker aid plan, but there are differences in how funding would be disbursed to the states.

The House worker readjustment program would authorize several new programs to provide increased funding for vocational education, and for research and development at colleges and universities. To help enhance the overall competitiveness of the American workforce, additional programs would be undertaken to combat illiteracy and encourage the teaching of foreign languages.

Included in the House worker aid program is an important proposal that would require states to respond rapidly to the announcement of a major layoff or plant closing. While past experience indicates that a quick and coordinated response to a plant closing can be extremely beneficial, it is clear that current programs do not reflect this fact. According to the Education and Labor Committee report on the trade bill, "There is considerable evidence that one of the most serious defects in the current dislocated worker program under Title III is the absence in most States of a rapid governmental response mechanism, even when an employer provides advance notice of a mass layoff or closing."

To address this problem, the House trade bill would require each of the states to establish a dislocated worker unit (DWU). The DWU would be required to provide immediate assistance to labor and management following announcement of a major layoff or plant closing. The DWU would help set up a joint labor-management committee which would be chaired by a neutral third party. The committee would be another resource communities could use to help oversee and coordinate the provision of job training and counseling services for the workers.

The rapid response approach is patterned after Canada's Industrial Adjustment Service, a program that is widely admired by labor specialists. Over the past year, the Department of Labor has helped to set up demonstration projects in six states: New York, New Jersey, Vermont, Ohio, Michigan, and Iowa. Several states have decided to pattern their dislocated worker programs after the Canadian model. The House trade bill would institutionalize this approach by establishing guidelines for the states to follow in setting up the DWUs. The Department of Labor would be required to provide state labor specialists with training in rapid response methods.

In its fiscal year 1989 budget, the Administration proposes to combine the TAA and Title III programs into a single Worker Readjustment Program (WRAP). The budget proposal states that, "These separate . . . programs have not operated efficiently." The Administration is correct in pointing

out that the programs have had their share of problems. And the WRAP proposal is virtually the same as the House and Senate worker aid programs. But consolidating the two existing programs is not the answer. Both TAA and JTPA Title III provide needed and separate services to dislocated workers.

The two programs do need to be expanded and improved, and both the House and Senate trade bills are on the right track. I would urge the conferees on the trade bill to act on the consensus that has clearly emerged on this issue. All of the above changes, including guaranteed training funds, supplemental wage allowances, and rapid intervention, would be of significant help to the city of Kenosha and to communities across the country that are and will be facing the tragedy of a major plant closing.

For a community to rebound from a major layoff, the initiative and drive must begin at the local level. The federal government, however, can play a significant role. It must reach out to distressed communities and act as a partner in the recovery process.

#### ADM. JAMES STOCKDALE: A SPEECH IN PEORIA

#### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 13, 1988, Adm. James Bond Stockdale, recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor, spoke to the members of the Peoria Bar Association. What he said that evening, a mixture of scholarly learning about the past and personal experience in combat and as a prisoner of the Communist Vietnamese, should be read by all of our colleagues. At this point I wish to insert his speech in the RECORD:

#### LINCOLN MEMORIAL BANQUET—PEORIA COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION

(Speech by James Bond Stockdale)

In a nutshell, the explanation of my being here—with medals and all—can be simplified with one specific link. This link is tied to an instant of time: 3 PM, Sunday, September 13th, 1964, in Abingdon, Illinois. At that point, 24 years ago, I was getting out of a limousine in front of the Methodist church in Abingdon, with my wife, Sybil and my mother, Mabel, to attend the funeral of my father. I was wearing a Navy Commander's uniform, the only clothes I had with me, having flown back from the Western Pacific a few days before in response to a warning cable from Sybil. She had passed along to me the bad news that my father was not expected to live more than a week. I had barely arrived to be with him when he died, now at the church all events and all people important to our family seemed to be converging on that instant. On opening the car door, the first person I saw was Opal Baymiller, mother of Carroll, grandmother of David Radley, grandmother of Jim Baymiller who had driven her over from Peoria, great grandmother of Air Force Academy cadet Laura Radley who is sitting right in front of me, and lifelong friend of both my parents, classmate from first grade on, of my mother.

So I think that about says it—except to add that I had even more on my mind than

this great confluence of family events. Those of you who have read Sybil's and my book, *In Love and War* now know that a few days before I had left that Western Pacific, I had been tangled up in a series of events that were to change our world. (Historian Barbara Tuchman in her latest, *The March of Folly* has written that these historic events I mention will eventually be seen, in the broad scope of American history, as "no less significant" than the firing on Fort Sumter.) Of course what I am talking about goes by the name of The Tonkin Gulf Affair. Actually, there were four Tonkin Gulf events spread over four days and involved one surface battle and three air actions, all of which I had led as the commanding officer of U.S. Navy Fighter Squadron Fifty-One. And I got out of that limousine—indeed left town soon after the funeral ceremony to return to that Western Pacific, as undoubtedly the only man in Illinois who knew for sure that the Vietnam War was already upon us, and certainly the only one who knew for sure that it had been triggered under false pretenses.

Yes, I knew the war was unavoidable, when news accounts were merely speculative, not because I had been reading secret messages (I had read them, but they were as speculative as the news accounts), but because I had had one of those flashes of insight that come to those who see, first hand, history turn a corner. (After it happens to you, it's hard to get the higher-ups to believe you; they're cautiously sticking to the party line, or more accurately perhaps, the line of those who rely on only the written word for information on distant events. The gap between what a written message conveys to its recipient, and what the sights and sounds and facial expressions on a battlefield convey to the person who is there, has caused the world all manner of surprise and later grief—and we can expect even more surprise and grief in the future as absolute Washington control, fueled by written word communication, becomes de rigueur.) So also does the man on the street frequently miss the true flavor of live happenings. Dispassionate accounts of less than cataclysmic far away events, accurately written in the Washington Post or New York Times, can give the reader a general idea of the risk of their being triggers for irreversible chains of events. But to be going down Main Street at treetop level in a North Vietnamese city of 44,000 people on a sultry peacetime noon hour and see "right out there", 28,000 pounds of TNT suddenly rip open and wipe out an oil tank farm, black smoke and red flames billowing up past ten thousand feet, people suddenly awakened, piling out of nearby buildings and into the street, gives one a more precise bit of information: In this case, that "there will be repercussions". [That old World War I recruiting slogan flashed through my mind: "Don't just read history, make it."] As I wrote in our book:

"In that split second, a great truth was revealed to me. America had just been locked into the Vietnam War. No question about it; as of right now all other options are now closed."

Great truths are sometimes available only at the eye of the storm. Professor John Keegan, British military historian and long time lecturer at Sandhurst, in his recent book *The Mask of Command* does justice to both our Abraham Lincoln and our other Illinois giant of the 19th Century—not Stephen Douglas, but (if you ask me) the real "Little Giant," Ulysses Simpson Grant. For

Grant, like Lincoln of course, grew and gained wisdom, as well as commitment and momentum as the Civil War went on. Grant became Grant, according to Keegan, only in his third major battle, in April '62 at Shiloh, just after his self-made career had yielded his self-made victories at the Tennessee forts of Henry and Donelson. It was there at Shiloh, in the midst of that two day battle that by all odds he should have lost but didn't, that he learned what those early battles, still almost seeming like a mish mash of accidental events based on a misunderstanding, truly portended. There at Shiloh, Grant on the ground, looking at the eyeballs of an inspired enemy, thru a gunsight so to speak, received a revelation that changed his views on the whole war. Those young Confederate infantrymen were not dupes of demagogues, but crusaders for their cause. Not fighting from bravado, but from conviction. (Reading from *The Mask of Command*):

"From that time onwards, Grant knew that Americans were two peoples and could be made one only by the total defeat of the minority by the majority. It was the decision that the war must be made total."

In an instant, Grant grasped what others had missed, that what he was in the midst of was an ideological war, the very worst kind.

I expect some of you have been to the completely refurbished Willard Hotel in Washington, D.C. Sybil and I have been there a couple of times in the last few months. Both times I have found myself looking around the lobby trying to imagine how it would have been to be an onlooker, to see a particular early 1864 scene there,—and its sequel at the White House two blocks away the next morning. These are scenes Fletcher Pratt paints in his book *Ordeal by Fire*:

"Willard's Hotel for Gentlemen and Ladies swarmed with officers in March, 1864, most of them in full dress and all of them in full importance. The raining provost of the Army of Louisiana, who had experienced the rigors of a hard campaign at the bar of the Palmetto House in New Orleans, was expounding military strategy to an audience of newspaper men. Richard Dana, whose two years before the mast had given him a low opinion of barfly officers, looked in time to see a short, round-shouldered, seedy-looking man come through the door, leading a boy by the hand. The eye was drawn by the fellow's peculiar gait, a lurching heave, as though the next step would bring him down on his nose—and then Mr. Dana gulped at the sight of two stars on his shoulder-straps. He jumped up, but others had made the discovery before him and the whole lobby hummed with "Grant—Grant" . . . (The old guy from the West, the warrior they had heard about with unprecedented victories at Vicksburg, and most recently at Chattanooga—and he was then, [I have to remind myself], younger than I was when I was shot down . . . 42. I was 50 by the time my battles were over, Grant was 43.) . . . The squat man, as oblivious of the crowd's disapproval as he had been of its indifference, signed the register and still towing his son, pitched along to his room. . . . The next morning he was closeted with Lincoln. Lincoln had been willing to give a military specialist a free hand at any time, but had been unable to discern the requisite signs of ability in any of his generals. With very good reason he felt himself as able a military man as McClellan or Pope or Halleck or even Hooker."

I got a better idea of Lincoln's feeling on this from scanning a two-volume series called "The Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln", which I found in the Stanford library. It's his official papers in chronological order, and the year 1862 is full of two or three line personal telegrams General McClellan. (Very early on, Lincoln had concluded that his famous General McClellan had what he called "The Slows.") Samples of messages to McClellan: "What's the news from the front?" Then later: "What news from Manassas Junction? What generally?" Then: "My Dear Sir: You remember my speaking to you of what I called your over-cautiousness. Are you not over-cautious when you assume that you cannot do what the enemy is constantly doing?" Next: "How does it look now?" Then: I have just read your dispatch about sore-tongued and fatigued horses. Will you pardon me for asking what the horses of your army have done since the battle of Antietam that fatigues anything?" Again: "The enemy is recrossing the Potomac. Please do not let him get off without being hurt." And so on. Of course we've all enjoyed Lincoln's most famous quotation about McClellan: "It is called the Army of the Potomac but it is only McClellan's bodyguard. If McClellan is not using the army, I should like to borrow it for a while."

Back to Fletcher Pratt's account:

"Seated there with Grant the first time, Lincoln sensed that all that was behind him now. In just half an hour's conference he saw how differently from the others, Grant's mind functioned. Lincoln suggested a plan of campaign. Grant grunted, and without even commenting on it, offered an alternative scheme for war that went beyond Lincoln's imagination. The President relaxed with a sigh of gratitude and never interfered again. So Grant went down into Virginia, prepared to treat time and ground as expendable material. And behind him, William Tecumseh Sherman, the sword of the republic, the giant of the West, was set free at last with 100,000 men at his back and Atlanta for his goal."

As Lincoln saw Grant off at the White House steps, he said: "I don't understand these military technicalities, but as near as I can make out, you propose to hold the leg while Sherman takes off the hide." Next day, Lincoln promoted Grant to Lieutenant General (three stars) and made him Commander of all the Union Armies. By mutual agreement, Grant never thereafter briefed the President on his future strategies.

They were a real pair, and I love to read about them together, as you can tell. So much for my introductory remarks.

There would seem to me to be only one formula appropriate for a person like me giving the talk at *The Lincoln Memorial Banquet* of the Peoria County Bar Association: to honor the great man; to tie him to Peoria; to tie me to the Peoria area, and to him; and to relate Lincoln's example to my experiences, my life.

To do that, I've read new books and re-read old ones; I've gained insights into Lincoln's character that I never had before; and I've generated a tremendous urge to just burst forth and recite!

But now, the Peoria scene overcomes me. I hear and read about the quantity and depth of Lincoln scholarship, completed and taking place, in Illinois Historical circles. (Did you see that article in the New York Times this week about the compilation of some newly released material into what is called the "Lincoln Legals"—a summariza-

tion of his legal philosophy and practice based on 75,000 new documents?) And now I look at this audience of three hundred Illinois lawyers and judges, and realize that some of you are participants in such in-depth studies of Lincoln's life. And I come to realize that I have to discipline myself, and face the fact that I have a lot in common with that old Pennsylvania gentleman (about my grandfather's vintage) who died and went to heaven early in this century.

On arrival in heaven, this old gentleman could hardly contain himself. He was of course tremendously relieved not to have been condemned to "the other place" and delighted to see so many of his old friends from years past there in heaven with him. He had so much to tell them about what had been happening on earth! He too, wanted to just burst forth and recite! Saint Peter was showing him around when they spotted a crowd of heaven dwellers sitting around in a circle listening to one of their number speak. "What's going on there?", the old man asked Saint Peter. "Oh, it's just a group interested in natural history", replied the Saint. "They get together every day and regale one other with tales of momentous physical phenomena they had observed while on earth."

"Oh please let me join them today", the old Pennsylvania fellow said pleadingly. "I was an eye witness to the recent Johnstown flood; it was the most fantastic earthly event I ever saw in my life, and I'm so anxious to tell every body about it". "Very well", said Peter reluctantly. "But don't forget, Noah will be in the audience."

Already I know how detailed, how structured, and how precise that Lincoln scholarship of you Noah's in the audience can be. I have a Lincoln-scholar friend at Stanford. Historian Don Fehrenbacher has written much about him, and his book *Prelude to Greatness: (Lincoln in the 1850's)* is to some the bible on Lincoln's Illinois connection. Don and I had lunch in my preparation for this trip. He has chapters assessing all Lincoln's major speeches of that decade. Many speeches are broken down into subject matter categories, with listings of percentages of the total speech devoted to each category. For instance, the "House Divided" speech (as Lincoln's Senatorial Candidacy acceptance speech to the Illinois Republican Party Convention in Springfield in the summer of 1858 is known "in the trade"), has three parts. The "house divided" section of the "house divided speech", I learned, constitutes only 7% of the whole. Something called the "conspiracy" section takes up 72%, and the "living dog" section, (whatever that may be), the remaining 21%.

After taking that in, I read the book *Abraham Lincoln in Peoria Illinois*, by B. C. Bryner (303 pages, printed privately in Peoria in 1924). In it are two complete versions of the Lincoln's famous Peoria speech of October 16th, 1854. One version was as taken down during the speech by the Peoria Transcript reporter and published in the paper the next morning. The other was a version Lincoln had spent three days doctoring in Springfield, after the fact. I can find the good parts in both versions, but the second version has twice as many words as the first. So I ask myself: How does all this scholarship by mathematical analysis and percentage breakdown work out in what I think surely must be the common case—several versions of each speech, each of a different length?



But not to quibble. I'm just reinforcing the idea that I am by no means qualified to pass certain boundaries in Lincoln scholarship, and am obliged to stay only within those areas in which I claim special interest or personal knowledge. The Fehrenbacher book has a good discussion on "why Lincoln?", that is to say, "what forces of fate thrust him into the national limelight in this key decade between the years 1850 and 1860?" One factor was of course Lincoln's good luck, or good sense, or both, to become the toe to toe, evenly matched sparring partner (debating opponent) of the Great Illinois orator and national figure, Senator Stephen Douglas. A second factor was the fact that Illinois could be seen as the pivotal State in the Union during the decade of the gathering storm. It was in a sense a microcosm of the Union, polarized by pro and anti-slavery sentiments, and centrally located. (At the debate in Galesburg on October 7th, 1858, Douglas chided Lincoln for having "two speeches", one to be given in southern Illinois, another in northern.)

Illinois in the 1850's was bursting forth into national prominence in productivity and population. Corn production doubled, wheat production trebled; the state became in those ten years, by a wide margin, the grain-raising leader of the nation. Industrialization proceeded apace, and by 1860, half of those employed were engaged in pursuits other than farming. Fehrenbacher describes the Illinois of those years as a state of "mills, factories, and magnificent farms." In that decade its population doubled (three times the increase of the nation as a whole). It went from 12th to 4th largest state in the Union, moreover, most of his growth occurred in the northern half of the state, where communities were newer, more progressive, and where, of course, antislavery strength resided.

It was in that decade of the '50's that all four of my grandparents first showed up in Illinois. The youngest of them, my father's mother, was born in Abingdon in 1853. The other three arrived during that decade as children of westward-moving families. My father's father from Pennsylvania, my mother's father, from Ohio. My mother's father was eight when the wagon stopped in Abingdon in 1852. Today, Sybil and I own the farm he and his bride took over on their wedding day. That bride was 18 then, but years later she, my grandmother Bond, used to tell me of her memories of holding her father's hand while they stood on the Knox campus and heard the Lincoln-Douglas debate in Galesburg on that October 7th of 1858. Kids went to things like that; Illinois was a political cauldron and political speeches were festivals, mass entertainments, family affairs. Lincoln and "Long John" Wentworth, while waiting to address a crowd at the little town of Oregon (two thousand people, just north Dixon), amused themselves by counting the number of mothers in the crowd who were nursing babies while they stood there and waited for the speeches to start. They agreed on the count: 70 nursing mothers.

I am a proud son of this prairie, and grandson of that lusty generation of the 1850's who had a lot to say about how it all worked out when the Republic was at the crossroads. And in a way, I think of myself, like you, as a special heir to the Abraham Lincoln legacy.

I want to close by explaining how a couple of Lincoln's seminal ideas rang true to my life. I pick them both out of the Peoria speech of '54—but of course all of his good ideas can be traced to that October night.

First there was his plea to free yourself from feeling the obligation to accept stereotypical mindsets—to meekly go along with the idea that a person's opinions should conform to some rigid structure, fit into some shoe box or pigeon hole which conventional wisdom judged to be consistent, fitting and proper—and judged you to be way out of line if you ever dared stray from those confines. I mean in 1854 there was a widespread stereotypical idea of what ideas in this world were appropriate for an opponent of slavery, and what for an advocate. So today, is conventional wisdom a ready reference for what ideas are "typical lawyer" ideas and prejudices. Certainly we hear people talk about "typical military" ideas and prejudices. Because of course, we all have "military minds". What Lincoln said in Peoria is that anybody in any profession is free to, in fact advised to, pick and choose ideas and prejudices that pass the chooser's tests of right versus wrong rather than those generally thought to becoming to his station, his profession, his causes in life.

"Stand with anybody that stands right. Stand with him while he is right, and part with him when he goes wrong. Stand with the abolitionist in restoring the Missouri Compromise, and stand against him when he attempts to repeal the fugitive-slave law. In the latter case you stand with the Southern disunionist. What of that? You are still right."

American politics today are bandwagon politics. You buy your party's or candidate's whole package, or be accused of betrayal. Everybody is on a conveyor belt with a label glued to his brow. Hawks are to be hawks and doves to be doves throughout, period. Lincoln hated this insult to a person's intelligence, a person's right to think. It was certainly hard to stereotype him. He became a war-hawk for the Union cause. Yet his career in Congress years before had been stifled because he would not back away from his vocal opposition to our Mexican War. (His distinction was straightforward; he thought one war was just and necessary, the other unjust). Grant, too, defied categorization as hawk or dove. "Grant the hawk, Grant the butcher" (as his enemies like to call him) had this to say in his *Personal Memoirs* (two wonderful volumes he completed in 1885), about that Mexican War in which he fought very well as a young officer: "For myself, I was bitterly opposed (to the annexation of Texas), and to this day regard the war, which resulted, as one of the most unjust ever waged by a stronger against a weaker nation."

A lot of people think being emotionally involved in the political virtues of a war give you added zeal in fighting it—or are maybe even necessary to fighting it. I don't agree; I know too many exceptions to that. Grant was an exception. I knew another—coming from the other direction, in prison. I called him Colonel John Doe in the book. He was right wing all the way to the wall; he thought anybody who didn't believe the Vietnam War was a righteous crusade was a traitor; and did he hate communists! He hated them so much he attributed fiendish powers to them, feared them like the devil, and caved in to them whenever they put the arm on him. He was a real patsy, totally incapacitated by his political zealotry and hate, a failure as a soldier.

Grant was at the scene when the Mexican War started. Something like me in the Tonkin Gulf: "We were sent to provoke a fight, but it was essential that Mexico

should commence it. It was very doubtful whether Congress would declare war; but if Mexico should attack our troops, the Executive could announce, "Whereas, war exists by the acts of, etc."

"How can it be?", people ask me, "that you tell the world the Vietnam War was triggered by Washington under false pretenses, yet you fought the war enthusiastically and demanded allegiance of your fellow prisoners. 'So what?', I can say, 'I'm right in both cases like Lincoln suggested in Peoria'. I owe it to my country to expose sleazy dealings in sneaking the start of a war past the American people. How else to put the people on alert next time? And in the second instance, I think that in good wars or bad, soldiers have an obligation to each other to fight well and protect the integrity of their unit, their comradeship." (There are endless applications of this Lincolnian Emancipation of our minds from stereotypical imprisonment).

A second trait of Lincoln that I particularly admire was his willingness to move into taboo territory when the right rather than the wrong side of an argument resided there. From Peoria onward, he never hesitated to pan the concept of "popular sovereignty", Douglas' solution to the way to decide the slavery issue in the territories. He stood on the ground that there are issues that are too important to be on ballots.

It takes a strong man, and one who has confidence in his cleverness and sense of humor to hold that position, the position that democracy has limits of applicability, in the face of you-know-what kinds of ridicule it invites. But Lincoln bit this bullet because he knew human nature (said in Peoria that you "cannot repeat it"), and had the insight to know that sometimes symbolic battles have to be fought to forestall real ones. (That Kansas-Nebraska act battle was in its essence a symbolic battle. There was not much chance of people in the territories of Kansas and Nebraska voting in slavery). But Lincoln had learned what we all learn under pressure, that sometimes symbolic battles must be fought before real battles can start. But Lincoln knew that American history would turn a bad corner if slavery became accepted in the public mind as just a matter of voter preference. He worried about principles.

Lincoln elevated his arguments above simple reason. Human nature is not "reasonable", and he took that into account. And as you know, in the war he showed an understanding of the fact that solving the human predicament sometimes requires the leader to move beyond not only reason but maybe beyond law. There are, I think, rare circumstances in the course of human events when sometimes the saving of lives, sometimes the support of the just, require a leader with the courage and judgement to take the law into his own hands (and of course stand accountable to his countrymen afterward). Lincoln lived in such a world, and because I did too, I especially identify with him.

Article I, Section 9, of the Constitution says, "The Privilege, of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it." In 1861, in spite of a ruling by the Chief Justice that the safeguards of habeas corpus could be set aside only with the authorization of Congress, without such authorization, Lincoln, fearing that the Maryland legislature would vote to secede, arrested many of its members and

suspended the privilege of the writ. It was debatable that at that time a state of rebellion existed or danger to the public safety "required it." And certainly there was no "invasion." In his publicly stated desire to save the Union above all other considerations, he kept his eye on the moral high ground. And his moral sensibilities called in this case for such an act to keep Maryland in the Union. When we consider the morality of some acts beyond the law—acts that we do not even believe should be made legal—we recognize that no principle can be inviolable. Lincoln understood that there are circumstances in which inviolable principles kill people.

When in the Vietnam War I and the others got thrown into prison, and took stock of the circumstances, it was clear to us all that what had been touted as American law for prisoner of war behavior had almost no applicability in the circumstances in which we found ourselves.

What do you rely on in those cases? A heritage, a sense of values, common sense, and your own willingness as a leader \* \* \* as Lincoln was the leader by a pre-crisis arrangement of election, so I was a leader by a pre-crisis arrangement of military rank \* \* \* to realize and not kid yourself, but face the fact that what is just and what is moral cannot be achieved easily, if at all, within the constraints of what law you have. And then to act on that realization, on your own cognizance, without the protection of any "approval from on high", and make order out of chaos by your own best lights. (I had no contact with Washington authority; Lincoln had no higher authority.) When you get there, you'll know that it's time for you as the quarterback, to run the naked reverse, without protection. [Don't assume that what I said above about what had been "touted as American law for prisoners" not being right for our conditions, means that it was too stringent. It's the other way—our conditions required laws that would send the JAG corps right up the wall—what we had to order ourselves to do—what our society demanded—for integrity, for pride, for comradeship, would not be permitted under the Constitution: ordering people to take torture (certainly cruel and unusual punishment) prior to complying with certain captor demands, and so on. Talk about no habeas corpus! We threw out rights of privacy, confidentiality, freedom of speech, and on and on.] How do you sleep at night? You just live on hope that history will treat you well.

"My gosh", you say. If the world can get like this, what's to protect us from tyrants? The short answer is that you just have to hope that the man who finds himself in charge is well brought up—well enough brought up to handle it.

Over the years in the Hanoi prisons we had law, a society, customs, proprieties, traditions, heroes. We built the society ourselves; we wrote our own law. We even protected ourselves against our own tyranny.

A very small percentage of our senior officers would not conform to the rules of the prison organization and were rightly held in contempt for being too permissive vis-a-vis the communists by their juniors. More than once I received messages from junior officers that went something like this: "If I find myself in a cell block under the command of that flunk (so-and-so, by name), I will not obey his orders". This called for the promulgation of criteria for a junior's proper relief of a senior for cause, something I dubbed the "Caine Mutiny Law". It was mandatory

that all prisoners memorize all our laws, and this one was tapped through prison walls with the following wording:

"Command Authority. Any prisoner who denies or fails to carry out the code of conduct, military law, or organizational policies, may be relieved of all military authority. Emotional instability so serious as to impair judgment for a prolonged period may also be cause for relief. Relieving action on the part of the second-in-command must be based upon his senior's current performance and not on the past or heresay. It is neither American nor Christian to nag a repentant sinner to his grave."

That was used about five times over an eight year period, without a hitch, or the blemish of disrespect. You notice the "repentant sinner" provision. Odd for municipal law, but legal scholars tell me what we evolved was a blend of military law, morality, and the natural law of the Stoics. For we made a presumption that would be hard to sell these days. Like Epictetus (whose writings I did remember in that prison), we thought instinct was reliable:

"We come into this world with an innate conception as to good and bad, noble and shameful, what is becoming and what is unbecoming, what is fitting and what is inappropriate, what is right and what is wrong."

Lincoln saved the nation just because he had the perception to recognize the moral strength of Americans, and the courage to call upon them to seize and hold to that which was worthy of them: good over bad, noble over shameful, becoming over unbecoming, and right over wrong.

This medal, hanging around my neck on the blue and white ribbon, was Abraham Lincoln's idea. He initiated this award, The Congressional Medal of Honor, in 1862. You can't get it for following any order or obeying any law. Lincoln said we should recognize selfless actions that are different than, and separate from, all that. The human spirit sometimes, even unconsciously, soars to greater heights. It would be unconscionable to order men, or legally require men to fall on ticking hand grenades to save their buddies, or to catch them and hope they can throw them back into the enemy trench before they go off. It's the spirit that motivates people to do these sorts of things in spite of the odds that is described by the phrase: "above and beyond the call of duty". This medal of Lincoln's is the only American decoration in which that phrase appears in its citation. I'm proud to be one of the two hundred or so living Americans who have received this medal, and I think of Abraham Lincoln when I wear it. He of all people, knows the meaning of virtue beyond orders or law.

Thank you for allowing me to come back to Illinois to say that.

### YOUTH TODAY, BEST HOPE FOR TOMORROW

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, it is often said that the youth of today are our best hope for tomorrow. After meeting with an outstanding delegation of high school student leaders from across the Nation in December, I can proudly say that our future is in good hands and that it looks bright indeed.

These students are involved with an outstanding nonprofit, nonpartisan organization known as Direct Connection. Direct Connection is founded on the belief that the key to the survival of our world is the development of greater communication between the youth of the United States and the youth of the U.S.S.R. There are currently over 2,000 student chapters of Direct Connection across the Nation.

During the fall of 1987, a Direct Connection student delegation traveled to Moscow and conferred with representatives of various Soviet youth organizations. They also had the opportunity to meet with several Soviet officials and the United States Ambassador to the Soviet Union. In December, another Direct Connection delegation traveled here to Washington to meet with Soviet General Secretary and Mrs. Mikhail Gorbachev during their visit to the United States.

I also had the pleasure of meeting with this student delegation during their visit to our Nation's Capital, and I was most impressed with their grasp of the complex issues involved in United States-Soviet relations and their strong commitment to world peace. It is indeed heartening to know that our Nation's youth care so deeply about this important issue, and that they are willing to become personally involved in it.

Direct Connection has some very impressive plans for the future. Another delegation is hoping to meet with the President and Mrs. Reagan during a future trip to Washington, and the organization is completing its plans for a United States-Soviet youth conference to be held in Helsinki in the spring. During this conference they hope to discuss such issues as the reduction of nuclear weapons, drug abuse, the preservation of the environment, and plans for future exchanges.

I am impressed with the goals and accomplishments of Direct Connection, and I commend the many young people involved with this organization across the Nation for their outstanding efforts to bring about international peace through international understanding. In the hope that some of my colleagues or their constituents might be interested in learning more about this organization, I ask that a brochure Direct Connection has prepared about its Helsinki conference be reprinted here in the RECORD.

### DIRECT CONNECTION 1988 HELSINKI U.S.- SOVIET YOUTH CONFERENCE

#### INTRODUCTION

President Reagan, writing to the students at Sierra Mountain High School in Grass Valley, California, who participated in the 1986 Direct Connection US-Soviet students' video exchange, said that "the actions of our citizens are as vital to our efforts for peace as those of our diplomats and soldiers. This is where our young people can truly help. As a young American, you have the opportunity to do a great deal to build peace."

General Secretary Gorbachev, at his news conference concluding the 1987 Washington summit, spoke about his meeting with the Direct Connection delegation<sup>1</sup> of US high

<sup>1</sup> The Direct Connection youth delegation at the Washington summit represented the California Association of Student Councils (CASC), the Mary-



school and college student leaders: "Just now I met a group of American students, and I had to say to them, self-critically, that both American and Soviet kids seem to come to terms together much faster than we politicians. They don't have the complexes that we have, I guess. Before we can come to terms we have to get rid of complexes and get rid of the obstacles standing in the way, and that's not all that easy at a ripe age. But they, the youngsters, they look at each other openly and they very quickly find a common tongue. And it is not something superficial, it's not a rose-colored approach—at age 15, 17, they already are giving very serious thought, not only to their personal problems, not only to what is of interest to their own selves—they are thinking about how we should live in this world. That's a remarkable phenomenon—it should be written about."

Many thousands of young people in the United States and the Soviet Union have repeatedly demonstrated their serious interest in the major issues confronting both countries, and all of humanity, at the end of the 20th Century. But they have gone beyond mere interest. The vast majority are committed to taking an active role now in shaping the public policy that will determine our collective future.

In order to assist the youth of both countries to meet, exchange ideas, and translate their vision of the future into creative, concise and credible proposals to their government leaders. Direct Connection proposes a one-week US-Soviet Youth Conference in Helsinki, Finland, before the anticipated next summit meeting in Moscow.

US and Soviet student leaders have also indicated strong support for a radical improvement in US-Soviet relations, as well as for the unprecedented 50 percent reduction in weapons of mass destruction now being negotiated in Geneva. They would like to see millions of students in the United States, in the Soviet Union and all over the world express their support for what President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev are now trying to accomplish. To this end, they propose a mass letter-writing campaign from young people to the two leaders before the Moscow summit and at the same time as their Helsinki Conference.

After their meeting with the Gorbachevs and given the support now coming from the US Congress, and in looking forward to their meeting with the President, young people know that their vision of the future—their hopes, their dreams, and their ideas—are being taken seriously by the adult leaders of today, and they are ready to continue their mission with renewed inspiration and commitment.

#### PROPOSAL

A delegation of approximately 40 American high school and college student leaders, representing the youth of the whole country, will meet an equivalent delegation of

Soviet students representing the youth of the USSR, on neutral territory, in Helsinki, Finland. The US Helsinki delegation will be similar to the Direct Connection Washington summit delegation, expanded to include representatives from other youth programs and organizations such as the Senate Youth Program and Presidential Classroom.

#### PROCESS

US and Soviet students will spend a week together, getting to know each other, exchanging information and points of view, and developing a common position on some of the major issues, in order to then together present their final proposals and requests to President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev.

Position papers by previously agreed-upon US and Soviet experts in the various fields will be available for background information prior to the Conference. In general, the role of adults will be that of advisors and facilitators. Since the conference is dedicated to young people creating the design for their own future, the participating students will determine the actual conference agenda themselves.

US and Soviet student delegations will meet in small study groups of up to ten students to discuss specific issues and areas of concern. These study groups will then report back to all participants in general assembly with their recommendations for proposals to be acted on by the large group as a whole.

Although the issues are complex, one of the conference objectives is for Soviet and American young people to model a process of *consensus, conflict resolution and mutual trust building* that will:

- (1) allow them to speak out credibly to the adult world on the major issues by presenting carefully worked out, focused, eloquent and straightforward proposals that emphasize a continued commitment on the part of the young people themselves and are designed for implementation at any level;
- (2) demonstrate that only hard work and real effective communication will lead to the mutual understanding that will ultimately result in world peace;
- (3) give future US and Soviet leaders an experience (through building relationships) that will influence their life perspectives, and promote fruitful future collaboration; and
- (4) establish a process for continued and future Soviet-American student leader exchange.

#### ISSUES

- (1) A nuclear-free world.
- (2) Education.
- (3) Political and economic concerns.
- (4) Drugs and health.
- (5) Cultural exchange.
- (6) Ecological/environmental preservation.
- (7) Youth exchange and programs designed to promote and implement new ideas on all of the above.

Major emphasis will be placed on the need to create clear communication, break through stereotypes and overcome the idea of "the enemy" through an exchange of accurate information about each other, and by identifying major areas of common and global concern. Differing US and Soviet values may be examined with a view to cultivating respect for perspectives other than one's own, which will be vital in developing a joint US-Soviet strategy for dealing with such problems as world hunger, and in gen-

eral increase awareness of global interdependence.

#### OUTCOMES

##### (A) For Conference Participants

(S=Soft, H=Hard)

- (1) (S) Young people meet each other on an intimate/deep level.
- (2) (H) Produce a number of excellent proposals.
- (3) (S) Work together collaboratively and create success.
- (4) (S) Make personal commitments for follow-up activities.
- (5) (H) Learn group life process skills.
- (6) (S) Are educated about issues.
- (7) (H) Build follow-up teams.
- (8) (H) Create long-term plans for interaction.

##### (B) For Government Leaders

- (1) (S) Share visions, hopes and wishes for the Summit and beyond.
- (2) (H) Ask them to endorse vision: what do they think of it?
- (3) (H) Ask them to take specific steps: what are they willing to do to help young people achieve vision?

During the last three days of the conference, the students will work to develop their joint proposals. The week will conclude with a dinner and dance for the delegations and a reception by the President of Finland and his wife. Afterwards, the now united US-Soviet youth delegation will travel to Moscow and Washington to present proposals and requests to General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan, as well as to New York to make a presentation to the Secretary General, the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations.

#### LETTER-WRITING CAMPAIGN AND CONCERT

While US and Soviet student leaders meet in Helsinki, DIRECT CONNECTION proposes a massive, simultaneous letter-writing campaign from millions of American and Soviet students, and students worldwide, to both President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev, expressing their feelings about the arms race and their ideas for a solution and a future of US-Soviet and world cooperation, and encouraging both leaders to follow through on their 50 percent weapons reduction proposal. Discussions are now underway to explore the possibility of a joint US-Soviet rock concert to back up the young people in their appeal to the government leaders.

#### VISION

Young people today are fully aware that the world is in crisis. But they also believe profoundly in the ability of the individual to influence the process that will provide solutions. They believe above all in the ability of many individuals of different race, creed, nationality, sex and age to set aside self-interest and together form a force for the common good. Young people now are working hard to effect a change for the better, beginning with self, and on through family, friends, classroom, school, school system, local community, state and media to the highest levels of government and industry in the land.

As we approach the end of the second and the beginning of the third millennium, all the old issues, all the perennially recurring themes of interpersonal, international and interspecies relations, must be approached through the new thinking now revolutionizing our concept of the world and of ourselves.

land Association of Student Councils, the National Association of Student Councils, the Latino organization "Future Leaders of America," the Afro-American and Asian-American communities, the American Indian community through the Mohawk Nation of the Six Nations Confederacy, and National Forum, a student-run group that during 1987 collected 328,000 signatures from high school students nationwide, asking for a televised discussion and explanation of US nuclear policy. The delegation also included the student-body president of Princeton University, the vice-president of the Brown University student body, and representatives from Georgetown, Colgate and North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

At the same time, we must remember that this new thinking is deeply rooted in some of the most ancient insights of our species, insights older than civilization and common to native peoples everywhere, insights born of the wisdom of the earth and based on a true, right and natural expression of mind itself.

The nuclear age has made a radical change in our point of view imperative. Each individual must become aware of the enormous store of strength, harmony, peace and compassion within him/herself. Self-realization, in one form or another, is possible for everyone, and will result in that "turning in the seat of consciousness," the simultaneous opening of heart and mind, through which many people will be able to enter into spontaneous and natural cooperation. Cooperation is vital to mankind's survival, but equally necessary for a full flowering of our creative potential. Whether out of recognition of our actual possibilities, or out of fear of the ultimate disaster, cooperation is the key to our future. It is the only way in which we can eliminate the nuclear threat and, more than that, overcome poverty, disease and the scourge of world hunger.

Our mutual interdependence—as people, as generations, as cultures, as social, political and economic structures and, just as important, as human beings in our relationship to all other forms of life—must now become a matter of visceral recognition and awareness. The development of that awareness—the fundamental change in consciousness brought about through self-realization, the new thinking, based on ancient insights, and group consensus instead of majority rule—that is the true purpose of Direct Connection's Helsinki US-Soviet Youth Conference.

This proposal was developed by Direct Connection, in cooperation with the students and staff of the California Association of Student Councils, Michael Doyle Associates, Future Leaders of America and the Center for Living Skills.

#### A SALUTE TO UNITED WAY SERVICES: 75TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION

##### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, today, February 25, is a special occasion for United Way Services of the Greater Cleveland area. United Way Services, a volunteer organization founded for charitable and philanthropic purposes, is celebrating 75 years of providing service to the northeast Ohio area. For this reason, I would like to join the residents of the 21st Congressional District of Ohio in saluting the organization's 75 years of committed service.

United Way Services formally began in Cleveland in 1913. Today, the organization has more than 20,000 active volunteers who not only help to raise and allocate funds for more than 170 health and human care agencies, but also work with other volunteers, including community organizations and government officials, to find solutions to human care problems.

United Way Services has a long history. Its origin can be traced back to 1900, when the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce created a

committee which endorsed worthwhile charities and provided contributors with a guide to credible welfare agencies. The Chamber of Commerce formalized an organization in 1913, which eventually would become known as United Way Services, the first organization in the country to set up a formal system to allocate funds for the needy and to study human care needs. This process, called the "citizen review process," became a model for United Way organizations nationwide.

In 1913, the organization held its first fundraising campaign with a goal of involving as many contributors as possible. More than 6,000 individuals responded and the organization's fundraising movement was underway. During World War I, United Way Services raised \$4.5 million which was distributed to more than two dozen health and human service agencies.

By 1950, nearly 130 agencies were benefiting from United Way Services' once-a-year fundraising campaigns, which raised close to \$10 million, and the American Red Cross became a financially participating agency.

In the decade of the 1960's, United Way Services began meeting the needs of adjacent counties in the Cleveland area just as the population began spreading to the suburbs. The organization officially adopted the name United Way Services in 1978, along with its current symbol—the rainbow rising from a helping hand—representing the services and programs supported by the United Way that in turn support people in the community. The image in the center, based on the universal symbol of mankind, is cradled by the helping hand, showing that all people are supported and uplifted by United Way's efforts. The rainbow springing from the helping hand represents hope for a better life through caring and sharing.

Mr. Speaker, while United Way Services has had various names and symbols over the past 75 years, it has never changed its goal of giving dedicated and committed service to the residents of the northeast Ohio area. For this reason, it is an honor to have the opportunity to commemorate United Way Services' 75th anniversary.

I am proud that Cleveland is the home of United Way and hope the organization will continue its great tradition of providing assistance to the Cleveland community.

Again, it is an honor to salute United Way Services.

#### THE SEMANTICS OF HUMAN RIGHTS

##### HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, Richard Schifter, addressed the Conference on Human Rights and Religious Freedom, sponsored by the Giorgio Cini Foundation in Venice, Italy. Assistant Secretary Schifter headed the United States delegation to the Ottawa Human Rights Experts Meeting in 1985 where with

great conviction, distinction and unequivocation Ambassador Schifter presented the strong bipartisan commitment of the American Government and people to respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all individuals.

Mr. Speaker, at the Venice conference Assistant Secretary Schifter spoke on the worldwide appeal of certain basic human aspirations. I want to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues Mr. Schifter's remarks and urge them to read them.

#### THE SEMANTICS OF HUMAN RIGHTS

In the last few decades an international debate has raged over the various classifications of human rights. We have heard discussions of what have often been referred to as "civil and political rights," which have been either bracketed with or juxtaposed to what are called "economic, social and cultural rights." Some theoreticians in the field of human rights have also spoken of a first, second and third generation of human rights.

The first generation has generally been viewed as encompassing civil and political rights, the rights so clearly enunciated by the writers and thinkers of the Enlightenment in the 18th Century.

The second generation of human rights is generally assumed to include the aforementioned "economic social and cultural rights." In learned discussions of the subject it is said that these are the contributions of the Marxist-Leninist societies.

The third generation appears to be a concoction of issues developed during the last quarter century, including what has been referred to as the right to a clean environment, the right to die, and other relatively new matters of social concern.

Nuclear disarmament has also been injected into the debate under the rubric "right to life." (I might note that anti-abortionists who use the same term have evidently not attempted to advance their cause in the context of the international human rights debate.)

As a footnote to this introduction of the three so-called generations of rights, let me point out that the attribution of the second generation to Marxist-Leninist thinking is historically and substantively inaccurate. If you take a good look at the rights spelled out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, you will find that they fit into the program of Franklin D. Roosevelt rather than Karl Marx or Lenin. And that should not be surprising. After all, it was Eleanor Roosevelt, President Roosevelt's widow who, in her capacity as Chairman of the United Nations Human Rights Commission played a very important role in the framing and ultimate adoption of the Universal Declaration, whose text served as a basis for the framing of the Covenants.

The point I would like to make to you today, and this is the theme of my talk, is that a good many of us have fallen into a semantic trap. Rather than getting to issues of substance, we often debate *ad nauseam* the question of what does or does not constitute a human right. It is a debate which has become extraordinarily sterile.

I would suggest that we try to deal with these topics by using different terminology. The bundle of issues with which we are here concerned focuses on the relationship between government and the individual citizen. Let us divide that bundle between, on



one hand, the limits imposed upon government to safeguard the integrity and dignity of the individual and, on the other hand, the affirmative programs and policies to be conducted by government to achieve the same ends. And let us say further that the fact that we are dealing with one large bundle of relationships between government and the individual does not mean that that entire bundle must at all times be discussed jointly, nor that the same persons are qualified to discuss every single issue that comes up in this context. In my country, at least, the typical expert on the right to freedom of expression is not normally an expert on the delivery of medical care to the elderly.

Nor is there value in debating the question of which set of relationships is more important than the other. Let us simply say that all are important. The point is well illustrated by a story I heard quite a number of years ago, which, I believe, is also applicable today. It is the story of two dogs meeting at the Czechoslovak-Polish border. One dog, seeking to cross from Czechoslovakia to Poland is slightly on the fat side and well-groomed. The dog seeking to cross from Poland to Czechoslovakia is bedraggled and scraggly. The dog leaving Czechoslovakia asks the other one: "Why are you going to Czechoslovakia?" The other dog answers: "To eat," and continues: "But why are you going to Poland?" The first dog answers: "To bark."

This story is not only political commentary on comparative conditions in Czechoslovakia and Poland. It is also a profound observation about the instinctual character of the drive to express oneself. The philosophers of the Enlightenment defined that instinct. They built an ideology around it. But they did not invent the human drive for freedom. They described a phenomenon, an essential aspect of human nature.

It follows that the desire to be free, to be able to express oneself, to write as one pleases, to worship God in accordance with one's conscience or not to worship God—all these are not the inventions of Western civilization. They reflect natural human aspirations and that is indeed why an ideology based on them has worldwide appeal and, understandably, served as an underpinning for such international standard-setting instruments as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

But then there are those who argue that persons who are starving are not concerned about freedom of speech. That may very well be true. But what we of the West say is that the choice before humanity is not one of starving in freedom and eating in slavery. On the contrary, as we look around the world, we can see that freedom and prosperity go hand in hand. The ideal solution is one in which we, unlike the Czech and Polish dogs in my anecdote, can both eat and bark.

What we frequently hear at international gatherings is that one of the principal differences between the two major options of governmental systems offered the world today is that one pays attention to the special concerns of a few individuals and the other cares about the welfare of the masses.

I submit to you that if one really cares about the masses, one must also care about each and every individual that makes up the mass. Otherwise, as is often the case "caring" becomes an abstraction, a vague promise that is not sought to be realized.

What we, who profess the democratic ideology, believe is that, as Thomas Jefferson put it when he wrote the United States Dec-

laration of Independence, we are all endowed with certain unalienable rights, including the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. These rights, we believe, may not be subordinated to any allegedly higher objective, as determined either by a single potentate or a collective, self-perpetuating leadership group. In other words, we do not subscribe to what in Aesopian terms is called "democratic centralism."

In the countries in which principles of individual freedom are now well established, the basic precepts of individual freedom are not even the subject of argument. Such debate as still continue deals with what we might consider marginal questions, such as what are allowable restrictions on pornography, how serious must be a person's mental illness before such a person can be involuntarily committed to a psychiatric institution, what may government do to restrict freedom of assembly if demonstrators interfere with access to a public building? But, as I have said, the basic precepts are not in doubt and not subject to argument.

We are then told that with all the attention paid to these freedoms to speak, publish or assemble, we neglect the unemployed, the homeless, the sick. "Is anyone paying attention to these issues of public policy?" is the challenging question posed to us in debates.

My response is that precisely because the issues of basic freedoms have become so noncontroversial, public debate and election campaigns in the democratic world do indeed revolve around questions of economic and social policy, not because anyone has called them "rights" or outlined them in a constitutional document, but because they are often in the forefront of the thinking of our ultimate decision-makers, the voters. Voters choose among candidates on the basis of who, in their opinion, advocates better solutions to the problems that we face in the economic and social sphere. It is in that context that the issue is not one of promise, of writing guarantees into constitutions and other basic documents, but one of delivering results.

Since the beginning of the Century one of the principal arguments in the political arena has indeed been the question of which system of government can deliver the best solution to the problems we confront in the economic and social sphere. By now, in the ninth decade of the Century, it appears that the verdict is in. With all the problems that we in the democratic world still face, that we continue to grapple with day by day, the private-incentive system has proved itself better capable of delivering the goods than the various collectivist experiments. As we all know so well, the country which operated the largest collectivist program in agriculture abandoned it totally about eight years ago and thereafter experienced an extraordinarily rapid growth in agricultural production. It is now trying to reintroduce private incentives into all other aspects of economic enterprise. And, more recently, in other Leninist countries, we hear talk of restructuring, the term that concedes that the collectivist command economy has proved to be a massive failure.

Let me now return to my point of departure. We need to gather at conferences such as this one to gather those experts, practitioners and thinkers who are prepared to discuss the basic principles of human freedom and personal dignity and the limits which must be imposed upon the powers of government to assure respect for those principles internationally. And there is most as-

suredly nothing wrong with holding meetings for the purpose of discussing ways and means of dealing with the problems of unemployment, as well as vocational training, the advisability or inadvisability of subsidizing uneconomic enterprises, of the creation of make-work jobs etc. We could also discuss differing approaches to the encouragement of the construction of quality housing, providing adequate, safe and sanitary dwellings for those who are now ill-housed, the furnishing of medical care of quality, and provisions to be made for the elderly. All this should be done by qualified experts in the fields in question and should not be injected into discussions on the limits of government, which deal with issues, as I noted earlier, in a wholly different area of expertise.

This conference, devoted to the themes which relate to the limits of government, should, therefore, appropriately deal with the major threats to individual dignity and freedom which are posed by the authority of the state. It is appropriate, I suggest, to go through the relevant Articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which were thereafter incorporated into the Helsinki Final Act and determine where shortfalls can be identified and how steps could be taken to encourage correction in these shortfalls.

For today, almost forty years after adoption of the Declaration and twelve years after the signing of the Helsinki Final Act, the limitations imposed on governments to protect the individual's liberty, security of person, freedom of thought, conscience and religion, freedom of expression and similar freedoms are in many places consistently and deliberately violated. These violations must not be ignored, for ignoring them means betraying the heroes and heroines throughout the world who take great risks and make major personal sacrifices, endangering their life and personal security so that the cause of freedom may live. It is to them, that we all owe a debt of gratitude. And we must continue to discharge that debt by speaking up on their behalf wherever and whenever we can.

CHAIM GRADE

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to place the works of Chaim Grade, a distinguished Yiddish poet and novelist, retroactively under the protection of the Copyright Act of 1976. I strongly believe that, given the importance of Grade's works and the extreme circumstances under which he wrote, this matter deserves favorable consideration by the Congress.

Chaim Grade has been acclaimed as the greatest Yiddish novelist. Many of his finest works depict the tragedy of Jewish life in Eastern Europe during and after the Holocaust.

Born in Vilna, Lithuania in 1910, Grade was influenced by his father, Rabbi Shlomo Mordecai Grade, a Hebraist and Zionist. Following his father's death, Chaim Grade lived with his mother, Vella, who worked as a fruit peddler to support herself and her son. At 22, Grade abandoned his religious studies and began to

write. He associated himself with a group of modernist writers and painters who called themselves Jung Vilna. The city of Vilna was, at that time, commonly referred to as the "Jerusalem of Lithuania" because of its pious and intellectual Jewish life.

As the Germans invaded Lithuania in 1941, Grade escaped on foot into Russia. Mistakenly believing that the Nazis would leave Jewish women and children alone, he left his young wife and beloved mother behind. After the war, Grade returned to Vilna to face the tragic loss of his loved ones and his community. Left with a tremendous sense of guilt, he longed to preserve and honor that which was lost. Chaim Grade's writing career, which had begun as a struggle against the generation of his parents and teachers, became a monument to that era.

In 1948, Grade came to the United States with his second wife, Inna Hecker Grade, so that he would be able to create without censorship. The Grades chose to live in the Riverdale section of the Bronx, which I am honored to represent.

Chaim Grade's works in Yiddish have received the highest critical acclaim. Nobel Peace Prize winner Elie Wiesel has written that "the work of Chaim Grade, by its vision and scope, establishes him as one of the great—if not the greatest—of Yiddish novelists. Surely, he is the most authentic."

Grade was invited in 1978 to read his poetry at the White House. Too ill to attend, his wife read in his place. In 1983, his book "Rabbis and Wives" was among the finalists for the Pulitzer Prize in letters. And, the "Encyclopaedia Judaica" has said that Grade's attempts at confronting the national Jewish tragedy makes him, in a sense, "the national Jewish poet, as Bialik was in his day."

Chaim Grade was reluctant to have his works translated into English, fearing that they would lose their authenticity. Early efforts at translation were very disappointing to him. Initially forbidding further translation, he finally allowed it after entrusting his wife with the task of verifying the authenticity of the English text and the faithfulness to the Yiddish original.

Inna Hecker Grade has dedicated her life to preserving the integrity and increasing the accessibility of her distinguished husband's works. Because of her efforts, his name is firmly implanted into the list of accomplished Yiddish writers. And, through her expert translation, she has brought to the general English reading public a master of world literature.

The enthusiastic critical reception of Chaim Grade's work is well deserved. Unfortunately, his ignorance of the law and his preoccupation with the Jewish tragedy resulted in his neglect to seek copyright protection for it. Instead, he took for granted Le Droit Moral, the Moral Law, which served to protect the rights and works of authors in Europe.

Grade trusted the American system and believed that no one would take advantage of his works. But, his growing renown and the increasing appreciation of his literary talent has brought with it the danger that others may seek to profit from his work. It is vitally important that his writings be preserved and protected from misrepresentation.

The legislation I am introducing today would retroactively place Chaim Grade's works under the protection of the 1976 Copyright Act. All of Grade's works, published or unpublished, would be protected in the name of his widow, Inna Hecker Grade, for a 50-year term beginning from the date of his death in 1982.

I believe that this action is both appropriate and necessary to protect the integrity of Chaim Grade's works and to preserve the history and letters of the Jewish people. I urge the support of my colleagues and look forward to early and favorable consideration of this measure.

The text of the bill follows:

#### H.R.

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

#### SECTION 1. GRANTING OF COPYRIGHT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, copyright is hereby granted to Inna Hecker Grade and her successors and assigns in the works set forth in section 2 by Chaim Grade, including all editions in English and translations heretofore published or hereafter published by Inna Hecker Grade or her successors or assigns, for a term of 50 years from June 26, 1982 (the date of death of Chaim Grade). All copies of the protected works hereafter published are to bear notice of copyright, and all new editions hereafter published are to be registered in the Copyright Office, in accordance with the provisions of title 17, United States Code, or any revision or recodification thereof. The copyright owner shall be entitled to all rights and remedies provided to copyright owners generally by law, except that no liability shall attach under this Act for lawful uses made or acts done before the date of enactment of this Act in connection with such works, or in respect to the continuance for one year subsequent to such date of any business undertaking or enterprise lawfully undertaken before such date involving expenditure or contractual obligation in connection with the exploitation, production, reproduction, or circulation of such works.

#### SEC. 2. WORK SUBJECT TO COPYRIGHT.

The following works of Chaim Grade (including lectures and essays) are covered by section 1:

- (1) "Yo" ("Yes");
- (2) "Mussarnikes" ("Mussarniks");
- (3) "Dojrois" ("Generations");
- (4) "Oyf di Hurves" ("On the Ruins");
- (5) "Pleitim" ("Refugees");
- (6) "Farvoksene Vegn" ("Overgrown Paths");
- (7) "De Mames Tzavoe" ("The Mother's Will");
- (8) "Shayn fun Farloshene Shtern" ("Shine of the Extinguished Stars");
- (9) "Mayn Krig Mit Hersh Rassayner" ("My Quarrel with Hersh Rassayner");
- (10) "Yerushalaim shel Maylah, Yerushalaim shel Matah" ("The Heavenly Jerusalem and the Earthly");
- (11) "Hurbin";
- (12) "Vilna", with 5 major parts entitled:
  - (A) "Vilan";
  - (B) "Di Shank" ("The Tavern");
  - (C) "Der Ger-Tzadik" ("The Convert");
  - (D) "Di Hiter fun der Shtot" ("The Guardians of the City");
  - (E) "Unter di Gevelbte Toyern" ("Beneath the Vaulted Gates");
- (13) "Talmidei-Hahomin in der Lite" ("Talmudic Scholars in Lithuania");

(14) "Oyf Mayn Veg Tzu Dir"; ("On My Way to You");

(15) "Dos Alte Hoyz" ("The Old House"), alternate titles are:

(A) "Zin un Tahter" ("Sons and Daughters");

(B) "Der Beth-Horav" ("The Rabbi's House");

(16) "Fun Unter der Erd" ("From Beneath the Ground"), the title of the first version is "Froyen fun Ghetto" ("Women of the Ghetto");

(17) "Yury Goresha", a part of the novel "From Beneath the Ground";

(18) "Alte Boherim" ("The Bachelors");

(19) "In Gerangl mitn Malah" ("Wrestling with the Angel"), subtitle is "Lieder un Elegyes" ("Poems and Elegies"); Collected Poems, 1932-82;

(20) "Chaim Nachman Bialik";

(21) "H. Leivik, der Poet fun Laydn un Goyrl" ("H. Leivik, The Poet of Suffering and Fate");

(22) "H. Leivik in Mayn Lehn and Shafn" ("H. Leivik in my Life and my Works");

(23) "Itzik Manger, der Poet fun Shaynkayt un Shpil" ("Itzik Manger, the Poet of Beauty and Play");

(24) "Dray Yiddische Klassiker, Mendele, I.L. Peretz, Sholem-Alaychem" ("Three Yiddish Classics, Mendele, I.L. Peretz, Sholem-Alaychem");

(25) "Anski, der Maskl, Revolutioner un Baal Tshuvah" ("Anski, the Champion of Enlightenment, the Revolutionary and the Penitent");

(26) "Probelmen fun a Yiddishen Shrayber un Problemen fun der Yiddisher Literatur" ("Problems of a Yiddish Writer and Problems of the Yiddish Literature");

(27) "Mayn Veg in der Yiddisher Literatur" ("My Path in the Yiddish Literature");

(28) "I.L. Peretz";

(29) "Mayn Bagegenish mit Sovetishe Yiddisher Shrayber" ("My Encounter with the Soviet Yiddish Writers");

(30) "Dray Dramatishe Poemen—'Di Goldene Kayt', 'Der Goylem', 'Der Dybbuk', 'Three Dramatic Poems—'The Golden Chain', 'the Goylem', 'The Dybbuk'";

(31) "Dray Hoybt Motiven in Mayn Shafung" ("Three Mayn Motives in My Works");

(32) "Yung Vilna un ir Svivah" ("Young Vilna and its Milieu");

(33) "Shevet Tzion" ("The Return to Zion");

(34) "Shabes un Voh in der Yiddisher Literatur" ("The Sabbath and the Weekdays in Yiddish Literature");

(35) "Mussarnikes un Litvishe Yeshivas" ("The Mussarniks and the Lithuanian Yeshivas");

(36) "Sholem Alaychem";

(37) "Nusah Mizrah Evrope un Reb Isroel Baal 'Shem' Tov" ("The Jewish Way of Life in Eastern Europe and Rabbi Israel Baal 'Shem' Tov");

(38) "Reb Isroel Salanter un Reb Isroel Baal 'Shem' Tov" ("Rabbi Israel Salanter and Rabbi Israel Baal 'Shem' Tov");

(39) "Der Talmudhokem in der Yiddisher Literatur" ("The Talmudic Scholar in Yiddish Literature");

(40) "Di Haskore in Vilner Shtot Shul Nohn Ger-Tzadik, Graf Potocki" ("The Memorial Service at the Grand Synagogue of Vilna for the Convert, Count Potocki");

(41) "Dr. Shmuel Ravidovitch un zayn Philosophia fun Yiddishen Kium Umetum" ("Dr. Samuel Ravidovitch and his Philosophy of the Jewish Life Worldwide");

(42) "Dr. Shmuel Ravidovitch un zayn Kamf farn Yiddishen Kium Umetum" ("Dr.



Samuel Ravidovich and his Struggle for the Jewish Life Worldwide");

(43) "Zaynen di Yiddishe Shrayber in Sovet Russland Geven Marranen?" ("Were the Yiddish Writers in Soviet Russia Marranos?");

(44) "Reb Yehudah Ibn Shmuel Dr. Kaufman" ("Rabbi Jehudah Ibn Samuel Dr. Kaufman");

(45) "Shir-HaShirim—A Liebe-Lied, a National Gezag un Mistishe Poeme" ("The Song of Songs—a Love Song, a National Hymn and a Mystical Poem") lecture and essay;

(46) "Tzfas un der Barg Miron" ("Saffed and Mount Miron") lecture and essay;

(47) "Mentshen, Shtayner un Flantzen in Eretz-Israel" ("The People, the Stones and the Greening of Israel") lecture and essay;

(48) "Mit Vos Vilna Iz Geven Andersh?" ("What Made Vilna Unique?");

(49) "Histadruth";

(50) "Yiddish Lebn in Vilna far der Zvayer Velt Melhome" ("Jewish Life in Vilna Before World War II") alternate title is "Yiddish Folk lebn un Traditzie in der Lite" ("Jewish Folk-Life and Tradition in Lithuania");

(51) "Di Naye Hebreische Literatur un der Yunger Dor in Israel" ("The New Hebrew Literature and the Young Generation in Israel");

(52) "Di Ibergeblibene" ("The Survivors");

(53) ("To the Survivors of the German Concentration Camps, World Federation of Bergen-Belsen, Associations");

(54) "Drayssik Yor Shpeter" ("Thirty Years Later");

(55) "Der Bodn un di Legende fun Eretz-Israel" ("The Soil and the Legend of the Land of Israel");

(56) "Di Letzte Mahlaykes tzvishn Rabbim in Vilna" ("The Last Controversies Among the Rabbis of Vilna");

(57) "Amerikaner Yiddishe Poetn, Morris Rosenfeld, Avrohom Reisen, Walt-Lessin un Mani Leib", ("American Yiddish Poets, Morris Rosenfeld, Avrohom Reisen, Walt-Lessin un Mani Leib");

(58) Any other works of Chaim Grade, however created, whether published or unpublished.

## RENTAL HOUSING PROGRAM FOR MILITARY FAMILIES

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following newspaper article on the benefits of the military pilot program on rental housing. It appeared in the Air Force Times on February 8, 1988. The article does an excellent job explaining the advantage of making permanent a current DOD pilot program which encourages landlords near a military installation to waive security deposits in exchange for a Government guarantee for payment by withholding the money from the service member's pay.

This article points out that the housing officials at the three test sites have indicated that the guarantee program has reduced family moving costs and improved morale. It is important to note that no appropriation of funds is necessary because the service member

would be ultimately responsible for meeting the costs of any damage or breach of lease.

On February 18, 1988, I introduced H.R. 3975, which directs the Secretary of Defense to establish a permanent program involving military personnel and their civilian landlords. This legislation makes permanent the pilot program which has been in effect at Fort Ord over the last 15 months. The program has been implemented with a high degree of success resulting in the solution of problems with military residents to payment and landlords obtaining guarantees on security deposit payments.

I commend this article to all my colleagues and hope that it will encourage each Member to consider cosponsoring H.R. 3975 which will resolve one of the most pressing and financially disabling issues our service members and their families face by making permanent this highly successful pilot program.

[From the Air Force Times, Feb. 8, 1988]

### HILL MAY EXTEND NO-DEPOSIT RENTAL PROGRAM

(By Grant Willis)

WASHINGTON.—Private landlords have rented more than 1,400 housing units to military members—without requiring security deposits—under a one-year test program to reduce move-in costs at three stateside installations, military housing officials said.

Pentagon officials and congressional staffers expect lawmakers to extend the program, but it might not come soon enough for service members scheduled to move this summer.

Congressional authorization for the guarantee program is set to expire in June. That means no additional families will be able to participate in the program between June and October, even if Congress re-authorizes the program for fiscal 1989.

The Department of Defense program encourages landlords near the installations to waive security deposits in exchange for a government guarantee. If a service member in the program breaches his lease or fails to pay for damages to an apartment, the government may reimburse the landlord and withhold the money from the member's pay.

Housing officials at the three test sites—an Air Force, a Navy and an Army installation—say the guarantee program has reduced family moving costs, improved morale and cost the government almost nothing.

"It allows a family to come to a base and not worry about a lot of out-of-pocket money," said Jack Borodko, housing manager at Luke AFB, Ariz. The program began at Luke last May and is scheduled to end in June. Other test sites are Moffett Field Naval AS and Fort Ord, both in California.

Final reports from the test sites are due in August. Preliminary statistics show few participating landlords have made claims against the government.

DOD surveys have repeatedly shown that military families never recover the full cost of a move to a new duty station. Faced with the cost of shipping household goods, many families lack the cash to pay the first month's rent, last month's rent and a security deposit on a new apartment.

Until now, the service member's only remedy for high move-in costs has been a three-month pay advance. The advance is equivalent to a 12-month interest-free loan, but it can cause additional hardship when the service member struggles to pay the money back.

Here is how the program works: First, an installation housing office recruits landlords willing to waive security deposits for military tenants. That may sound like a gamble, but many landlords feel more secure with military tenants, said Rodney Kleman, a lawyer who owns 78 apartments near Fort Ord.

"I would prefer to cooperate with the military, because you know they have a steady job and you have the (post) housing referral office behind you to stand up for what's right," he said.

Landlords who participate sign a memorandum of understanding with the housing office. The government agrees to reimburse the landlord for any breach of the lease or any damage caused by the member's guests or dependents. The reimbursement is limited to the amount the landlord usually charges for security deposits not the full extent of property damage.

Under the program rules at Luke and Moffett, landlords may not submit claims to the government until they have "exhausted any remedy," including court action. This may discourage some landlords from participating, because they have to go through so many steps to recover their money. Borodko said.

Military families who live in a participating landlord's rental unit agree to a three-, six- or 12-month lease. The maximum lease under the program is 12 months. As long as the lease remains in effect, the tenant does not have to pay a security deposit. The guarantee is not renewable, however, and families who remain in the same unit after their original lease expires must pay a security deposit if the landlords asks for one. Families also lose their deposit guarantee if they move.

Even if a landlord makes a successful claim for damages, the government does not lose money because the law allows service secretaries to withhold the expense from the service member's paycheck.

All the test sites report they have been able to run the guarantee program with existing housing office staff. "The administrative cost of the program is offset by less staff time that is spent trying to find members cheaper housing or apartments with lower security deposits," Borodko said.

But Pentagon officials are cautiously optimistic that Congress will renew the program in fiscal 1989 or expand it to all stateside installations.

"All the indications we've received are favorable," a DoD housing official said. "But the program has never been tested in court. If you don't know what the (final) results are it's hard to tell what the problems are."

The original legislation for the guarantee program was sponsored in the House by Rep. Leon E. Panetta, D-Calif., whose district includes Fort Ord. If the program results are positive, Panetta will try to keep the program going in fiscal 1989 and expand it to more military installations, said Barry Toiv, an aide to the congressman.

Security-deposit guarantees have brought "a lot of smiles" to Air Force families at Luke AFB, said Borodko, the housing manager. Since the program began last spring, the Luke housing office has signed memoranda with 74 multifamily landlords, 23 real estate agents and four individual homeowners, Borodko said. The landlords own a total of 18,000 rental units in the area near the base.

Average rents for one-bedroom apartments in the Phoenix area are \$350 per month, while the average for a three-bed-

room unit is \$800 per month, Air Force housing surveys show.

The Air Force has paid no claims to landlords under the guarantee program, Borodko said, but the housing office did help landlords collect \$35,000 directly from military tenants in mediated settlements last year. Borodko was unable to say how many of the settlements were connected with the guarantee program, since the housing office offers mediation services to all its clients.

Because the program is so new, it is too early to tell whether security-deposit guarantees would work overseas. DoD officials said. The officials noted that military members stationed overseas already get reimbursed for rental security deposits through the initial terminal occupancy allowance, a component of the monthly overseas housing allowance.

### COMMISSION ON VALUES EDUCATION

#### HON. ROBIN TALLON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, read between the headlines of 1988 and you will find the common theme of moral decay. Unethical behavior is evident in every aspect, and on every level, of our society. From the White House, to Wall Street, to Heritage U.S.A., evidence of corruption, dishonesty, and greed abound. Additional incidents of insider trading, fraud in scientific research, bribery, and kickbacks are too numerous to name.

What sort of impact are the decisions of so many responsible adults having on our young people? A few statistics tell a frightening story. Cheating in our schools is rampant.

Over 25 percent of our Nation's fourth graders say they feel pressure to use drugs.

Drunken driving is the leading cause of death among those 15 to 25 years of age.

And, more than 1 million teenage girls in this country become pregnant each year. The United States surpasses all other Western developed nations in its rates of teenage pregnancy, abortion and births.

We are raising a generation of children who cannot distinguish between right and wrong. They are not prepared to make tough choices when there are gray areas, or when values seem to conflict.

I am not laying this at the foot of our school system. Still, schools can play a role in helping to install values in individuals. The 1960's and 1970's saw a move toward relativistic, values-free teaching in which students were given the options, but no guidance toward answers.

Our young people have been led to believe that ethical boundaries are up for grabs. The line is always moving. The simple word, decency is one we shy away from.

But, recently things have started to change. Leaders from a wide range of political and social arenas and religious backgrounds have called for strengthening the teaching and democratic values stating that education for democracy must extend to education in moral issues. Now, a growing number of educators agree that schools should teach civic virtue

and take clear positions on right or wrong behavior.

That is why I am joining in sponsorship of H.R. 2667, legislation to create a commission on values education. The purpose of this bill is to find out how we can better educate people to become productive members of society by identifying and promoting basic values.

It requires the commission to identify values which are essential to our well-being, including honesty, integrity, tolerance, self-discipline, self-respect, civility, importance of family, justice, and equality, the rule of law, individual rights, the common good, love of country, love of knowledge, responsibility and accountability, and protection of oneself and others from degradation and abuse.

It also requires a report to Congress within a year with recommendations on what Congress and the executive branch can do to promote the teaching values in American schools.

This commission would not be made up of so-called experts. Language has been included specifically stating that appointments be made from groups including parents, students, educators, philosophers, theologians, and religious leaders, sports figures, social service workers and the general public.

We need to shore up a moral foundation that was once taken for granted in this country. For over two centuries, our Nation has relied on this foundation for vision. The same sort of vision that inspired our Founding Fathers. A vision that can direct us away from a damaging self-absorption to a new outward looking global perspective. A vision focused on American know-how, innovation and adaptability. A vision that will take us into the 21st century with the same pride, competence, and compassion that brought us into this one.

The single most important thing I have learned as a Congressman is that how we perform as a nation is determined by how we perform as individuals. Our young people must recognize the importance of their own future and potential. Our tomorrow depends on it.

### CONSTITUTIONALITY OF SECTION 711, H.R. 3100

#### HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, in response to inquiries regarding the constitutionality of section 711 of H.R. 3100, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1987, I commissioned a legal opinion from the Congressional Research Service. That opinion, which follows, states, in part, "The power to make appropriations includes the authority not only to designate the purpose of the appropriation, but also the terms and conditions under which the executive department of the Government may expend the appropriation \* \* \* The purpose of the appropriations, the terms and conditions under which \* \* \* appropriations (are) made is solely in the hands of Congress and it is the plain duty of the executive branch of the Gov-

ernment to comply with the same." *Spaulding v. Douglas Aircraft*, 60 F. Supp. 985, 986 (S.D. Col. 1945), *aff'd* 154 F.2d 419 (9th cir. 1946)."

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,

Washington, D.C., February 11, 1988.

To: Honorable Sam Gejdenson.

Attention: Kathleen Bertelsen.

From: American Law Division.

Subject: Constitutionality of Section 711, H.R. 3100, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1978.

Reference is made to your inquiry of February 4, 1988, requesting our comments on the above matter.

Despite intimations that section 711 of H.R. 3100, which effectively prohibits using economic and military assistance or arms sales to obtain other country aid for the Contras, trenches upon the President's foreign affairs powers, it seems well within Congress' powers to enact. See 133 Cong. Rec. H11066 et seq. (daily ed. Dec. 9, 1987).

Section 711 amends section 722(d) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985 99 Stat. 190. Known widely as the Pell Amendment, section 722(d) provides:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act (except the funds authorized to be appropriated in this section), by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or by the Arms Export Control Act shall be used to provide assistance of any kind, either directly or indirectly, to any person or group engaging in an insurgency or other act of rebellion against the Government of Nicaragua. The United States shall not enter into any arrangement conditioning, expressly or impliedly, the provision of assistance under this Act or the purchase of defense articles and services under the Arms Export Control Act upon the provision of assistance by a recipient to persons or groups engaging in an insurgency or other act of rebellion against the Government of Nicaragua.

Generally, section 722(d) prohibits the use of funds under the Foreign Assistance Act or the Arms Export Control Act to provide any assistance to any person engaged in any insurgency against the Government of Nicaragua. It also prohibits the U.S. Government from entering into any arrangement with the recipients of U.S. assistance or purchasers of defense articles and services to provide such assistance.

The Committee of Conference on the 1985 legislation described the purpose of the second prohibition as follows:

The purpose of the second sentence of this section is to prohibit the United States from furnishing economic or military assistance or selling U.S. military equipment on the condition, either expressly or impliedly, that the recipient or purchaser provide assistance to insurgents involved in the struggle in Nicaragua. This section does not prohibit U.S. Government officials from discussing U.S. policy in Central America with recipients of U.S. assistance or purchasers of U.S. military equipment. Nor does it prohibit recipients of U.S. assistance from furnishing assistance to any third party on their own volition and from their own resources. H.Rept. No. 99-237 at 143.

Section 711 of H.R. 3100 leaves the first prohibition as it is and revises the second to read as follows:



The United States shall make no agreement and shall enter into no understanding, either formal or informal, under which a recipient of United States economic or military assistance or a purchaser of United States military equipment shall provide assistance of any kind to persons or groups engaging in an insurgency or other act of rebellion against the Government of Nicaragua.

The changes to the Pell Amendment made by section 711 seem to be largely stylistic rather than substantive. It substitutes the arguably more precise "agreement" and "understanding, either formal or informal" for the more indefinite "arrangement conditioning, expressly or impliedly" of the earlier law. Substantive change if any is not immediately apparent and more than likely both versions have a common purpose, namely, to prohibit U.S. officials from taking advantage of any leverage afforded by the FAA or the AECA to prevail upon recipients of U.S. assistance or purchasers of U.S. military equipment to assist the Contras and similar groups.

As indicated, it has been suggested that section 711 in some unexplained way interferes with Executive powers in the area of foreign affairs in violation of separation of powers principles. Although not susceptible of exhaustive definition, the President's powers "in this vast external realm" are not insignificant. *United States v. Curtiss-Wright Corp.*, 299 U.S. 304, 319 (1936). The congressional powers implicated by section 711 are equally, if not more, formidable, including as they do the power to make and condition appropriations. (E.g., "... no funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available . . .").

It may be noted that there are no directly relevant court cases involving a conflict between the congressional power of the purse and the presidential foreign affairs power. Cases involving these powers, chiefly litigation brought by private persons, support the breadth of the former and the nonstatutory basis for some of the matters comprehended by the latter. See, e.g., *Spaulding v. Douglas Aircraft Co.*, 60 F. Supp. 985, 986 (S.D. Cal. 1945), *aff'd*, 154 F.2d 419 (9th Cir. 1946), and *United States v. Curtiss-Wright Corp.*, 299 U.S. at 319. In these and a handful of other cases, the courts have not gone much beyond some generalities about the powers in question; none, to the best of our knowledge, attempts either to exhaust the range of activities comprehended by them or to draw a boundary line between them. As Justice Jackson observed in the landmark *Steel Seizure* case in 1952 and as recently repeated by then Justice Rehnquist in the *Iranian Assets* case: "[any person as well as a judge . . . may be surprised at the poverty of really useful and unambiguous authority applicable to concrete problems of executive power as they actually present themselves." *Youngstown Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579, 634 (1952) (concurring opinion) and *Dames & Moore v. Reagan*, 453 U.S. 654, 600 (1981).

The issues raised by section 711 are not new issues, but in one form or other have been debated for two hundred years. Indeed, if Edward S. Corwin is to be believed, debate was and is inevitable. "... the Constitution, considered only for its affirmative grants of powers capable of affecting the issue, is an invitation to struggle for the privilege of directing American foreign policy." *The President: Office and Powers 1787-1957* 177 (1957).

The Constitution gives the power to "receive ambassadors and other public Minis-

ters" and "to make Treaties" to the President but he may only do the latter with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senators present. U.S. Const. Art. II §2, cl. 2. Court cases recognize him as the nation's "mouthpiece" in foreign affairs, support the view that he alone negotiates, and that he may remove some obstacles in the path of normalizing relations with another country, such as settling claims. See e.g., *United States v. Curtiss-Wright Corp.*, *supra*; *United States v. Belmont*, 301 U.S. 324 (1937); *United States v. Pink* U.S. 23 (1942); *Dames & Moore v. Regan*, *supra*.

As Commander in Chief, the President has command of the army and navy and may respond to an attack upon the United States. See, e.g., *Youngstown Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. at 642 (concurring opinion). Also, there is authority for the proposition that he may act to safeguard American lives and property abroad. See *Durand v. Hollins*, 8 F. Cas. 111 (No. 4186) (C.C.S.D.N.Y. 1860) and *Slaughter-House Cases*, 16 Wall. 36, 79 (1872). But see the Hostage Act of 1868, 22 U.S.C. §1732, which excludes war from the President's options to obtain release of Americans unreasonably detained by a foreign government.

What more goes with these two titles is largely a matter of advocacy rather than law. Again, as Justice Jackson noted, "[a] century and a half of partisan debate and scholarly speculation [re. presidential powers] yields no net result but only more or less apt quotations from respected sources on each side of any question. They largely cancel each other." *Youngstown Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. at 634-635 (concurring opinion).

On the other hand, aside from his powers "to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offenses against the United States . . ." and to "receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers", the President is totally dependent upon Congress for authority or money and usually both to implement any policy. Congress is under no legal obligation to supply either or both. For example, "[w]hile Congress cannot deprive the President of command of the army and navy, only Congress can provide him an army or navy to command." *Youngstown Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. at 644 (concurring opinion).

The power to make appropriations includes the authority not only to designate the purpose of the appropriation, "but also the terms and conditions under which the executive department of the government may expend the appropriation. . . . The purpose of the appropriations, the terms and conditions under which . . . appropriations [are] made is solely in the hands of Congress and it is the plain duty of the executive branch of the government to comply with the same." *Spaulding v. Douglas Aircraft Co.*, 60 F. Supp. 985, 986 (S.D. Cal. 1945), *aff'd*, 154 F.2d 419 (9th Cir. 1946).

Louis Henkin observes as follows on the point:

One necessary and proper power of Congress, as important as any for the conduct of foreign relations, is that implied in the provision that "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law." (Art. I, sec. 9, cl. 7) While, we shall see, Congress usually feels legally, politically, or morally obligated to appropriate funds to implement his treaties and other foreign undertakings, Congress can readily refuse to appropriate when it believes the President has exceeded his powers. Even when the President acts clearly within his powers, Congress decides the

degree and detail of its support; it determines ultimately the State Department's budget, how much money the President shall have to spend on the armed forces under this command, how much he can agree to contribute to the United Nations. Since the President is always coming to Congress for money for innumerable purposes, domestic and foreign, Congress and Congressional committees can use appropriations and the appropriations process to bargain also about other elements of Presidential policy in foreign affairs. Because the President usually cannot afford to veto appropriations acts they are favorite vehicles for "conditions" and other riders imposed on unwilling Presidents. *Foreign Affairs and the Constitution* 79 (1972) (Notes omitted) (Emphasis added.)

Although Congress in enacting laws has to scrupulously avoid even incidental adverse effects on fully autonomous presidential powers (e.g., the pardoning power, *Ex parte Garland*, 71 U.S. 333 (1867)), it is under no similar constraints in other areas. The fact that in the exercise of an acknowledged power, such as the power to raise and equip the Armed Forces of the United States, the Congress may incidentally affect the ambit of presidential discretion as the organ of foreign relations or as Commander in Chief is not a violation of the separation of powers. For example, Congress is under no constitutional obligation to provide "bargaining chips" in for the form of additional weapons systems for the purpose of international negotiations. "The Constitution does not subject this lawmaking power of Congress to presidential or military supervision or control." *Youngstown Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. at 588.

Section 711 deals with programs which only Congress can authorize and fund: foreign aid and arms sales. In brief, statutory authority is required for these purposes. See testimony of former Deputy Secretary of State Kenneth W. Dam in accord with this conclusion. *The Supreme Court Decision Concerning The Legislative Veto*. Hearings Before The Committee On Foreign Affairs, 98th Congress, 1st Session (1983) at 100. Congress has ringed both programs with conditions designed to carry out their purposes, prevent abuses, and implement congressional policy choices. E.g., 22 U.S.C. §§ 2370, 2422, 2753. Whether written as direct restraints on authority or indirect restraints on authority in the form of conditional appropriations, neither form has been seriously challenged on constitutional grounds. The Pell Amendment as modified by section 711 of H.R. 3100 effectively prohibits direct and indirect assistance under the FAA and the AECA to the Contras or using these programs to accomplish these results by other countries. It does not prevent negotiations or interfere with the power to receive ambassadors and other matters that inhere in the latter, areas of autonomous power. While the policy underlying the congressional exercise of legislative power under consideration may be questioned, the existence of the power seems fairly clear.

Although Congress is subject to the Constitution even in the exercise of its power of the purse, see, e.g., *United States v. Lovett*, 328 U.S. 303 (1946), "[e]ven when the President acts clearly within his powers, Congress decides the degree and detail of its support," Henkin, *Foreign Affairs and the Constitution*, at 79, and "it is the plain duty of the executive branch of the government

to comply with the same." *Spaulding v. Douglas Aircraft Co.*, 60 F. Supp. at 986.

RAYMOND J. CELADA,  
Senior Specialist in  
American Public Law.

### ENERGY EFFICIENT TECHNOLOGY

#### HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call my colleagues' attention to the energy efficiency technology exhibit now on display at the Cannon rotunda. The conservation technologies presented there can have an enormous impact on reducing our energy needs and benefiting our environment.

Sponsored by the Northeast-Midwest Congressional Coalition, the Environment and Energy Study Institute, the Congressional Clearinghouse on the Future and the Competitiveness Caucus, the exhibit displays exciting conservation technologies developed by several national laboratories and private companies. These technologies will help the Nation become more productive, competitive, and secure by reducing the cost of manufacturing, reducing dependence on foreign oil and significantly improving our environment.

Despite the great gains in energy efficiency already achieved, much more can be accomplished. Yet the current administration has cut the DOE conservation budget by 75 percent in the past 7 years and is again seeking almost a fourfold reduction for the coming budget year. President Reagan has neglected conservation and renewable energy while pouring substantial sums of money into nuclear energy, in spite of the fact that nuclear energy expansion has come to a standstill in the past 10 years, while conservation and efficiency efforts have reduced our national energy consumption by 30 percent.

It is my sincere hope that the unwisdom of this administration will soon be reversed, so that the technologies that hold the most promise will receive the greatest level of assistance. I again commend those who have worked so hard to put this exhibit together and who are attempting to steer our Nation's energy policy in the right direction.

### TERRORISTS MURDER THE INNOCENT IN EL SALVADOR

#### HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

MR. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of yet another vote on the Contras, I want to share with my colleagues a disturbing news story from El Salvador. According to recent reports, Marxist FMLN guerrillas have again murdered innocent Salvadoran workers and have also kidnapped a government official and mayoral candidate.

The armed Marxist guerrillas often resort to terrorist tactics in their ongoing offensive in

that poor country. While the guerrillas claim that they want to liberate El Salvador and help the people of that country, innocent Salvadoran peasants are all too often the victims of the Marxists' liberation efforts.

In addition to killing peasants, many government officials have been kidnapped and assassinated along with others to include off duty marines who were sitting in an outdoor cafe when they were brutally murdered. The guerrillas have also launched an offensive designed to destroy the infrastructure of that poor country. Roads have been cut, power pylons have been destroyed, and power stations have been damaged. Even schools and buses have been destroyed. The struggling Salvadoran industrial base has also come under siege.

The Marxist guerrillas receive training and supplies from both Cuba and Nicaragua. A building in downtown Managua is the radio communications control center for the various FMLN guerrilla groups operating in El Salvador.

The guerrillas clearly have one objective in mind. They are determined to destroy the democratic government of President Duarte and replace that government with a Marxist-Leninist one. Should that happen, El Salvador would be nothing more than a clone of Nicaragua. Both countries will then be able to work together to export their Communist revolutions to neighboring states and perhaps to Mexico itself.

I urge my colleagues to read the following article which highlights the same side of the Salvadoran guerrillas.

[From the Washington Times, Feb. 24, 1988]

#### FMLN KILLS 3 WOMEN DURING TRANSPORT BAN

SAN SALVADOR, EL SALVADOR.—Marxist guerrillas killed three women and wounded six other persons in an ambush on a bus taking factory workers home during a rebel transport ban, military and local officials said yesterday.

The military also reported the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front guerrillas kidnapped a government official and a mayoral candidate in local elections scheduled for March 20.

The FMLN traffic ban, called as part of an offensive to disrupt the polls, gripped El Salvador for a second day yesterday, with roads in the countryside almost paralyzed and chaos in the capital because of the lack of public transport.

The ambush brought to nine the number of civilians killed by the FMLN in the past week. A family of six was killed when a mortar shell landed on their house during an attack on the military barracks in eastern Usulután city last week.

The guerrillas' Radio Venceremos did not immediately acknowledge the bus ambush, but last night it reiterated its threat to attack vehicles defying the ban.

The military, which has deployed thousands of troops to keep the roads open, said the guerrillas machine-gunned the bus about midnight Monday on the Pan-American highway near San Martín, six miles east of the capital.

Urban guerrillas burned a vehicle belonging to the state telephone company in the capital.

The military also said the FMLN kidnapped two people in the town of Alegria, Usulután. It identified the victims as

Manuel Guardado, who is running for mayor as a candidate of the ruling Christian Democrat Party, and Ricardo Arturo Batles, a money collector for the state water and power company.

FMLN sabotage caused more than \$200,000 worth of damage to the San Fermín coffee processing plant outside the town of Berlin, a few miles from Alegria, the military said. Offices and four vehicles were burned.

Meanwhile, few buses or other vehicles were venturing out in rural areas because of the guerrilla threat, radio reports said. The Pan-American highway and other main roads were almost deserted, they said.

Customs officials said only five commercial vehicles crossed the border from Guatemala on Monday. At the other end of the country, vehicles were waiting on the Honduran side for the guerrillas to call off the indefinite ban.

Local correspondents said the east was at a virtual standstill. Many businesses in San Miguel and Usulután cities were shut.

State electrical company workers were trying to repair power lines sabotaged by the guerrillas on Monday. Power was back in the capital, but correspondents said parts of the four eastern provinces were still without electricity.

Traffic bans are a favorite tactic of the guerrillas to show they are still a force to be reckoned with. Last year they held seven.

### REV. DR. GRANVILLE ALLEN SEWARD CELEBRATES 20 YEARS AT MOUNT ZION BAP- TIST CHURCH

#### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

MR. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, 1988, the congregation of Mount Zion Baptist Church in Newark, NJ, will celebrate the 20th anniversary of its pastor, Rev. Dr. Granville Allen Seward. At a special dinner that evening, Reverend Seward will be honored for his "Commitment to the Vision" during 20 years as pastor of Mount Zion. It will be an occasion for the congregation and the community to express their loving pride and warm appreciation for this outstanding individual.

When Reverend Seward arrived in Newark in 1968, he came with a sense of mission and an enduring faith. At the young age of 17, he acknowledged his call to the ministry. In 1957, Reverend Seward was ordained and served for 7 years as the pastor of First Baptist Church in Rendville, OH. He has also carried his ministry to other parts of the world including tours of Asia and Africa.

Reverend Seward also began his ministry in Newark with impressive academic credentials. He received a bachelor of Arts degree from Ohio State University and a bachelor of divinity degree from Colgate Rochester Divinity School. After pursuing graduate studies at Ohio State University, Reverend Seward entered the Crozer Theological Seminary where he received a doctorate of ministry in 1982.

Reverend Seward's mission and commitment has extended to the entire community. As an educator, he served as a visiting pro-



fessor at the Colgate Rochester Divinity School and at the New York Theological Seminary. From 1980 to 1984, Reverend Seward was a member of the Newark Board of Education where he served effectively and with distinction.

The true hallmark of Reverend Seward is his kindness, his deep and abiding faith, and his commitment to helping others. His 20 years as the pastor of Mount Zion Baptist Church have been a time of expanding horizons and growth.

I want to extend my warmest congratulations and best wishes to Reverend Seward on this special occasion. He has enriched the entire community with his leadership and commitment and he has earned our respect and appreciation.

### NATIONAL RURAL HEALTH AWARENESS WEEK

#### HON. THOMAS J. TAUKE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Speaker, and fellow Members of the House, on February 17, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. GRANT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. TALLON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. WEBER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. DAUB, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. HALL of Texas, and I introduced House Joint Resolution 461, designating the week beginning May 15, 1988 as "National Rural Health Awareness Week."

I ask my colleagues to consider the unique problems facing rural communities today. The health status of rural Americans remains significantly lower than that of urban Americans, with rural Americans showing disproportionately higher rates of maternal and infant mortality, higher injury rates, and higher rates of chronic illness. Statistics show that greater numbers of rural Americans are poorer and tend to be less insured—if at all—than those living in urban areas. Rural areas also face acute shortages of health professionals, including physicians, nurses, psychologists, and allied health professionals. Moreover, closures of rural hospitals and other health care facilities, which have a severe impact on their communities, continue to spread across the rural areas of our Nation.

In order to further address the rural health crisis, we must continue to focus attention on the health care needs of rural Americans and rural communities. It is in recognition of this that I ask my colleagues to join me in designating the week of May 15 as "National Rural Health Awareness Week." For your ready reference, a text of the resolution follows:

H.J. Res. 461

Whereas the economic and social well-being of a nation depends on the health of its people;

Whereas 25 percent of the people in the United States live in rural communities;

Whereas 33 percent of the elderly people in the United States live in rural communities;

Whereas rural communities have only 12 percent of the physicians in the United

States, 18 percent of the nurses in the United States, and 14 percent of the pharmacies in the United States;

Whereas rural communities face an acute and growing nursing shortage, and 50 percent of the hospitals and long-term care facilities in rural communities report difficulty in recruiting and retaining nurses;

Whereas the people who live in rural communities are increasingly experiencing a lack of access to obstetric care;

Whereas the decline of the rural economy in recent years reduced the economic resources available to rural communities and lead to increased closures of hospitals and other health care facilities in rural communities, the loss or curtailment of services by rural health departments, and the disruption of social service programs;

Whereas the decline in the number of hospitals and other health care facilities in rural communities has, in turn, increased the shortage of physicians, nurses, psychologists, and other allied health professionals in such communities;

Whereas rural communities have few transportation services, thereby making it difficult for rural residents without transportation to obtain needed health care;

Whereas the residents of rural communities generally have poorer health than residents of urban areas and have higher infant and maternal mortality rates, higher rates of chronic illness, and higher rates of injury than residents of urban areas;

Whereas there are more poor and medically indigent people in rural communities than in urban areas;

Whereas hospitals in rural communities serve a higher percentage of elderly patients than hospitals in urban areas serve, and Medicare payments are a high percentage of the total revenues of hospitals in rural communities; and

Whereas current policies result in substantially lower Medicare payments to health care providers in rural communities for services equivalent to the services provided by health care providers in urban areas, and such payment policies further increase the likelihood of financial failure and closure of health care facilities in rural communities: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the week beginning on May 15, 1988, is designated as "National Rural Health Awareness Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

### JAPAN: HELP PROTECT COMMERCIAL SEA LANES

#### HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed recently when Japan categorically rejected a U.S. suggestion that it extend its defense effort.

Former U.S. Secretary of the Navy James Webb urged Japan to increase its maritime defense to extend beyond the 1,000 nautical miles of sea lanes that it currently safeguards. Such an increase would augment shipping

protection to the strategically important Indian Ocean. This request complements others made by the administration and Congress that Japan play a more prominent military role in defense of the free world.

While we are all aware of the political sensitivities surrounding military spending in Japan, we also know that the Japan of the 1980's is fundamentally different from the Japan of the 1930's and 1940's. Today, Japan and the United States represent all of the freedoms and liberties that are guaranteed by free and open democracies.

The Japanese Government's decision to issue a "categorical no" to the idea of increasing maritime protection for free world shipping displays a disturbing stubbornness that may harm the unity of the West. It is time, Mr. Speaker, for the Government and the people of Japan to take on a larger responsibility for protecting the way of life that they enjoy and share with the rest of us.

### PRESIDENT REAGAN'S LAST STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

#### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to your attention, and the attention of all my colleagues, a commentary that recently appeared in the Civil Rights Journal regarding President Reagan's final State of the Union address. Contrary to the content of the address, the facts show that Reagan has exhibited persistent irresponsibility in managing this Nation during his 8-year tenure.

Our Nation has witnessed an era in which Reagan has continued to mortgage our future and our children's future with quantum increases in defense funding and simultaneous decreases in taxes. His policy translated into a greater and greater Federal deficit while he continued to call for a balanced budget. He added insult to injury by attaining the distinction of the President with the largest personal staff in the history of our country.

Moreover, his huge cuts in social spending have led to the greatest chasm between the haves and have nots in this Nation since the Great Depression. We should all be outraged that our President could speak of rising jobs and incomes without recognizing the plight of the poor. Not only has Reagan's administration done little to aid the ever-growing homeless population, it has slashed Federal spending on employment and training programs for the economically disadvantaged by 50 percent since 1980.

In foreign policy, Reagan hid behind a wall of rhetoric and inaction when he preferred to condone legally sanctioned racism and brutality in South Africa with resisting the "Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986." Moreover, his administration bypassed the Government structure handed down by the founding Fathers with its illegal actions in the Iran-Contra affair.

Reagan has also ignored the growing crisis facing our children with his boasts of reducing drug abuse while he refused to take a stand against nations that export this poison to our

shores. His inaction on combating the deadly AIDS disease that is contaminating our maternity wards and in addressing infant mortality rates in our inner city communities that are higher than most developing countries is a testament to his lack of dedication to our youth. Our President has also chosen to cut Federal aid to education versus devising ways to help those children that our educational system ignores.

With these actions, Reagan has set improper moral tone in this Nation where racial violence is on the rise. This country has witnessed the resurgence of injustice with such situations as the assault of youths in Howard Beach and, more recently, the rape of 15-year-old Tawana Brawley in Wappinger Falls.

As the Reagan administration moves toward a close, I am, therefore, honored to present the following commentary exposing President Reagan's camouflage of the facts in his last formal address as President of our country:

CIVIL RIGHTS JOURNAL—COMMENTARY No.  
320—THE STATE OF THE UNION?

(By Benjamin F. Chavis, Jr.)

As I listened to President Reagan deliver his final State of the Union Message, I wondered if he was really talking about the United States. It is a tradition for all presidents to use, as a centerpiece of their state of the union messages, many laudatory comments about the accomplishments of their administrations.

For millions of African Americans, Latino Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans and many white Americans, Mr. Reagan's speech not only missed the mark, but also presented a chilling reality: the poor and the downtrodden are no longer envisioned as part of what Reagan termed "the flowering of American prosperity and freedom."

It is not that the President's speech writers forgot to include in the address a challenge to the nation on the growing racial crisis. It is, rather, that the speech was intended to camouflage the resurgence of overt and violent racism which is spreading across this nation.

It is not that Mr. Reagan forgot that his administration divergent but harmonizing communities were a reflection of a deeper community of values—the value of work, of family, of religion—and of the love of freedom that God places in each of us and whose defense He has entrusted in a special way to this nation.

Mr. Reagan is convinced that this nation is destined by God to rule over the rest of the world. Yet, the God of Justice and Creation demands not pious and elitist affirmations of manifest destiny, but rather, justice, freedom and peace for all of God's people in not one but in all of the nations of the world. Until the United States and its leadership repents for past and present sins of injustice, the attempt by Reagan to use God to justify evil actions will only lead to further domestic and international turmoil.

Of course, 1988 will offer the nation an opportunity to change its present course. The extent to which all eligible voters go to the polls and vote in record numbers for candidates who dare to take a stand for justice and freedom for all people of the world is the extent to which this nation can become a true moral force in the world.

## CHILD CARE ISSUE EMERGES AS FOCUS OF LEGISLATIVE EFFORTS

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has experienced a dramatic shift in demographics over the last 30 years. Today, the numbers of single parents, teen parents, working mothers, families in which both parents work, households headed by women, and poor children are higher than they have ever been, and the numbers continue to grow. The importance of child care in a family's ability to participate and to stay in the work force is crucial, and the demand for child care services is skyrocketing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention an article that recently appeared on the front page of the Washington Post, entitled: "Child Care Issue Emerges as Focus of Legislative Efforts." One of the important points made by the article is that the goals of increasing the supply of child care services and of providing some kind of support for these services are goals shared by a wide variety of people. Members of Congress of both parties, in both Houses, members of the administration, representatives of labor groups and of business groups, Presidential candidates and academicians agree that day care is an issue that needs to be addressed.

I would like to insert the article in the RECORD at this point, and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 8, 1988]

### CHILD CARE ISSUE EMERGES AS FOCUS OF LEGISLATIVE EFFORTS

(By Cindy Skrzycki and Frank Swoboda)

The growing number and influence of working mothers has given rise to a potent, family-centered political constituency that has catapulted child care support high up on the nation's legislative agenda.

"The issue is taking on a momentum that's making it virtually irresistible," said Jerry Klepner, legislative director of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees. "It's very possible to get a bill through the Congress and to the president this year."

Not since 1971, when President Richard Nixon vetoed a major child care initiative, has the issue received so much attention. Legislation is moving through Congress aimed at increasing the availability of public and private day care facilities. Although there are political differences about how to increase child care support, the goal is one of the few that Republican and Democratic lawmakers appear to agree on.

A major part of the new-found support for the issue comes from the demographic power of the baby boom generation. The issue of who will mind the children while mother is at work is one that has long vexed single parents and low-income working mothers. But the entry of middle-class working mothers who are as protective of their careers as of their families has given a new momentum to the issue.

Since the 1950s, the number of working women and preschool children has more than quadrupled. Today more than half of

all women with children younger than 6 are now in the work force and by the mid-1990s, two-thirds of all preschool age children are expected to have mothers who work outside the home.

"This has suddenly become the phenomenon that strikes at all economic levels," said Barbara Willer of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, who also believes that employers' concerns about future labor shortages are driving the new-found interest in day care.

Polls document that family issues are fast emerging as a critical domestic issue, with a poll by The Wall Street Journal and NBC news showing that 80 percent of so-called "new collar," or baby boom, workers think government should do more to improve child care and help working parents.

The issue is moving so fast that Labor Secretary Ann D. McLaughlin has set up a special task force to shape an administration position by early March. "Obviously we're on a fast track," a member of the task force said last week.

McLaughlin has broached the subject with both President Reagan and White House chief of staff Howard H. Baker Jr. "It's a percolating issue the administration is going to have to come to grips with," a McLaughlin aide said.

Perhaps the most startling development was the conversion of conservative Sen. Orrin G. Hatch (R-Utah) to the child care issue. Four years ago, Hatch was firmly on record against the federal government directly funding child care. Today, he is key congressional proponent of a national child care policy with a bill of his own. He still thinks children are better off if a parent stays at home, but child care now is his "number one legislative issue."

Observers note, however, that while there is growing momentum for action on the child care front, there is a lack of focus on how to proceed.

"My nose tells me there is a powerful interest in how we raise the next generation, but that does not translate neatly into compelling popular support for specific programs that are largely funded and defined by the federal government," said Ralph Whitehead, Jr., a professor at the University of Massachusetts who has studied baby boomers and work and family life.

There is a growing bipartisan agreement, however, that something needs to be done to increase the number of day care centers—now estimated at 63,000 licensed facilities nationwide. This is particularly true in the House where a package of labor bills ranging from mandated health insurance and parental leave to increasing the federal minimum wage are the only new items on the legislative agenda. Almost all other bills, such as trade, welfare reform and catastrophic health insurance issues, are now before House-Senate conferences.

Family work-place issues have become so pressing that virtually every political group has begun to address them.

House Democrats held a special retreat last month in which family issues, including child care, dominated the discussion. Many at the retreat said they saw so-called "kids issues" as a way to recapture the family issue from the Republicans after Reagan leaves office.

Democratic presidential candidate Albert Gore has gone so far as to promise to convert the White House basement into a child care center for the children of mothers and fathers who work at the executive mansion. "If I'm elected president, child care will



start close to home," the Tennessee Democrat said.

Last month, Republican presidential candidate Sen. Robert Dole (R-Kan.) introduced a child care bill that would replace the current child care tax credit with a program of federal grants to states.

Even among traditionally reluctant business groups, such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, the child care issue has been moved to the top of this year's legislative agenda. This week, the Chamber's board of directors will consider a recommendation for a limited federal approach to child care. Next week, the NAM will take up the issue at a meeting of its legislative leaders.

The issue involves two very different approaches and constituencies:

The Act for Better Child Care Services has become the basic Democratic bill. Sponsored by Sen. Christopher Dodd (D-Conn.) and Rep. Dale Kildee (D-Mich.), the primary focus of the proposal is affordable child care for low and moderate income families. Federal block grants would be used to provide an incentive for state matching funds. The bill would set federal standards for operating a child care center.

The Child Care Services Improvement Act is the Republican approach that is expected to appeal to business. Sponsored by Sen. Hatch and Rep. Nancy Johnson (R-Conn.), the bill uses a more modest block grant approach than the ABC bill, supplemented by tax credits for employers that establish on-site centers. It also limits the legal liability of child care center operators. Unlike the ABC bill, which targets lower income workers, the Hatch proposal has no income test. Johnson and Hatch plan to introduce a "fine-tuned" version of their proposal Feb. 22.

The Hatch bill deals with more traditional conservative concerns. "The differences between the two bills are pretty stark," Hatch said. "They [backers of the ABC bill] just seem to throw money at it from the top. They will create a huge social spending bureaucracy."

Hatch said, "there's a natural fear by conservatives that this is another big federal program injecting itself into family life."

Dodd rejects the Hatch approach as far as giving tax credits to business is concerned. "My bill is low income, that's where the real problem is. I'll be damned if it should go to people who can afford it already. There's a fundamental difference in the constituencies we're aiming at here," Dodd said.

Despite this tough rhetoric, there already were signs that both sides might be willing to compromise on a child care bill.

A Senate Labor Committee aide said that because of the slim Democratic majority in the Senate there could be no bill unless it accommodates Hatch. "The Hatch bill is a very interesting bill. He put a lot of thought into it," she said.

Hatch agrees there can be no bill without his approval. "There's no way child care will pass without conservative support," he said. "We will have to compromise on this and create a consensus. I intend to do that."

Another key to any eventual compromise will be the absence of any mandated government program.

Neither bill moves in that direction. Currently there is a variety of federal programs that for years have made child care part of an array of options authorized, but not required. The McLaughlin task force at the Department of Labor has identified dozens of programs ranging from the Job Corps to

Aid For Dependant Children that authorize some form of child care.

In addition to the exposure the issue is getting from many of the presidential candidates, organizations such as the Great American Family Tour are trying to generate grass roots pressure in key cities before the March 8 Super Tuesday primary elections. "The road to the White House has to go through family policy issues," said Kathy Bonk, spokeswoman for the tour.

The Family Tour is an effort by Rep. Patricia Schroeder (D-Colo.), Harvard University pediatrician T. Berry Brazelton and Gary Goldberg, producer of the television series "Family Ties" to push family issues during the presidential campaign through speeches, rallies and meetings with local and state officials.

Similarly, The Coalition of Labor Union Women, an AFL-CIO affiliate, will hold a rally on May 14 in Washington to push family policy and legislation.

The expectation of many in Congress and among advocacy groups is that business will play a growing role in meeting day care needs.

Currently, according to estimates by the Conference Board, a business research organization, only about 3,000 companies offer child care options to employees either through centers or through the administration of a federal tax subsidy program. Parents now can deduct a portion of their annual child care expenses. In addition, where a company has established a flexible benefits plan, employees can shelter some of their income for child care expenses.

"The private sector isn't responding creatively at all to a work force of parents instead of a work force of men and a few mothers who occasionally have problems," said Rep. Johnson.

Although business is against any kind of mandated benefits, such as proposed legislation for family and medical leave, its attitude is beginning to change toward accommodating employees with family needs, some analysts say. "I'm sensing that work and family concerns are becoming much more mainstream throughout the corporate culture," said Dana B. Friedman, senior research associate for the Conference Board. About 120 companies are expected to attend a Conference Board briefing this week on what the role of the corporation should be in the debate over child care.

A relatively small number of companies already are providing child care.

The answers on the child care dilemma are not easy for either government or business because almost every work site brings with it a different set of circumstances and solutions.

"It's still a female issue," said Oliver Mann, who operates a day care facility for the Campbell Soup Co. "Poor women always had the child problem. Until middle-class women got into the work place, this was never an issue. It's an equal opportunity issue."

#### OPINIONS ON CHILD CARE

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women
Q. Is it your impression that there are enough child-care facilities in this country to provide for current needs, or that there are not enough child-care facilities? <sup>1</sup>			
Enough.....	26		
Not enough.....	53		
No answer.....	21		

#### OPINIONS ON CHILD CARE—Continued

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women
Q. The government should develop policies to help make child-care services more available and affordable for these people. <sup>1</sup>			
Agree.....	71		
Disagree.....	23		
No answer.....	6		
Q. Should government do more to provide day care?			
Yes.....	54	51	56
No.....	43	48	39
Q. Should business provide day care? <sup>2</sup>			
Yes.....	51	46	56
No.....	39	46	34

<sup>1</sup> Washington Post/ABC News Poll, January 1987.

<sup>2</sup> Time Magazine, June 1987.

Source: American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees.

#### TRIBUTE TO M. GAULT BEESON, JR.

#### HON. ROBIN TALLON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen from my district, M. Gault Beeson, Jr. "Bunny" as he is called is a dedicated and committed steward of our land and wildlife.

Bunny Beeson is founder and president of Wildlife Action, Inc. In 1977, Bunny Beeson was on a hunting trip with friends along the Little Pee Dee River, they were concerned about the diminishing number of ducks in South Carolina. They talked about the responsibility of each individual to take care of the environment, its wildlife and our nature resources; they decided to form Wildlife Action.

Since its beginning, Wildlife Action has grown from a small group of concerned sportsmen into a diverse group of men and women who share a mutual concern for preserving the natural habitat of wildlife and protecting the environment. In 1986, Beeson decided to sell his sporting goods business and go to work full time for Wildlife Action as a volunteer.

Beeson's enthusiasm and concern are infectious, he has convinced countless others to join Wildlife Action and support the organization's five point law of preservation, conservation, education, sportsmanship and fellowship. I am especially interested in Wildlife Action's ongoing project to protect the Little Pee Dee River and have it be a part of South Carolina's Scenic Rivers Program.

Beeson's involvement in civic affairs is not new, nor is it limited to wildlife action. As a youth, he earned the Eagle Scout award and received the God and Country Award. He later served as a scoutmaster for 15 years. Beeson recognized the need for a sports facility in his hometown of Mullins and organized a group of citizens that ultimately planned and built the Mullins Recreational Complex.

He served for 8 years as chairman of the Marion County Fish and Game Commission, and he was a member of the Governor's Subcommittee for the Land Procurement and Utilization Committee and served as the S.C. Wildlife and Marine Resource Department's

panel for the Habitat Enhancement and Land Protection Act of 1986. He was also a member of the advisory board for the S.C. Wildlife and Marine Resource Department's "Project Wild" Program.

He was recognized by the Marion County Chapter of Wildlife Action as member of the year for 1984 and he received the Preservation Award in 1986 for spearheading a project to preserve acreage for a wildlife refuge in the county.

Beeson was also the recipient of the S.C. Governor's "Take Pride in America" Award in 1986 for his efforts to preserve acreage for a wildlife refuge in Marion County.

Mr. Speaker, we are very fortunate to have Bunny Beeson in South Carolina and the Sixth Congressional District. I applaud his efforts to preserve our land and wildlife for future generations to enjoy. We are grateful to Bunny Beeson and Wildlife Action for their unselfish and tireless work.

## WE NEED TO RENEW OUR COMMITMENT TO THE HOMELESS

**HON. MICKEY LELAND**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, we all know homelessness has not disappeared from our streets. The U.S. Conference of Mayors report, "The Continuing Growth of Hunger, Homelessness and Poverty in American Cities", revealed that the average demand for emergency shelter among the cities surveyed, grew 21 percent in 1987; and, that families with children are the fastest growing population among the homeless. Last year the waiting list for public housing reached 1 million and it is estimated that 12 million poor families are in need of help to pay their rent bills.

Over the past 2 years, we have made a conscious effort to aid homeless individuals. The provisions enacted by the omnibus drug bill and the Stewart B. McKinney Act addressed the immediate short-term needs of the homeless. In addition, last December the first housing bill since 1980 successfully passed both Houses of Congress. Unfortunately, the bill did not make up for the 71 percent cut in federally subsidized housing which has occurred over the past 8 years. There is a great need for us to reaffirm our commitment to help the homeless. Present action concerning this issue, however, must focus on providing permanent long-term assistance.

The Affordable Permanent Housing for the Homeless Act of 1988, which I and several of our colleagues are introducing today, would provide decent low-income housing for homeless individuals, families, and handicapped persons within 6 months to a year of the date of its enactment. In addition, the bill helps prevent homelessness by securing housing for individuals and families in imminent danger of losing their homes.

I urge you to lend your compassion and support to this piece of legislation which are vital to the survival of the Nation's neediest poor.

H.R. 2024

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

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Affordable Permanent Housing for the Homeless Act of 1988".

### SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) homelessness in the United States has reached alarming proportions and has become a national emergency;

(2) not since the Great Depression has homelessness in the United States reached the epidemic proportions that it has reached among major segments of the population;

(3) the homeless population of the United States is estimated to be 3,000,000, and, by all accounts, the number is increasing;

(4) in 1984, the Department of Housing and Urban Development estimated that the average annual increase in the homeless population is 10 percent;

(5) in 1985 and 1986, the United States Conference of Mayors conducted surveys that revealed that the homeless population increases annually by 20 to 25 percent;

(6) the homeless population includes growing numbers of families, single men and women, children, and teenagers;

(7) a significant majority of the homeless are mentally disabled and require specialized facilities and housing;

(8) the dimensions of the homelessness crisis have grown, both in numbers and in scope, beyond the capacity of State and local governments to handle it without Federal participation;

(9) it is in the national interest for the Federal Government to strengthen existing programs and to create new Federal, State, and local cooperative programs to meet the housing needs of the homeless population and to enact measures specifically designed to prevent additional homelessness; and

(10) housing assistance to the homeless should—

(A) seek to provide lasting solutions to the problem of the diminishing number of available affordable housing in the United States; and

(B) make the provision of permanent housing to the homeless a priority.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to alleviate homelessness by expanding and preserving the permanent supply of affordable and decent housing.

### SEC. 3. HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR THE HOMELESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, to the extent of amounts provided in appropriation Acts, provide financial assistance under the provisions of and amendments made by this Act to expand and maintain the permanent supply of affordable and decent housing.

(b) ELIGIBLE BENEFICIARIES.—All amounts made available under the provisions of and amendments made by this Act shall be used for the benefit of individuals and families who are homeless or are in imminent danger of becoming homeless.

### SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL SECTION 8 AND PUBLIC HOUSING ASSISTANCE.

Section 5(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(8) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE HOMELESS.—To provide affordable and decent housing for individuals and families who are homeless or are in imminent danger of be-

coming homeless, the budget authority available under this subsection is authorized to be increased on or after October 1, 1987, as follows:

"(A) SECTION 8 CERTIFICATES.—For assistance pursuant to 5-year contracts under section 8(b)(1), by not more than \$707,375,000, which amount shall be used as follows:

"(i) FAMILIES IN RENTAL REHABILITATION UNITS.—\$565,900,000 shall be for project-based assistance for very low-income families residing in structures assisted under section 17(c). Section 213(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 shall not apply to the allocation of assistance under this clause.

"(ii) FAMILIES IN IMMINENT DANGER OF BECOMING HOMELESS.—\$141,475,000 shall be for assistance for very low-income families in imminent danger of becoming homeless.

"(B) SECTION 8 MODERATE REHABILITATION.—For assistance pursuant to 10-year contracts under section 8(e)(2), by not more than \$480,000,000. Assistance under this subparagraph shall be used in accordance with section 441 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, except that not less than 33 percent of the assistance shall be used to assist handicapped homeless persons.

"(C) PUBLIC HOUSING ACQUISITION.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—For public housing grants under subsection (a)(2) for the acquisition of additional public housing dwelling units, by not more than \$300,000,000.

"(ii) PREFERENCE.—In making grants under this subparagraph, the Secretary shall give preference to public housing agencies proposing to acquire properties that—

"(I) are covered by a mortgage or loan insured under the National Housing Act or guaranteed under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code; and

"(II) are the subject of a foreclosure proceeding.

"(iii) ALLOCATION.—Section 213(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 shall not apply to the allocation of assistance under this subparagraph.

"(iv) RECAPTURE.—The Secretary shall recapture, and reallocate to other public housing agencies under this subparagraph, any assistance provided to a public housing agency under this subparagraph that is not used to acquire public housing dwelling units before the expiration of the 12-month period beginning on the date the assistance is provided. The Secretary may extend the 12-month period if the Secretary determines that the reason for the delay in the use of assistance is not within the control of the public housing agency."

### SEC. 5. RENTAL REHABILITATION GRANTS.

Section 17(a) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) RENTAL REHABILITATION GRANTS TO PREVENT HOMELESSNESS.—In addition to the amounts authorized in paragraph (4), there is authorized to be appropriated for rental rehabilitation under this section \$140,000,000 for fiscal year 1988. Amounts provided under this paragraph shall be available only for grants to rehabilitate vacant units to provide housing for homeless families and individuals and families and individuals in transitional housing (as defined in section 422(12)(A) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act). The owner of each assisted structure under this paragraph shall agree to give priority to the assisted units to homeless families with children and to maintain the assisted units as



housing available and affordable for very low-income families for not less than 10 years."

#### SEC. 6. ANNUAL REPORT.

Not later than December 31 of each year, the Secretary shall submit an annual report to the Congress. The report shall include—

(1) a comprehensive and detailed description of the activities carried out and accomplishments achieved under the provisions of and amendments made by this Act;

(2) an assessment of the extent and nature of the lack of affordable housing for homeless families with children;

(3) an assessment of the level of Federal assistance needed to fully meet the housing needs of homeless families; and

(4) any recommendations of the Secretary.

#### SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of the provisions of and amendments made by this Act:

(1) **HANDICAPPED.**—The term "handicapped" means an individual who is handicapped within the meaning of section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959.

(2) **HOMELESS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term "homeless" or "homeless individual" includes—

(i) an individual or family who lacks a fixed, regular, or adequate nighttime residence;

(ii) an individual or family who has a primary nighttime residence that is—

(I) a supervised publicly or privately operated shelter designed to provide temporary living accommodations (including welfare hotels, congregate shelters, and transitional housing for the mentally ill);

(II) an institution that provides a temporary residence for individuals intended to be institutionalized; or

(III) a public or private place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings; and

(iii) an individual or family who is sharing the primary nighttime residence of another individual or family (other than under a shared housing arrangement approved by the Secretary), and whose presence in the residence results in a failure of the residence to comply with space or occupancy standards established by the Secretary for the residence or for dwellings of similar size and design.

(B) **EXCEPTION.**—The term "homelessness" or "homeless individual" does not include any individual imprisoned or otherwise detained pursuant to an Act of Congress or a State law.

(3) **IMMINENT DANGER OF BECOMING HOMELESS.**—The term "imminent danger of becoming homeless" means subject to a notice of eviction.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(5) **VERY LOW-INCOME FAMILIES.**—The term "very low-income families" means families (including families consisting of a single person) whose incomes do not exceed 50 percent of the median family income for the area, as determined by the Secretary with adjustments for smaller and larger families.

#### SEC. 8. FUNDING AVAILABILITY.

(a) **CALCULATION.**—The amounts authorized in the provisions of and amendments made by this Act shall be in addition to any amount authorized or appropriated for the programs involved before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **AVAILABILITY UNTIL EXPENDED.**—Any amount appropriated under an authorization in the provisions of and amendments

made by this Act shall remain available until expended.

#### SEC. 9. REGULATIONS.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue any regulations that are necessary to carry out the provisions of and amendments made by this Act and reserve funds under such provisions and amendments.

### SOCIAL SECURITY ELIGIBILITY RECONCILIATION VERIFICATION AND INDEPENDENT STATUS ACT OF 1988

**HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, today I join with CLAUDE PEPPER in introducing the Social Security Eligibility Reconciliation Verification and Independent Status [SERVIS] Act of 1988. This legislation will provide the Social Security system with some new direction and effective management that will ensure its viability.

As we all know, it is extremely difficult for the elderly to get by on the fixed incomes provided by their Social Security benefits. Since the system was first introduced to Americans, it has been the only means of support for many after retirement. It has undergone many changes through the years and has been criticized by some because of the way it has been managed.

Recently, the General Accounting Office reported that management problems in the Social Security system has resulted in over \$58 billion in unallocated benefits to collect in the Social Security trust fund for which SSA is unable to immediately track the respective beneficiaries. These accumulated funds belong to people who have paid Social Security taxes on their earnings throughout their working lives and who have not been accurately credited for the benefits for which they are eligible.

Undercrediting workers' earnings means reduction in their benefits later on. Affected beneficiaries who have had their earnings undercredited face the loss of an average \$17 per month in benefits for which they are entitled. Some beneficiaries may be due as much as \$4,500 in retroactive payments.

The Social Security Administration is not even fully aware of how this problem has come about. SSA conjectures that most of the error is due to employer accounting errors in calculating employee earnings, or entering improper employee identification numbers, or failure of employers to submit any earnings figures at all for their employees' Social Security credit. The problem is due, in part, to the fact that SSA's reporting periods following an annual basis while IRS's reporting schedule follows a quarterly schedule.

Since IRS receives the most complete employee earnings record, SSA should be working with that agency to make sure that their earnings estimates are consistent with IRS. This is not taking place. It has even been determined that some SSA earnings reports had

been sent to IRS by mistake, set aside and forgotten, and were not detected for over a year.

Although some efforts have been made to get at this problem by SSA, little progress has been made. A General Accounting Office report, "More Must Be Done to Credit Earnings to Individuals' Accounts," indicates that the problem is not going to go away unless there is some direction provided. This bill that we are introducing today seeks to do just that.

Most people are unaware that they may be eligible for more monthly benefits than they are receiving. SERVIS will launch a public education campaign to make workers and beneficiaries aware of the earnings crediting problem. It will also help to clear up the backlog of cases in SSA regarding crediting reconciliation. And it will set up a coordinated system between SSA and IRS to avoid future crediting problems.

The second part of this legislation would enable any Member of Congress to raise a point of order against any bill which comes before the House or Senate which would reduce Social Security benefits. Social Security is a system built on confidence. It is a contract between the people and their Government. Political tinkering with the system only leads to a loss of faith in its viability for its participants. Neither the President nor Congress can arbitrarily reduce benefits in the name of deficit reduction and keep Social Security strong at the same time. We want to safeguard the system from the everchanging political tides which, from time to time, see Social Security as a target for deficit reduction. We will do this by making it more difficult for the Congress to reduce benefits.

And last, we are reiterating a position which we have taken in the past two Congresses that the Social Security Administration needs to be an independent agency. SSA, which is a giant agency on its own, should be taken out of the Department of Health and Human Services and given more power over its budgetary priorities. Much study has been given to this proposal since it was first formally brought before the Congress with the Social Security Amendments of 1983. It has since drawn widespread bipartisan support.

I hope all our colleagues can join in supporting this legislation. We owe it to our constituents to return to them the full benefits they have earned over a lifetime of contributions to the Social Security system. We want the system to work for everyone.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JOHN JETER HURT, JR.

**HON. LINDSAY THOMAS**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend a few moments today paying tribute to a man whose life had a profound affect on those around him—his family, his many friends, those he worked with, and his fellow members of the Southern Baptist Church.

The man I am speaking of is John Jeter Hurt, Jr. who passed away on February 17, 1988. While Mr. Hurt was never a resident of the First Congressional District and I was only fortunate enough to meet him on just a few occasions, I felt a marked loss with his passing and I know that a great many others also felt a similar loss. His many contributions to his community and his church and his deep commitment to his family and friends is the legacy that he leaves with us to remember him by in the years to come.

Mr. Hurt was born in Conway, AR, the eldest of five children. He graduated from Union University in Jackson, TN, and went on to serve as a reporter and editor for the Associated Press in Nashville, Chattanooga, Memphis, New York, and Atlanta.

Mr. Hurt then moved on to the staff of the Christian Index, the State newspaper of Southern Baptists in Georgia, where he edited the paper from 1947 to 1966. He made immediate changes upon arriving at the paper, cutting out sermons, reporting news, and appealing to "the person in the pew." During his tenure, circulation at the paper increased more than threefold and over the years, other State papers have followed his lead in reorganizing. Later, Mr. Hurt served as editor for the Baptist Standard, the newspaper of Texas Baptists, until retiring in 1977. While at the Standard, he continued his commitment to strong journalism—short, pithy, and to the point.

In addition to his work with the newspapers, Mr. Hurt was a former president of the Southern Baptist Press Association, a former trustee of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and Americans United for Separation of Church and State, and a deacon at Wilshire Baptist Church in Dallas, TX.

More important than Mr. Hurt's long list of important accomplishments and titles is the commitment and dedication that he had for the values and issues that were important to himself, his family and his church. He was willing to stand for the unpopular—challenging what he believed to be wrong and commending what he believed was right. He was not timid in expressing his opinions, whether it be to urge better race relations or voice support for foreign missions or to call for the separation of church and State.

Another passion was his quest for the truth. Mr. Hurt believed in openness for covering stories and was a strong contender for editorial freedom. He demanded efficiency from his staff and would not tolerate anything that was not open and above board. This loyalty and integrity in his professional career carried through in his personal life as well.

He was often referred to as the crusty crusader, a man who demanded the highest of standards and would accept nothing less, but who had a soft spot inside for those in need and a heart that would reach out to anyone. This is a man who had the respect of his colleagues and the love of the family and friends around him.

In closing, I would like to note that Mr. Hurt is the father of my administrative assistant, Bob Hurt. Bob upholds the fine Hurt tradition of integrity, honesty, and diligence, and the First Congressional District of Georgia is indeed fortunate to have had the service of

Bob these past 15 years—10 years with my predecessor, the Honorable Bo Ginn, and with my office for the past 5 years. I know that Bob's family is feeling a great loss right now, but the memories and the accomplishments of John Jeter Hurt, Jr. will stand in time as a tribute to him and help to ease the pain of this loss. My heartfelt sympathies are extended to Bob and his mother, Mrs. Doris Oglesby Hurt, and the rest of the family. While the loss is great, those memories that linger behind are sweet and will help sustain us.

#### KILDEE HONORS KENNETH J. SMITHEE

#### HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a person who has dedicated much of his life to improve the quality of life for the people of Michigan, Mr. Kenneth J. Smithee. For the past 21 years, Mr. Smithee has served as the director of the Genesee County Parks and Recreation Commission. In this capacity, Mr. Smithee has worked diligently to preserve and expand the public park system in our community. As a result of his efforts, the citizens of Michigan can better enjoy the natural resources our State has to offer.

Mr. Smithee is widely recognized as an expert in park management and administration. Throughout his career, he has been very active in a number of professional organizations where he has shared his experiences with his colleagues so they can improve their community parks and recreation areas. Mr. Smithee has also spent many years in the classroom where he taught park administration courses at Central Michigan University and Michigan State University. In recent years, he has served as the president of the American Academy for Park Administration, and as president of the board of trustees of the National Recreation and Park Association. Mr. Smithee has also received numerous awards from State and national organizations, including the National Association of County Parks and Recreation Officials, and the Michigan Recreation and Park Association.

It is with great reluctance that we bid farewell to Ken Smithee. However, we in Genesee County consider ourselves extremely fortunate to have benefited from the services of such a highly qualified, and deeply committed individual like Ken Smithee. I take comfort in knowing that Mr. Smithee will continue to share his wealth of knowledge and experience with future park managers when he resumes his teaching career at Arizona State University.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Genesee County, and indeed the State of Michigan, are extremely grateful to Mr. Smithee for all he has done to preserve and improve the quality of life for our children, and our children's children. As Mr. Smithee embarks on a new facet of his life, I want to congratulate him on a job well done, and wish him and his family well in their future in Arizona.

#### WESTHEAD'S LOYOLA SCORES LIKE LAKERS, SOARS ABOVE USC, UCLA

#### HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate one of the finest college basketball teams in the Nation this season, the Loyola Marymount Lions. The Lions are currently ranked No. 20 nationally by both the UPI and the AP polls and are defending a 17-game winning streak.

I am especially proud of the Lions because Loyola Marymount University is my alma mater. California is home to a number of the most respected teams in college basketball. In the past Loyola Marymount's athletic achievements have often been overshadowed by the achievements of these larger California schools. But this season Loyola Marymount's 20 and 3 record is the envy of every college basketball team in the State.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Coach Paul Westhead and his Lions for their fast-paced successes on the basketball courts this season. They are helping to bring to Loyola Marymount the attention and recognition that the university has deserved for so long. In honor of their achievements, I ask that an article about the team that appeared recently in the Washington Post be reprinted here in the RECORD.

The text of the article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 17, 1988]

WESTHEAD'S LOYOLA SCORES LIKE LAKERS, SOARS ABOVE USC, UCLA

(By Matt Lait)

LOS ANGELES.—Life at little Loyola Marymount University, perched on a hillside overlooking the lazy harbor of Marina Del Rey, proceeds with the tanned, relaxed nonchalance of other California campuses, until a visitor looks inside Albert Gersten Pavilion and encounters a scene of electric mayhem.

At a school of only 3,500 students, Paul Westhead, who once coached the Los Angeles Lakers to an NBA championship, has fashioned a basketball team averaging more than 108 points a game and signaling a rise in the West of small powers in the ruins of the larger Pacific-10 basketball schools.

Not long ago, the only people who showed up for a Loyola game were parents, girlfriends and the opponent's fans. But, lately, with the Lions leading the nation in points per game, basketball enthusiasts from around the city have waited in ticket lines hoping for a chance to see the team perform its blitz of fast breaks and slam dunks as it defends a 17-game winning streak. At 20-3, Loyola Marymount is one of the few Division I teams already to have 20 victories—and, for the first time ever, has made the wire service ratings, at No. 20 in both AP and UPI polls.

Under Westhead, the program has attracted national attention for its quick-paced, high-scoring style. It is the only style Westhead, a native of Philadelphia, will coach.

It is what made two former Philadelphia starters at the University of Southern Cal-



fornia, Bo Kimble and Hank Gathers, defect to Loyola.

"This is the kind of game I grew up on," Kimble said. "It's like a playground game. To me, it's the only way to play the game."

The two freshmen from Southern Cal looked for another home court after a dispute with incoming USC Coach George Raveling, putting their scholarships in jeopardy. The refugees from USC were soon joined by another Pac-10 starter, Corey Gaines from UCLA.

Faced with talented recruits who threatened to cut into his playing time, Gaines decided to transfer to a school where he could play out his senior year in a program that fit his running style, even if it meant sitting out a year and paying the private school tuition.

"Everybody can see that this is not as big a name school [as UCLA] but nowadays the small schools are doing well because the players are starting to see that it's not where you go but what you do where you go that counts," Gaines said.

"If Coach Westhead was here at the time I came out [of high school] I probably would have gone here, knowing what I know now."

With these three transfers in the starting lineup, Loyola has not lost.

Meanwhile, as this athletically unheralded school basks in Los Angeles' center court, UCLA and USC, the city's larger, more dominant schools, are having dismal seasons, leading many people to say the West Coast is a barren basketball wasteland.

"Unfortunately, the national image of basketball here is poor because two or three of the big hitters are down, but there's a whole bunch of us who are doing real well like [UC] Santa Barbara, [UC] Irvine, and in the past Fresno State. California is a big state," Westhead said.

"I think it speaks not of the weakness of the bigger schools but of strength and power of basketball on the West Coast," he said.

So far, in the West Coast Athletic Conference, Loyola has been unbeatable. The Lions press almost every inbounds play and take defensive chances by overplaying for a steal. On offense they quickly pass the ball upcourt and try to shoot within the first six or seven seconds of a possession.

In the normally moderate-scoring conference, with coaches known for emphasis on defense, Loyola has allowed opponents to score 92 points a game and shoot 52 percent. But the tiring pace eventually wears the opponent down and Loyola has been winning by an average margin of 16.5 points a game.

"We try to get steals, so of course we take gambles and risks on defense and they get a few easy buckets, but they pay for it in the long run by staying with our pace," Gaines said.

Asked how his team would fare against the nationally higher-rated teams, Westhead said, "We'd score in the hundreds and they'd be tired. Whether we would win or not, who knows? But those two things are guaranteed."

In his third year at Loyola, Westhead finds the lure of coaching in the NBA not as important as it once was. "Happiness is when your scheme is working and the players have bought into it," he said.

"Coaches are in it for the thrill of the game . . . so whether you're sitting at the beach because you're an NBA coach waiting for the next game or you're in a high school gym recruiting before the next game, that become irrelevant.

"This team has good quality and excellent commitment to the scheme. They really believe that this running system is invincible," he said.

Indeed, the players and students of Loyola Marymount walk around campus with the proud conviction that "the system" is unbeatable.

"I definitely think we are one of the best teams of the West Coast, if not in the nation," Gathers said. "I think we can run with anybody."

Westhead realizes he has critics who, despite his current success, say his system is too one-dimensional because it does not prepare the team for other game situations. He agrees.

"It's true, it only works if you buy the whole system," he said. "Without buying in like that, it becomes very mediocre." But as long as his players buy it, he's sold that it's the best system around.

"I decided," Westhead said, "not to follow the advice of Ben Franklin, another Philadelphian, who said, 'Don't put all thy eggs in one basket.' Instead, I'm following the advice of Mark Twain, who said, 'Put all your eggs in one basket and watch that basket.'"

#### H.R. 4033—MEDICAID WORKING POOR FAMILY AMENDMENTS OF 1988

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Medicaid Working Poor Family Amendments of 1988, H.R. 4033. I am joined in sponsoring this bill by Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LELAND, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. DOWDY of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment; by Chairman DOWNEY, Mr. FORD, Mr. PEASE, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. DONNELLY of the Public Assistance Subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means; and by Representative MILLER, chairman of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families.

This legislation would provide Medicaid and other health care coverage to working poor families for 24 months after they leave welfare. The purpose is twofold: (1) to reduce the number of poor mothers and children who have no public or private health insurance coverage; and (2) to assist low-income families in making the transition from welfare dependency to economic self-sufficiency by assuring mothers that they and their children will have health care coverage even if they take a low-wage job that does not offer health benefits. According to the Congressional Budget Office, about 475,000 families, including about 950,000 children, would receive coverage under this bill.

Except for a new effective date, this bill is identical to the legislation twice approved by the Energy and Commerce Committee last July, first as an amendment to the Family Welfare Reform Act, H.R. 1720, and again last August as an element of the budget reconciliation legislation. This legislation was not included in the text of the welfare reform bill, H.R. 1720, approved by the House on Decem-

ber 17; instead, it was among the provisions in the budget reconciliation bill passed by the House on October 29. Unfortunately, due to an Administration veto threat, the provision was dropped from the final conference agreement on the budget reconciliation act, Public Law 100-203. Although funds for this purpose were assumed in the fiscal year 1988 budget resolution, we are now into a new budget cycle, and reintroduction of this bill is in order.

Under current law, families receiving cash assistance under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children [AFDC] Program are automatically eligible for Medicaid. If the mother works and her income exceeds the payment standard established by the State, she loses her AFDC eligibility. Generally, she and her children are entitled to an additional 4 months of Medicaid coverage, although in some limited circumstances the family may qualify for a minimum of 9 months of coverage.

Obviously, current policy creates a very strong disincentive for welfare recipients to work. If a mother knows that her children will need medical care and that her employer does not offer health insurance coverage, she will think long and hard before taking a low-paying job that will knock her off AFDC and, after 4 months, Medicaid. CBO gives the example of a mother with one child whose countable income is \$4200, and who lives in a State with an AFDC payment level of \$4800. If this mother works longer hours and increases her income by \$50 per month, she will eventually lose \$50 per month in cash assistance, plus her Medicaid benefits worth \$150 per month. Thus, a \$50 increase in earnings has cost this family \$200, an implicit "tax rate" of 400 percent.

There is no justification for forcing women to choose between taking a job and having health care coverage for their children. Many of the families leaving AFDC go to work in minimum wage or near-minimum wage jobs that do not offer health insurance coverage. After four months, these women—and their children—are stranded. Even if they could afford to buy health coverage, their employer doesn't offer it. The only way they can be assured of health coverage is to quit, reapply for AFDC, and, by receiving cash assistance, qualify for Medicaid again.

Current law also jeopardizes the health of working poor mothers and their children by leaving them uninsured. The new Office of Technology Assessment report "Healthy Children: Investing in the Future," documents the importance of Medicaid and other health insurance coverage in enabling poor children to get access to the basic medical care they need to stay healthy. According to the Children's Defense Fund, between 1982 and 1985, the number of uninsured children grew by 16 percent, from 9.6 million to more than 11 million. Two-thirds of these children live in working families. A small but significant segment of these families were at one point on AFDC but lost their Medicaid benefits shortly after taking a low-paying job without health coverage. It is this portion of the uninsured population that this bill targets.

I would stress that this bill will work whether or not the Aid to Families with Dependent Children [AFDC] Program is modified by pend-

ing welfare reform legislation. Obviously, transitional Medicaid coverage is an essential element to any welfare reform strategy to make families economically self-sufficient. However, families are now leaving AFDC to work at low-paying jobs, and many of them do not get health insurance coverage to replace their Medicaid benefits. We can't allow this disinsurance of low-income families to continue.

It is also worth emphasizing that, under this bill, continuation Medicaid coverage is available only as long as the mother or other caretaker continues to work and report earnings. Unless she is laid off or sick, she will have to continue to report earnings, or the coverage will lapse. This obviously creates a strong incentive for families to remain economically self-sufficient.

According to the preliminary CBO estimates, the cost of extending health coverage to 475,000 working poor families under this bill will be \$40 million in Federal Medicaid outlays in fiscal year 1989, \$175 million in fiscal year 1990, and \$240 million in fiscal year 1991. This investment is among the most effective that the Federal Government can make. It will encourage economic self-sufficiency and reduce medical poverty among working poor families. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

**SUMMARY OF MEDICAID WORKING POOR FAMILY AMENDMENTS OF 1988**

The bill has two basic elements. It would require States to extend, for 24 months, Medicaid or alternate health care coverage to families who lose cash assistance under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children [AFDC]—Program due to earnings and who continue to work. States would also be required to extend, for 6 months, Medicaid coverage to families who lose AFDC benefits due to collection of child or spousal support. The bill would be effective with respect to individuals losing AFDC due to earnings or child or spousal support on or after October 1, 1988 (in the case of Texas, with a 2-year appropriations cycle, October 1, 1989). The mechanics of the 24-month coverage for families who lose AFDC due to earnings are as follows.

**Initial 6-month Extension.**—During the first 6 months after losing cash assistance because of earnings, families would have to be offered the same Medicaid benefits to which they were entitled while receiving cash assistance. States could not impose premiums. This coverage would terminate if the family no longer had a dependent child, or if an individual was terminated from cash assistance due to fraud. If the family earner worked for an employer that offered health insurance coverage, States could, at their option, pay the family's expenses for premiums, deductibles, and other cost-sharing to enroll them in the employer's plan; the State would then pay, through Medicaid, the cost of services that the employer plan does not cover.

**Subsequent 18-month Continuation.**—During the subsequent 18-month continuation period, families who received coverage during the initial 6-month extension, and who continue to work and have earnings, would have to be offered continuation coverage. At a minimum, States would have to offer these families Medicaid coverage, although they could delete nursing home and other long-term care

services and limit the Medicaid benefit package to acute care services. In addition, States could, at their option, offer these families the choice between basic Medicaid coverage and one or more alternative types of coverage. Finally, States could, at their option, require payment of a monthly premium for such coverage.

States would have the option of offering as many as four different types of alternative coverage in addition to the basic Medicaid benefit package. These coverage alternatives are: First, enrollment in the family's employer's plan; second, enrollment in the State's employee's group health plan; third, enrollment in any basic health care plan a State has established for uninsured individuals generally; or fourth, enrollment in a Health Maintenance Organization that does not otherwise contract with Medicaid. The State would pay any premium required for such alternate coverage; the family would be responsible for all deductibles and copayments, except for maternity care services or ambulatory pediatric care for young children. If a State chose to impose an income-related premium on the family during this period, it could vary the amount of the premium by coverage alternative. One month each year, States would have to offer families the choice of enrolling in another coverage option.

The income-related premium which a State could impose during this period could not exceed 10 percent of the amount by which the family's gross monthly earnings (less child care costs) exceed the amount an individual would earn by working full-time at a minimum wage job (\$581 per month). Premiums would be collected monthly; premium amounts would be adjusted based on quarterly earnings reports.

During this 18-month period, coverage would be terminated for any of the following reasons: First, the family no longer has a dependent child; second, the family fails to pay any required monthly premium; third, the family fails to report earnings in a month and the family earner has not been laid off or ill; fourth, the family's gross monthly income (less child care) exceeds 185 percent of the Federal poverty guidelines (\$1,433 per month for a mother and two children) or fifth, the family earner has terminated from cash assistance for fraud or was subject to sanction. In the case of reporting failures, States would have the option to reinstate coverage if a family reports late.

**TRAGIC SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST**

**HON. MARCY KAPTUR**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the recent rioting and unrest in the Israeli-occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza has prompted a worldwide sense of urgency for an alternative to the violence which has seized Palestinians and Israelis alike these past several weeks. Palestinian aspirations for human rights are passionate and understandable.

Democratic freedoms must ultimately be theirs. Yet we also know that this occupation is a product of a war directed at the destruction of Israel. The State of Israel has the right to exist as well. Yet rioting and violent demonstrations that have claimed the lives of so many, and left so many others seriously wounded, have yielded no permanent solution to this tragic situation.

As a nation, the United States must act in its foreign policy in a way that honors our long-held democratic principles—that is, all people have a right to own property, to be safe in their homes, to raise families without fear, to practice full citizenship with the right to vote and to express their opinions freely, and to have their human rights upheld by the laws and courts of the Nation. If you read the U.S. Constitution and our Bill of Rights, it is to these principles that the United States is devoted at home. We must also practice them abroad in the exercise of our foreign policy.

I represent a district in which Jews, Christians, and Muslims live together. All are equally appalled by the violence and unrest afflicting the peoples of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. They realize only too well that there are no victors when peaceful negotiations give way to violent demonstrations and reprisals. Recently, Mr. Speaker, I received letters from several teenage young men and women in my district addressed to President Reagan regarding the tragic situation in the Middle East. I would like to take this opportunity to read one of them. Together, they express so eloquently the hopes and fears which are harbored by all men and women, young and old alike, committed to peace and respect for the human rights which are fundamental and inalienable to all citizens of the world.

DEAR MR. REAGAN: I am a 15 year old girl. The reason I am writing this letter is because of the situation in Palestine. I think we should be trying to stop this and compromise for a solution. Something has got to be done about this, and soon! Please, Mr. Reagan, help solve this problem before it's too late! We need your help to live a happier and safer life!

Mr. Speaker, I ask President Reagan to employ the full powers of his office in assisting the Palestinian and Israeli people to negotiate a peaceful settlement. While it must be kept in mind that any sense of expectation must be tempered by the realization that if there were an easy solution it would have been seized years ago, I urge my colleagues today, Mr. Speaker, to join me in extending our deepest encouragement to Secretary Shultz as he embarks on his important mission for peace and human rights for all people of that region.

**TARGHEE NATIONAL FOREST LAND EXCHANGE ACT**

**HON. RICHARD H. STALLINGS**

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce today the Targhee National Forest Land Exchange Act. This leg-



isolation will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain lands in the Targhee National Forest. I am very pleased that my distinguished colleague from Wyoming [Mr. CHENEY], is a cosponsor of this important bill.

Recently, I unveiled a plan to help safeguard several areas along the South Fork of the Snake River in Idaho. At the same time, the legislation will give the Grand Targhee Resort an opportunity to acquire additional land expansion and development.

My proposal not only will protect a critical reach of the river from development and ensure its protection for the enjoyment of future generations, but it also will help the economy of many communities in the Upper Snake River Valley.

The plan calls for a major land exchange between the Targhee National Forest and the Grand Targhee Resort, which is located 9 miles east of Driggs, ID, just inside the Wyoming border. The proposal would give the Forest Service an opportunity to seek public ownership of several key parcels of private land adjacent to the Targhee National Forest.

Before I discuss the land exchange proposal and its importance to the people of Idaho, I want to emphasize to my colleagues the broad, bipartisan support this idea enjoys.

Under the proposal, the owner of the Grand Targhee Resort, Mory Bergmeyer, would attempt to purchase several tracts of private property. He then would trade these private parcels to the Forest Service for approximately 270 acres of public land at the base of ski resort.

It is important to emphasize that my legislation does not mandate public or private purchase of any piece of property. I want to make it very clear that my plan is strictly based on a willing seller/willing buyer concept.

Furthermore, it will be the responsibility of the Forest Service to identify those private properties for possible exchange. According to Forest Service officials, only critical fish and wildlife habitat will be considered for the land exchange. Negotiate the purchase price from private landowners.

And it will be up to Grand Targhee officials to negotiate the purchase price with private landowners. I do not plan to play an active role in these negotiations. My principal concern will be to help ensure that this legislation passes and is signed into law.

It also is very important to mention that this proposal was not developed in a vacuum. In putting together the plan, I personally met with local county leaders, private landowners, Grand Targhee Resort officials, the Forest Service, and others to discuss the land exchange concept.

This legislation is necessary because current law prohibits the Forest Service from exchanging lands in different States. The privately owned land is in Idaho and the Forest Service property is in Wyoming. The Targhee National Forest is located in both States.

The South Fork of the Snake River has been identified as one of the most unique and valuable ecosystems in Idaho. Acquisition of these properties will allow land management agencies to preserve fish and wildlife, scenic qualities, and public use of the canyon.

Potential recreational and residential development along the river poses a serious threat to existing resource values. Over the past year, I have heard from many Idahoans who have expressed strong support for public acquisition of certain private properties to protect this magnificent river canyon corridor.

This pristine river is truly one of Idaho's priceless natural resources. The South Fork contains some of the State's most significant wildlife habitat and prime recreational fisheries. I sincerely believe the South Fork is more valuable to Idaho, both as an economic and natural resource, in its undeveloped and natural state.

In addition to protecting the South Fork and its many resource values, economic development is a major cornerstone of my land exchange proposal. As Idaho continues its economic struggle with our natural resource industries, recreation and tourism are becoming a vital, growing part of our economy.

There is a real need to help revitalize both the Teton Basin and Upper Snake River Valley economy. I believe Grand Targhee, under its new ownership, can play a major role in this economic development. The resort also offers many Idahoans with an important employment opportunity.

Grand Targhee Resort officials have advised me they want to develop a quality, year-round destination resort for skiers and others who are looking for a family-style experience. I strongly support their efforts. And so do many other community and business leaders throughout Idaho.

The Grand Targhee Resort is vital to the economy of the Teton Basin. According to Grand Targhee officials and regional economic development specialists, the economic impact of the resort on eastern Idaho is very significant. This proposed land exchange has important economic implications for the entire region.

I also recognize the difficult challenges facing our local county officials as they struggle to find adequate resources to provide a variety of needed public services. My proposal, however, would have little impact on the county tax bases. Most of the private land is currently taxed as wasteland or farmland and generates very little revenue.

The completion of this land exchange will result in a needed economic shot-in-the-arm to the Teton Basin and Upper Snake River Valley. Development of the Grand Targhee Resort and protection of the South Fork of the Snake River could attract thousands of visitors each year to eastern Idaho and help stimulate the economy of many Idaho communities.

This land exchange proposal truly offers eastern Idaho a unique opportunity to resolve a longstanding dispute over the future of the South Fork of the Snake River. At the same time, we can take advantage of a sensible economic development plan which will benefit many Idaho communities. I sincerely believe my proposal represents the best of both worlds.

## NATIONAL TRIO DAY

### HON. JOSEPH E. BRENNAN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. BRENNAN. Mr. Speaker, February 27 will mark the third observance of "National Trio Day." Congress established this observance to bring attention to the federally supported programs which assure equal opportunity to postsecondary education for young students and adults.

Trio programs—formally called special programs for students from disadvantaged backgrounds include: Upward Bound, Talent Search, and Student Support Services Programs.

In honor of this occasion, I am pleased to express my strong support for my home State of Maine's Trio programs and their commitment to assist the disadvantaged young students and adults. Trio programs provide information to students about college, motivate them to attend college, and help them succeed in college.

Maine's Trio programs served over 3,000 students throughout the State last year. Last year, over 350 high school students were served by Upward Bound. This project targets disadvantaged, low-income students to help them gain the skills and motivation to pursue an educational program beyond high school. Currently, four Upward Bound programs operate in the State of Maine at the University of Maine at Farmington, Bowdoin College, the University of Maine at Orono, and the University of Maine at Presque Isle.

In addition, 1,100 students were served by the Talent Search Program at the University of Maine at Orono. Talent Search encourages youth with postsecondary potential to complete high school and enter college. It also assists adults who have dropped out return to the educational system.

A third program, the Student Support Services Program serves over 1,800 students at programs based on campus at the University of Maine at Augusta, Unity College, Husson College, the University of Maine at Farmington, the University of Maine at Orono, the University of Maine at Presque Isle and the University of Maine at Fort Kent. These programs give students academic support once they are enrolled at the institution. Some of the available services include: Academic counseling, tutorial services, and career counseling.

I congratulate all of the people in Maine who are responsible for making these programs successful. These programs deserve our full support. They have proven to be extremely cost effective. The average cost per Trio participant is \$125 and the overall Trio dropout rate is less than 1 percent. Students from the same background who do not have the benefit of these programs, are twice as likely to drop out of college. The college placement rate for students from Maine participating in Trio programs is 81 percent which is higher than the national average.

We must not cut these projects. If we do, I believe that it will only exacerbate the present trend of declining enrollment of poor and mi-

nority students in postsecondary education. The best avenue for a brighter future is a good education. The Trio programs greatly assist in insuring that educational opportunities are available to needy students. I urge my colleagues to join me in extending strong support for Trio programs on this third observance of National Trio Day.

# STATE DEPARTMENT HUMAN RIGHTS REPORT FOCUSES ON NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the bipartisan 118 member ad hoc congressional committee for Irish affairs I wish to place into the RECORD the portion of the report "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1987." That deals with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

I consider the 1987 version of this report dealing with Northern Ireland to be unnecessarily tepid in its discussion of some very serious and ongoing human rights problems that exist in the six northeast counties of Ireland. What is especially of concern to me is the lack of critical editorial comments on the part of the report to some of these practices. In fact there are probably more instances of almost blind support of the British position than anything else.

One example is the section that deals with the use of plastic bullets by security forces in Northern Ireland. The report reads as follows:

Security forces in Northern Ireland continue the controversial use of plastic rounds—PBR's or plastic bullets—for riot control. In recent years, 16 people have been killed by PBR's over half of them under 16 years of age.

In 1984, the European Parliament passed a resolution calling for a ban on PBR use in Northern Ireland. While acknowledging the danger of PBR's the British Government contends they are less dangerous than live rounds. This view was supported in October 1984, when the European Commission on Human rights dismissed as "manifestly ill-founded" a case involving PBR's ruling that their use was "acceptable" and "less dangerous than alleged."

There is no reference made to legislation that has been introduced since 1984 in the Congress calling for a ban on the use of plastic bullets. There is no discussion about one of the individuals killed by plastic bullets, an unarmed civilian named Sean Downes who was killed in the presence of scores of visiting Americans during a rally in 1986. The question is why?

Similarly this report soft pedals one of the most controversial of all human rights issues in Northern Ireland today—the investigation as to whether the same security force—the Royal Ulster Constabulary practiced a shoot to kill policy against certain civilians in the communities of Northern Ireland. As I have reported in past statements this investigation was initially headed by a Manchester England police official, John Stalker. At about the same time as

his preliminary probe was beginning to show results of culpability, he was removed from the investigation because of a later unproved allegation involving an internal matter within his own police department. Within the last month the Attorney General of Great Britain announced that there would be no further prosecutions of RUC officials with respect to this policy. This evoked an international hue and cry and just today the RUC itself announced that it would conduct its own disciplinary proceedings against certain of its officers alleged to be involved with this policy.

What is the extent of discussion in the State Department report? It is almost as much of a whitewash as the British Government's probe itself:

A number of fatal shootings beginning in 1982 involving members of the RUC and the Army gave rise to allegations including those in Amnesty International's 1987 report that the security forces in Northern Ireland practiced a "shoot to kill" policy when dealing with suspected terrorists. Investigation of these charges resulted in a report, not yet made public by West Yorkshire Chief Constable Colin Sampson to the Director of Public Prosecution for consideration and possible judicial action. The long delay in completing action on the report has stimulated demands for an independent judicial inquiry as well as allegations of a coverup by senior police officers.

Period; end of comment. This in a report concerned with human rights?

The section goes on and on in its perfunctory treatment of human rights problems in Northern Ireland. It glosses over issues pertaining to economic discrimination—which is not only an established fact in Northern Ireland but has prompted the introduction of legislation by Mr. FISH and Senator D'AMATO calling on American firms doing business in Northern Ireland to adopt the Mac Bride principles of fair employment and nondiscrimination. Do you think this report makes even one reference to the Mac Bride principles? Of course not.

In reality, this report makes a mockery of the idea that ours is a consistent and aggressive human rights oriented foreign policy. For this policy to achieve the objectives of its founder and architect, former President Jimmy Carter, there must be consistency in our approach whether a country is a friend or foe. We cannot have selective morality in the enforcement of our human rights policy. We cannot be excuse makers for countries where violations exist. The State Department has displayed a disturbing degree of timidity in dealing with the United Kingdom and their obvious problems with respect to human rights in 1987. This type of timidity cannot and will not lead to positive change, rather an extension of the status quo.

The report follows:

## UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

The United Kingdom (U.K.) is a constitutional monarchy, with government based on a multiparty, parliamentary democracy. As there is no written constitution, human rights are "residual," i.e., assumed unless limited by statute. Human rights traditionally have been respected and guarded by the British people and their elected governments. The U.K. is a party to the European

Convention on Human Rights and has accepted the jurisdiction of the European Court of Human Rights over cases of alleged human rights violations.

The United Kingdom has a highly developed industrial economy. Persons may own property and pursue their economic interests, and the population benefits from a comprehensive social welfare program. British law bars discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, or political opinion.

Although the United Kingdom has a long tradition of respect for human rights, terrorist activity and sectarian violence in and related to Northern Ireland has, from time to time, put that tradition to the test. Accordingly, while public safety in Great Britain is maintained by a civilian police force, army units back up armed elements of the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC) in Northern Ireland.

On November 15, 1985, the British and Irish Governments concluded the Anglo-Irish Agreement. The Agreement affirms that the status of Northern Ireland will remain unchanged unless a majority in the North decide otherwise and provides for an Intergovernmental Conference in which the Irish Government can advance its views on some aspects of Northern Ireland and North/South affairs. The Agreement also envisages that the Conference will enhance cooperation between the security forces of Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic.

Although intended to safeguard the rights and identities of both communities in Northern Ireland, the Agreement has met with opposition, and paramilitary groups on both sides have continued their campaigns of violence. Reacting against the agreement, Unionist members of Parliament withdrew from the House of Commons. Other Unionists turned to strikes, boycotts, and suspension of work in local councils and the Northern Ireland Assembly. In July 1986, the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland halted all work before the end of the Assembly's session. No new elections have been scheduled. Following the 1987 parliamentary elections, Unionist politicians dropped their boycott of the House of Commons, and Unionist leaders entered into talks with government officials.

## RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

Section 1.—Respect for the integrity of the person, including freedom from:

### a. Political killing

The British Government does not practice or condone killing for political motives.

The Government reported that, during the first 9 months of 1987, 63 persons were killed by terrorists in incidents related to Northern Ireland. Twenty-five were members of the security forces. In May 1987, security forces killed eight armed members of the Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA) who were attacking a police station in Loughgall. A civilian was accidentally killed in this battle, making a total of nine people killed by the security forces in 1987. Since 1969, 2,597 persons have died in violence related to Northern Ireland.

Security forces in Northern Ireland continue the controversial use of plastic baton rounds (PBR's or plastic bullets) for riot control. In recent years, 16 people have been killed by PBR's—over half of them under 16 years of age. Only two have been killed since 1982 and no one in 1987.

In 1984 the European Parliament passed a resolution calling for a ban on PBR use in Northern Ireland. While acknowledging the danger of PBR's, the British Government



contends they are less dangerous than live rounds. This view was supported in October 1984 when the European Commission on Human Rights dismissed as "manifestly ill-founded" a case involving PBR's, ruling that their use was "acceptable" and "less dangerous than alleged."

A number of fatal shootings beginning in 1982 involving members of the RUC and the army gave rise to allegations including those in the Amnesty International's 1987 Report, that the security forces in Northern Ireland practiced a "shoot-to-kill" policy when dealing with suspected terrorists. Investigation of these charges resulted in a report, not yet made public, by West Yorkshire Chief Constable Colin Sampson to the Director of Public Prosecution for consideration and possible judicial action. The long delay in completing action on the report has stimulated demands for an independent judicial inquiry, as well as allegations of a coverup by senior police officers.

In April 1987, the Government announced a decision to draft, publish, and bring into force a code of practice for the exercise of emergency powers by the RUC and armed forces in Northern Ireland. The code, expected to be published soon, will address the emergency powers available to the RUC and the armed forces and how they should be exercised.

#### *b. Disappearance*

Government authorities do not abduct, secretly arrest, or hold persons in clandestine confinement, nor do they sponsor or condone such activities.

The Government reported that during 1987 over 50 persons were abducted or illegally held hostage in terrorist and other incidents related to Northern Ireland.

#### *c. Torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment*

British law forbids torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment of prisoners and provides penalties for such abuse. Confessions obtained by such methods are not admissible as evidence in court.

Government policy seeks to prevent abuse of prisoners. In January 1986, the Government put into effect a new Code of Practice for the police in Great Britain, with provisions for disciplinary action.

The Police (Northern Ireland) Order of 1987, which was approved by Parliament in May 1987, provides for reform of police complaints procedures in Northern Ireland broadly in line with changes which were introduced in England and Wales in 1985. The new procedures are expected to go into effect in 1988 with the establishment of the Independent Commission for Police Complaints. The new commission will have powers to approve officers, including those drawn from other police forces in the United Kingdom, to investigate complaints. In 1987 there were no substantial charges of mistreatment of arrestees during interrogation in Northern Ireland.

The Government acknowledges that some old British prisons are unsatisfactory and that many prisoners live in cramped, unhygienic cells. To improve conditions, the Government has embarked on a program to build 20 new prisons and to refurbish existing ones.

In Northern Ireland, where 60 percent of the prisoners are jailed for terrorist activities, prison conditions differ in some respects from those in Great Britain. All prisons in the province, except for the two centers for young offenders, are maximum-security institutions. This often forces low-

risk common criminals in Northern Ireland to serve their sentences under maximum-security conditions. On the other hand, Northern Ireland prisons are generally more modern—five of Northern Ireland's prisons have been built since 1970—than those in Great Britain. Northern Ireland prisoners also have visitation, mail, and clothing privileges not available to those in mainland prisons. In the last several years, two new prisons with an extensive range of educational and training facilities have been opened, and the old prison in Armagh was closed. Community service programs for certain offenders as an alternative to prison have been very successful. Northern Ireland's prison population grew by less than 1 percent in 1987.

Complaints continue about "strip searching," particularly of women, in Northern Ireland prisons, and Amnesty International, in its 1987 Report covering 1986, urged the Government to reconsider its policy. These searches involve a visual inspection conducted in special cubicles by female officers. Body cavity searches are not performed. Strip searching is routine for prisoners on first committal and final discharge and when making home visits. It is conducted on a random basis for prisoners making court appearances for leaving the prison temporarily for any reason. Since prisoners who are on remand (awaiting trial) are brought to court every 8 to 28 days, they face the possibility of more frequent strip searching than those who are sentenced. The Standing Advisory Commission on Human Rights determined that strip searches remain necessary to protect the well-being of guards, prisoners, and the community at large. But the commission also stated that strip searching is conducted too frequently. All visitors to prisons, including government officials, are subject to a "rub-down search." This involves an officer passing his or her hands over the visitor's clothing. Visitors are not strip-searched. Strip searching is also conducted at prisons located in other parts of the United Kingdom.

Britain has ratified the Council of Europe Convention on the Transfer of Sentenced Persons, by which prisoners may be sent to their home countries to serve their sentences. Within the United Kingdom, convicts are almost always required to serve their prison time in the general region where the crime was committed. Transfers can, however, be requested. Prisoners from Northern Ireland, for example, who are serving time in Great Britain can apply for transfer to Northern Ireland to serve their sentences closer to their families. Several such requests were approved in 1987.

#### *d. Arbitrary arrest, detention, exile, or forced labor*

British law gives the police broad discretionary powers to make arrest without warrant based on reasonable cause. Procedures for bail, judicial determination of the legality of detention, and suits for false imprisonment are routinely utilized.

Persons arrested without a warrant must be released on bail if they cannot be brought before a magistrate's court within 24 hours. Generally, persons charged with nonserious offenses can be released on bail. However, in some cases where the alleged offense is deemed serious, magistrates have repeatedly remanded persons for periods totaling up to 18 months before trial. In 1987 some 11,000 persons (roughly 20 percent of the prison population) were on remand. The average length of time between first remand and trial in scheduled cases in Northern Ire-

land declined steadily between 1984 and 1987, and the Emergency Provisions Act of 1987 gave the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland authority to specify maximum time limits for particular pretrial stages; this authority has not yet been utilized. The Home Secretary announced in late 1987 his intention to consider a similar system to help limit time on remand for detainees in England and Wales.

British common law allows for the restriction of personal liberties by the Government in an emergency situation, subject to review by Parliament. Acting on the premise that the fundamental "right to life" has been in serious jeopardy due to the violence in Northern Ireland, the Government has adopted the Northern Ireland (Emergency Provisions) Acts of 1978 and 1987, which are applicable only to Northern Ireland; and the Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act of 1984 (originally enacted in 1976), almost all of which is applicable to the entire United Kingdom. Although both these acts permit the restriction of personal liberties, they are subject to parliamentary review and to mandatory renewal at frequent intervals. In addition, Lord Colville was appointed in 1987 to provide Parliament with an annual independent assessment of the operation of the acts.

The 1984 Prevention of Terrorism Act allows the police to arrest without warrant persons anywhere in the United Kingdom whom they reasonably suspect to be involved in terrorism. Such persons may be detained for up to 48 hours without judicial review and up to a further 5 days on the authority of the Home Secretary. In recent years, the powers of the Act have been used when persons were suspected of acts of terrorism related to Northern Ireland, India, and the Middle East.

In September 1987, the European Commission on Human Rights recommended that, in the case of two men detained in 1984 under the Prevention of Terrorism Act's 7-day maximum detention period, the British Government respond to charges it had violated the requirement contained in the European Convention on Human Rights that a person should be brought "promptly to court." The Government quickly announced its intention to contest the Commission's findings before the European Court of Human Rights.

Under the Northern Ireland Emergency Provisions Act of 1978, the R.U.C., for the purpose of arresting anyone under the Prevention of Terrorism Act, may enter and search without a warrant any place where that person is or where the police reasonably suspect him of being, and may detain such persons for up to 72 hours on their own authority. The Act provides similar authority in connection with the arrest of persons suspected of having committed, or being about to commit, a "scheduled" offense (i.e., one listed on a schedule attached to the law). Also under this Act, members of the armed forces on duty may arrest without a warrant any person suspected of having committed or being about to commit any offense. Such persons can be held for up to 4 hours, after which they must be transferred to police custody or released. Allegations that these limits have been exceeded by the police or the armed forces have not been substantiated.

In Northern Ireland, pursuant to the provisions of the Prevention of Terrorism Act and the Emergency Provisions Act, arrested persons have the right to a lawyer after 48 hours in detention. Some human rights ac-

tivists charge, however, that the 48-hour rule is not always followed.

An independent review of the 1978 Emergency Provisions Act by Sir George Baker, published in April 1984, concluded that its provisions were still necessary. The 1987 act implemented a number of Baker's recommendations and provided further rights and safeguards for persons detained under emergency legislation. On the authority of a senior police officer and if specified conditions are met, the exercise of these rights may be delayed for a maximum of 48 hours.

British legal practice provides for the indeterminate detention of minors convicted of murder. In Northern Ireland, where public attention has focused particularly on this issue, there are 41 persons serving such sentences.

There is no forced or compulsory labor.

#### *e. Denial of fair public trial*

Fair trial is guaranteed by law and observed in practice. All criminal proceedings must be conducted in public, with the exception of juvenile court cases and cases involving public decency or security. In a trial on charges under the Official Secrets Act, the court may be closed at the judge's discretion, but the sentence must be passed in public. A national independent prosecution service was established in 1985, extending to England and Wales a system introduced to Northern Ireland in 1972, which provides greater consistency in determining which cases are to be prosecuted.

Juries hear all cases not covered by anti-terrorist legislation; these constitute the majority of criminal cases. In Northern Ireland, the right to trial by jury was suspended for certain terrorist-related offenses because the possibility of the intimidation of witnesses and juries raised serious questions about the ability of juries to render impartial verdicts. The nonjury ("Diplock") courts were established by legislation in 1973 as a means of dealing with terrorist activity in Northern Ireland. The Government remains committed to the use of jury trials whenever possible, and the 1987 Emergency Provisions Act gives the Lord Chancellor the power to determine if specific "scheduled offense" cases can be heard outside the Diplock system.

Persons convicted by a Diplock court have an automatic right of appeal of conviction or sentence to a three-judge Court of Appeals, a right not granted to defendants tried before a judge and jury. Historically, the rate of conviction in Diplock courts of defendants who have pleaded not guilty is similar to that of defendants tried before juries. Judges in Diplock courts must publish written explanations of their decisions. Nonetheless, there is support for a court system in which three judges (instead of one) would preside over trials when a jury trial is deemed impossible. The Standing Advisory Commission on Human Rights has endorsed a change to a three-judge system, coupled with a sizable reduction in the number of cases heard by Diplock courts.

The recent reversals on appeal of several convictions in earlier terrorism cases have limited the Government's ability to obtain convictions based on uncorroborated evidence by convicted terrorists ("supergrasses"). Although there were no "supergrass" trials in 1986 or 1987, the issue remains controversial. The evidence of an accomplice has always been admissible in British courts, but in nonjury courts the judge alone must decide whether the evidence of the "supergrass" is credible, bearing in mind the danger of convicting on uncorroborated

evidence. The British Government continues to maintain that the use of "supergrass" testimony is important in the legal fight against terrorism. Critics assert such testimony places too great an emphasis on assessing the credibility of a single witness.

The Criminal Law Jurisdictions Act, enacted by both the British Government (1975) and the Irish Government (1976), permits trial in the Republic of Ireland, in Northern Ireland, or in Britain of those accused of certain terrorist offenses, regardless of where the offense was committed.

#### *f. Arbitrary interference with privacy, family, home, or correspondence*

The right of privacy is well respected in both law and custom.

Warrants are generally required for a police search of private premises. However, under the Northern Ireland (Emergency Provisions) Act of 1978, any member of the armed forces on duty or any constable may enter any premises or other place, if he or she considers it necessary to do so to preserve peace or maintain order. Changes in the 1987 Emergency Provisions Act now require a standard of "reasonable grounds of suspicion" before a dwelling can be entered.

#### *b. Freedom of peaceful assembly and association*

Except in cases of extreme civil disorder, in which public safety is judged to be at risk, the authorities do not exercise their statutory right to limit the freedom of public assembly. However, some critics believe that the 1986 public order law gives police too much discretion to restrict public assembly.

The Prevention of Terrorism Act of 1984 and the Northern Ireland (Emergency Provisions) Act of 1978 include sections prohibiting membership in, or support of, organizations (Loyalist and Republican) involved in terrorism. These organizations are specifically listed in the statutes. The lists do not include political parties, even those, such as the Provisional Sinn Féin, which have close links to terrorist paramilitary organizations and openly support violence.

The summer "marching season" in Northern Ireland presents special problems. Because these Unionist marches commemorate the traditions of opposing sectarian communities, they are controversial and can be a source of public disorder. The RUC must be notified of all marches and may impose conditions, including rerouting, on the organizers. Although the Unionist community threatened to defy new laws regulating marches and processions, the 1987 marching season saw a noticeable reduction in violence, compared to recent years.

In Northern Ireland, the Constitution Act of 1973 specifically prohibits discrimination on the basis of religious belief or political opinion.

There is no religious or denominational bar to the holding of public office except in the case of the Sovereign, who must be a member of the Church of England.

#### *d. Freedom of movement within the country, foreign travel, emigration, and repatriation*

In general, U.K. citizens enjoy freedom of movement within the country and in foreign travel, emigration, and repatriation.

The Prevention of Terrorism Act of 1984 includes one exception to this general principle. The Act gives the Home Secretary the authority to exclude or prevent from entering mainland Britain anyone he believes

may be connected with terrorism related to Northern Ireland, unless that person was born in Great Britain or has been ordinarily resident there for 3 years. Similar authority is granted to the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland to exclude persons not native to or resident in that province. Only one person has been excluded under this law since 1984. Nevertheless, these powers have been referred to by many, including the National Council for Civil Liberties, as a system of internal exile.

Section 4.—Governmental attitude regarding international and nongovernmental investigation of alleged violations of human rights.

The Government generally maintains an open attitude toward international inquiries into alleged violations of human rights in the United Kingdom. It cooperates fully with the European Commission on Human Rights in investigations of complaints and has taken steps to rectify its own laws and policies when they were found not to be in conformity with the European Convention.

The United Kingdom is a party to several human rights conventions, participates in international and regional human rights bodies, and is the host country to international nongovernmental human rights organizations, such as Amnesty International.

Section 5.—Discrimination based on race, sex, religion, language, or social status.

British law bars discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national or ethnic origin. However, statistical studies have shown a black unemployment rate that is nearly double that of whites, black concentration in manual jobs, and racial discrimination in job recruitment. In 1984 a Code of Practice on Employment, proposed by the Commission for Racial Equality and accepted by the Government, took effect. Although the code does not have the force of law, it is used as a standard of good practice by industrial tribunals in racial discrimination cases and serves as a guideline for firms in eliminating all forms of discrimination.

Equal status and equal opportunity for women in professional fields is also provided by law. Enforcement mechanisms have been established, and progress toward women's equality is visible in many areas, including government hiring. Still, women have yet to achieve fully equal status. They hold three-quarters of Britain's lowest paying jobs, and the average female wage-earner takes home only three-quarters the pay of her male counterpart (up from 63 percent in 1970). Equal Opportunity Commissions were established in Great Britain in 1975 and in Northern Ireland in 1976 to assist in the enforcement of these laws.

Historically, in Northern Ireland, the majority Protestant community has controlled much of the local economy and been more prosperous than the Catholic community. The reasons for this are complex and involve a long history of anti-Catholic discrimination by Protestants.

Since 1972, when direct British rule was introduced in Northern Ireland, specific measures have been taken to combat religious discrimination against Catholics. These include: reform of the electoral rolls; prohibition of religious or political discrimination by any level of government; establishment of a Commissioner for Complaints to deal with grievances against local government; appointment of a Central Housing Authority to meet the problem of discrimination in housing; prohibition of discrimina-



tion in employment; and a special effort to recruit more Catholics into the civil service and the police. In addition, the Standing Advisory Commission on Human Rights was established in 1973 to monitor human rights. Since 1976 the Fair Employment Agency has served as the focal point of the Government's efforts to end job discrimination. In July 1987, the Government announced a substantial increase in the resources available to the Fair Employment Agency, and a revised government guide to employment practice was issued in September 1987 to prepare employers to comply with new equal employment legislation currently under consideration in Whitehall. Within the Northern Ireland civil service, the proportion of Catholics reflects their proportion in the overall population for those under age 35. In upper age groups and in the security forces, Protestants still dominate.

PIRA assassinations and death threats have largely stymied government efforts to recruit Catholics into the police force and security-related fields. PIRA has carried out a terror campaign not only against police officers but also against persons who provide services to the security forces. For example, since 1973, 26 prison staff members have been murdered while off duty, and in 1987 the PIRA murdered a man who had been teaching prisoners.

The unemployment rate in Northern Ireland is substantially higher than that in the United Kingdom as a whole and continues to be on average twice as high for the minority Catholic population as for Protestants. The number of manufacturing jobs in Belfast has dropped by about 50 percent in the last 10 years. With few job openings in the private sector, it has been difficult to make progress toward ensuring that the work force mirrors the religious composition of the community. The Government is trying to attract more investment to the province and is subsidizing the economy through public sector spending. Northern Ireland's shrinking economy makes this a necessary part of ending discrimination. The new International Fund, organized in support of the Anglo-Irish Agreement, is expected to inject a certain amount of capital into areas affected by violence and encourage job creation.

## MEDICAL ETHICS QUESTIONS

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, February 24, 1988, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

### MEDICAL ETHICS QUESTIONS

Medical researchers have made breathtaking advances in treating illness and injury, preventing disease, and creating tools to help doctors bring the benefit of scientific advances to patients. Doctors today can save the life of a premature baby or a brain-damaged adult who, only a few years ago, would have died instantly. But this ability to preserve life is creating new and disturbing questions for health care policy. The knowledge and technological ability that make modern medicine exciting increasingly

demand that doctors, patients, relatives, the courts, and society make agonizing decisions.

Today, the search for an appropriate medical treatment often presents a set of choices, rather than a clear answer. I find Hoosiers asking questions about the ethics and economics of health care with greater frequency. Here are some of the questions that have arisen in my public meetings:

May terminally ill patients receive a doctor's help to hasten death? Some patients have expressed their desire to die immediately, rather than endure more pain before death. California may soon vote on a referendum to allow doctors to legally administer a fatal overdose to any terminally ill patient who requests it. The American Medical Association (AMA), however, believes that no physician should "intentionally cause death," even at the patient's request.

What rights does a patient have to refuse medical treatment, including food and water? If the patient is not mentally alert, who decides? In 1976, Karen Ann Quinlan's parents won a court battle to disconnect her life-support machines. Today, courts routinely grant family requests to have artificial life-supports turned off. The AMA argues that a doctor may discontinue "all means of life-supporting medical treatment," including intravenous food and fluids for terminally ill or comatose patients. The courts have been less receptive to requests from mentally competent but physically helpless patients that medical treatment, including food and water, be stopped. Many states are enacting living will laws, which allow a person to specify in advance certain types of medical treatment they would prefer to forgo.

Should we use animal organs in human patients? The case of Baby Fae, who was implanted with a baboon heart and lived for several weeks, received worldwide attention. Research animals have long been used to test drugs and medical devices which can help great numbers of people. Some animals, like the chimpanzee, are potential organ sources, but they are also invaluable in research efforts to find cures for diseases like AIDS. Do we have the right to sacrifice an animal to save only one person? Is it "dehumanizing" for humans to receive animal organs?

Should we ration health care? Some countries have already made this decision. In Great Britain, for example, kidney dialysis and transplants are denied to anyone over age 55. Because of advances in medical science, providing the best available medical care can be prohibitively expensive. The Oregon legislature last year decided that the state's limited health care dollars would be better spent providing prenatal care to 1500 low-income women than in funding organ transplants for 30 patients. New mothers and their infants will benefit; those needing transplants may die. Most of us recoil at the thought of rationing health care. Our preference is to focus instead on the waste in the health care system. But restraining costs while providing the best medical care for everyone is becoming increasingly hard to achieve.

May doctors and nurses refuse to treat AIDS patients? The AMA says no. The courts have not yet ruled on the issue. Doctors have traditionally placed the welfare of patients first. In the days before vaccines, countless physicians died of tuberculosis, small pox, and other ailments contracted from patients. The majority of doctors are willing to risk contact with AIDS victims,

but the fear of contracting AIDS while providing medical treatment is real.

Should there be two levels of health care: one for the well-off and one for low-income persons? An estimated 37 million Americans, not poor enough to receive government-paid health care, have no form of health insurance at all. Yet critics charge the government subsidizes more than adequate health care for middle- and upper-income people in the form of tax-free health benefits offered by employers. This subsidy cost taxpayers some \$35.5 billion last year. The ideal is to provide the finest available health care to every person, but the reality often falls short. Many believe that the U.S. needs a comprehensive health care policy to provide guidelines for allocating limited medical resources.

How much claim do the new "technology" parents—the egg donors, surrogates, and sperm donors—have to the children they help produce? We remember Baby M and the efforts of her natural mother to retain custody despite the surrogacy contract with the child's father. Many states are considering legislation to regulate surrogacy. Some people believe that any technique to create life outside the body is wrong. Test tube babies and children conceived by other artificial means will continue to be born, and some biological parents will insist on contact with the children they helped bring into the world.

These questions challenge the wisdom of Solomon, and in no small degree require that people play God. I do not pretend to have the solutions; I am not even sure of my own feelings on many of these issues. I do find Hoosiers struggling with these and similar questions. My thought is that these issues are too personal and have too many implications to be resolved by traditional methods of government action. Answers to these questions must be based on personal experience and beliefs. It seems to me that legislators and policymakers must approach these questions with great caution. Acceptable resolutions are more likely to come from the grass roots level, and not be imposed by government fiat. Public awareness of these issues needs to increase, and public involvement will be crucial in reaching satisfactory solutions.

(Much of this information was taken from an article which appeared in the Washington Post.)

## INTRODUCTION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

**HON. GERRY E. STUDDS**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to reauthorize the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act for an additional 2 years. This act is designed to promote the conservation of species of fish and wildlife that are neither hunted or fished or, alternatively, protected under the Endangered Species Act.

These nongame species make up the vast majority of the Nation's fish and wildlife, and in many States include songbirds, bobcats, flying squirrels, river otters, and lynx. They provide countless hours of recreation and en-

joyment each year to birdwatchers, hikers, wildlife photographers, and conservation groups. The Fish and Wildlife Service estimates that over 93 million Americans enjoy activities related to these species and spend over \$1 million annually in the process. However, there is a paucity of information on the well-being of these species; less than 10 percent of the vertebrate species of fish and wildlife in this country receive any specific attention by our wildlife managers.

Increased attention to these species will identify those whose populations are in decline before they are so critically low that they need to be protected under the Endangered Species Act. The Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act provides funding for the States, through a partnership with the Federal Government, to develop management plans for nongame species of wildlife. When the plans are approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the States become eligible for partial reimbursement of the costs of developing and implementing these plans.

While it is, of course, absurd to expect that individual plans will be—or should be—developed for all of the many species that surround us, it is equally shortsighted not to plan special efforts for those populations of birds, fish, and other wildlife in need of some level of protection. The purpose of this act is to authorize and promote such efforts; it deserves both reauthorization and funding.

Unfortunately, Federal funds have never been appropriated. I intend to hold a hearing on this legislation in March to examine other potential funding sources for this program and to determine how other wildlife programs such as the wildlife conservation provisions of the Food Security Act of 1985 and the Migratory Bird Program benefit these nongame species.

I look forward to renewed efforts on behalf of our nongame populations to complement our impressive efforts on behalf of game birds and other wildlife, and to examine alternative funding sources for these efforts.

#### REMEMBERING ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

**HON. THOMAS J. MANTON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 25, 1988*

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the Estonian Declaration of Independence. For Americans, Independence Day is a day of celebration. We mark the day with fireworks and family gatherings to celebrate our good fortune and to give thanks for the rights and privileges we enjoy as a free people. For the people of Estonia however, Independence Day is a very different kind of occasion.

Mr. Speaker, Estonia formally declared its independence 70 years ago this week. Within 2 years the League of Nations officially recognized the Baltic country as a sovereign nation and admitted Estonia to its ranks. For the following 20 years, Estonia thrived economically, socially, and culturally and was signatory to a host of international treaties and accords.

Ironically, the Soviet Union, the first country to legally recognize Estonia as an independent

nation, stole Estonia's right to self-determination away. In a secret pact in 1939, Hitler and Stalin partitioned Eastern Europe and thereby engineered the end of Estonian statehood. The Nazis agreed to allow the Soviets to annex the three Baltic States, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, in return for land concession for themselves. The United States did not recognize the Soviet Union's claim to these countries then and will not now.

According to the tenants of the Atlantic Charter, all countries which had independent status before World War II were to have their sovereignty returned to them after World War II ended. However, the Soviets refused to honor this accord. For nearly a decade, freedom fighters in Estonia waged an armed resistance in the hopes of realizing their right to self-governance. The Soviets responded with mass arrests, house searches, executions and mass deportations.

To speak out in Estonia today one must risk a heavy penalty. Soviet gulags and psychiatric facilities are filled with Estonians who have dared to fight for freedom. The crimes they have committed range from asking for the renunciation of the Hitler-Stalin pact to flying the Estonian national flag. But even after decades of occupation and oppression the people of Estonia have not conceded the fight. On August 23, 1987, Estonians staged a large scale demonstration against Soviet rule in the city of Tallinn.

Mr. Speaker, this year is the 200th anniversary of our Constitution. We must also remember that this year marks a milestone for the Estonian people: The 70th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. We must take this opportunity to assure the Estonians that their cause has not been forgotten. We Americans who are so fortunate to live with freedom every day must remember too many people in the world are living without it. The people of Estonia and their families in this country have my support and my prayers that one day soon Estonia will again be a free and independent nation.

#### AMERICAN HEART MONTH

**HON. JOSEPH D. EARLY**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 25, 1988*

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, this is "American Heart Month." February 1988 marks the 24th consecutive yearly celebration of this event. A joint resolution approved by Congress in 1963 requests the President to annually proclaim February as "American Heart Month."

The American Heart Association [AHA] and its affiliates and over 2 million volunteers dedicate this month to heighten the dissemination of educational materials and to increase public support of its mission. The AHA, one of the world's largest voluntary health organizations, is committed to the "reduction of premature death and disability from cardiovascular diseases and stroke"—our Nation's No. 1 killer.

According to AHA, coronary heart disease, stroke, and related disorders cause almost as many deaths as all other sources combined.

They estimate that annually one out of every two Americans die of cardiovascular diseases and that nearly 65 million suffer from some form of these diseases—over 59 million Americans have high blood pressure, approximately 4.9 million have coronary heart disease; and about 2 million individuals have suffered a stroke. Also, for 1987 AHA cites a figure of over \$80 billion for health costs affiliated with these diseases including doctor and nursing care, hospital and nursing home services, medicines and lost productivity.

For the past 40 years, the AHA, the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute [NHLBI] and also more recently the National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Diseases and Stroke [NINCDS] have worked closely on research, education, and prevention programs to fight cardiovascular diseases. NHLBI's National High Blood Pressure Education Program and its National Cholesterol Education Program represent productive public-private cooperative efforts. They complement AHA's recently implemented "Physicians' Cholesterol Education Program" and its "Heart RX" program designed to assist health professionals teach patients about the risk factors of heart disease, stroke, and atherosclerosis. The risk factors include smoking, raised blood cholesterol, high blood pressure and diets excessive in saturated fat and cholesterol.

As a result of the combined efforts of AHA, NHLBI, and NINCDS progress has been achieved in curbing the mortality rates from cardiovascular diseases. In fact, according to the AHA, from 1976 to 1986 the death rate from coronary heart disease and stroke has declined by 27.9 percent and 40.2 percent respectively. These organizations believe that the future looks even brighter with promising programs on the horizon. Some include the extension of molecular biology into cardiovascular research and more studies into both the relationship between nutrition and cardiovascular disorders; and the effects of behavior, stress, and exercise on these victims.

I welcome this opportunity to commend the American Heart Associations' contributions. I urge my colleagues and the public to continue its support of biomedical research so critical for additional scientific achievements in this area.

#### EXEMPTION FOR SMALL BUSI- NESSES FROM THE BURDEN- SOME UNIFORM CAPITALIZA- TION RULES

**HON. HAL DAUB**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 25, 1988*

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill, H.R. 4020, that will end a burdensome provision for hundreds of small businesses that was contained in the Tax Reform Act of 1986. This provision is commonly known as the uniform capitalization rules from section 263A of the Internal Revenue Code. Within this new rule was an exception for small retailers and wholesalers with gross sales of less than \$10 million. The accepted reason for this exception is that small busi-



nesses are unable to accumulate and account for these costs and should not be burdened with unusually difficult accounting rules and redtape. Unfortunately, small manufacturers were not excepted from the new rules and so are faced with burdensome new rules with which they cannot comply.

My bill is intended to place all small businesses in the same arena and exempt them from the uniform capitalization rules and additional Government redtape.

In general, the uniform capitalization rules require the "capitalization"—as opposed to expensing—of direct costs and an allocable portion of indirect costs attributable to producing and/or acquiring real and tangible personal property used in the taxpayer's trade or business. The costs attributable to inventory must also be capitalized.

To indicate to you just how burdensome and complex these rules are for small businesses, let me list a few examples of the indirect costs that must be allocated and accounted for: repair and maintenance of equipment or facilities; utilities; rental of equipment, facilities, or land; indirect labor and contract supervisory wages; indirect materials and supplies; tools and equipment; quality control and inspection; taxes; depreciation, amortization, and cost recovery allowance on equipment and facilities; administrative costs; insurance; interest; contributions paid to or under a stock bonus, pension, profit-sharing or annuity plan or other compensation deferring plan or employee benefit expenses; rework labor, scrap and spoilage; bidding expenses; engineering expenses and on and on.

Most small businesses are lucky if they can accurately keep track of all of these costs—to capitalize them is simply too much for the Government to ask. This bill is a question of fairness and equity for all small businesses. But I also realize that it is a question of money for the Federal Government. The estimated revenue cost to the Government is \$1.5 billion through 1992. The entire provision raised over \$32 billion, so this cost is but a small fraction of the entire rule. In addition, I want to point out that the revenue estimate assumes that these small businesses will comply with the new complex uniform capitalization rules. I believe that noncompliance will run rampant, not because businesses do not want to comply with the new law, but because accounting and legal fees make it impractical for them to comply. As representatives of these small businesses, we should not overburden them with complex tax laws that encourage non-compliance. I urge my colleagues to come to the aid of these small businesses by cosponsoring my bill, H.R. 4020.

#### NATIONAL FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA WEEK

#### HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join with the members of the Future Farmers of America as they celebrate National FFA Week with the theme "FFA—Agriculture's New Spirit."

The Future Farmers of America is a vocational education organization for high school students who are enrolled in vocational agriculture classes in public high schools or area vocational education centers.

Each chapter develops an annual program of activities and each member of the chapter carries out a supervised occupational experience program. The FFA gives recognition to members for achievements at the chapter, district or area, State and National levels. These award programs directly relate to the supervised occupational experience programs. This allows each vocational education-FAA members the opportunity to participate and receive recognition.

During the 1986-87 school year Kentucky has 147 FFA chapters, with a membership of 12,631. Over 1,000 FFA members and teachers attended 1 week of FFA leadership development training at the Kentucky FFA Leadership Training Center in Hardinsburg, KY.

The FFA chapters, and the individual members, that are in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky, which I have the privilege of representing in the Congress, received many awards at the State and National levels.

The 60th National Convention was held in Kansas City, MO this past November. At the convention the Spencer County chapter received a gold emblem chapter ranking in the Building Our American Communities Awards Program and the National Chapter Safety Awards Program.

The National FFA Chapter Award Program honors superior FFA chapters for their excellence in chapter activities. Each chapter was judged on performance in 11 areas. The Spencer County chapter was ranked as a gold emblem chapter, and the Barren County and Breckinridge County chapters were ranked as silver emblem chapters.

Four members from the Second Congressional District were honored at the national convention for reaching the highest rung of membership available to an individual—the American Farmer Degree: Brad Chambliss of Hardinsburg, David Herndon of Mount Eden, Barry Alan Hines of Philpot, and Clarence A. Thomas, Jr. of Taylorsville.

Many FFA members become highly proficient in their chosen areas, and these members earned top honors as national winners in 29 proficiency areas. Each winner received a plaque, \$1,000 and an expense-paid agricultural tour of Europe. Paul Miles of Owensboro received the Agricultural Proficiency Award for "Oil Crop Production."

T.J. Hale of Franklin was a member of the horn section in the National FFA Band at the convention, and Brian Eadens of Bowling Green as an official delegate from the Commonwealth of Kentucky to the national convention.

Mr. Patrick Henderson of Harned, a vocational education teacher at the Breckinridge County High School, received the FFA Honorary American Farmer Degree. Mr. Joe Frank Duncan of Rockfield was the State winner of the Agriscience Teacher of the Year Award.

At the 1987 State convention the Spencer County Chapter was named the State winner of the Farm Operation Identification Program. The chapter members marked equipment on 33 farms and 28 farm homes in Spencer County.

Scott Hardin was selected as the individual chapter winner.

The Spencer County Chapter was also the State winner in the Chapter Safety Program. The chapter selected "Safety Awareness—Before it is too Late" as its theme. The Spencer County chapter went on to compete at the national level. The Daviess County, Barren County, Breckinridge County, and the Grayson County chapters were ranked as superior.

The Spencer County chapter was ranked as a gold emblem chapter and the Franklin-Simpson, Breckinridge County, and Barren County chapters were ranked as silver emblem chapters in the Building Our American Communities Program.

The regional star farmers were selected as the most outstanding from the Kentucky FFA membership, based on their accomplishments in the FFA and the Supervised Occupational Experience Programs in vocational agriculture. The following FFA members from the Second Congressional District were honored as star farmers: Denise Gayle Wood of Glasgow, Terry Keith Broadus of Bloomfield, and Mark Allen Glasscock of Taylorsville.

Brian Eadens of Bowling Green is the president of the Kentucky Association FFA for 1987-88, and Lee Carol Greenwell of Lebanon is the treasurer.

I am proud of all the members of the Future Farmers of America, and I know of no group of young people who are accomplishing more in the area of agriculture than the Future Farmers of America. They are to be commended for their efforts and achievements, and I want to wish them continued success in all their future endeavors.

#### MIAMI-DADE PUBLIC LIBRARY HONORED FOR STAND AGAINST CENSORSHIP

#### HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, through the years, public libraries have often borne the brunt of efforts at censorship. Today, they lead the fight against censorship. That is the reason our own Miami-Dade Library was selected by the Miami Chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union as the recipient of its first Acts of Courage Award.

The Miami-Dade Library sponsored "Censorship and Libraries: Exhibitions and Programs" included a series of lectures, discussions, readings, exhibits and an unusual "banned film series" featuring such controversial films as D.W. Griffith's "Birth of a Nation" and the 1978 movie "La Cage Aux Folles."

Freedom of information is one of the cornerstones of democracy, yet it is often of the most difficult of our rights to safeguard. In our society, the open exchange of ideas, information and opinions sometimes leads to conflicts which elicit strong arguments and emotions.

The Miami-Dade Public Library is to be commended for pointing out the dangers of censorship and for increasing public understanding of the many diverse, sometimes con-

flicting elements that contribute to a healthy pluralistic community.

### TRIBUTE TO THOMAS GIANCRISTOFORO

#### HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a friend who will be honored for 25 years of public service on February 27, 1988, by the Delaware County Association of Township Commissioners.

Thomas Giancristoforo, a resident of Tinicum Township, began his career in community service as a member of the Essington and Lester fire companies, where he continues to serve. In 1964 Mr. Giancristoforo was elected as a member of the Tinicum Township Board of Commissioners and served for 16 years as police commissioner. In 1980 he was appointed by his colleagues as president of the board of commissioners, a position which he still holds.

In addition to his career in public service Mr. Giancristoforo has always been greatly involved in community affairs, and is president of the Tinicum Township Patriotic Commission as well as a member of the Norwood Lions Club.

Mr. Giancristoforo's outstanding work as an elected official has been formally recognized on numerous occasions. Among his many tireless efforts on the behalf of the residents of Tinicum Township, Mr. Giancristoforo played a vital role in securing the location of the United Parcel Service regional facility in that area. This facility alone will create 4,700 new jobs for the region. In recognition of this and other efforts to better the economic condition of Delaware County, the Delaware County Chamber of Commerce honored Mr. Giancristoforo with the "Outstanding Community Award."

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will agree that Thomas Giancristoforo is an outstanding public servant and leader. I rise proudly with his family and the residents of Tinicum Township in commending Mr. Giancristoforo on his exemplary service to our community.

### ULSTER SHOOT TO KILL POLICY

#### HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, true partnership inspires progress just as surely as bad faith destroys hope. This is a lesson which Great Britain has never learned and it is no closer to learning that lesson today.

Britain's ill-advised actions on several fronts have crushed the hopes which many of us had cherished for sustained improvement in Anglo-Irish relations. In the last 30 days, Great Britain has offered a new definition of the word "partnership."

Under the British notion of partnership. Great Britain decides, and Ireland abides. Ireland has been freely given the right to speak, but England has demonstrated that it will not heed the voice of its partner.

Yesterday, another British soldier was charged in the slaying of an unarmed Catholic. A day earlier, Britain disclosed that one of its soldiers who had been sentenced to life for killing an unarmed Catholic in Northern Ireland, was paroled after 3 years and was back in the army.

In addition, when faced with an overwhelming public demand to try members of the Royal Ulster Constabulary for the murder of innocent, Irish, noncombatants, the English authorities have declined to prosecute, or reveal their findings.

Without consulting the Irish Government in Dublin, Britain made permanent the emergency powers which allow it to detain Irish citizens for up to 7 days without bringing a charge against them.

Moreover, an Irish law which requires Britain to submit charges and evidence when demanding the extradition of Irish citizens has consistently been ignored.

Finally, this month has seen British justice perform as ignobly as the British Government: ignoring a huge body of scientific and forensic evidence, and the outraged cries of members of its own Parliament, who have called for the release of the Birmingham Six, and the Guildford Four.

Mr. Speaker, when the Anglo-Irish accords were announced more than 2 years ago, hopes were raised around the world that a new partnership, founded on justice and mutual advantage, had slowly begun to form.

If there is to be a successful Anglo-Irish partnership then Britain must be as willing to share the burdens as she has been to reap the benefits.

I challenge Britain to stop promising cooperation, and start delivering simple justice to Ireland. Put those involved in the shoot-to-kill cases on a public trial, and let the facts come out. Invite the Government in Dublin to join as an equal partner in policy discussions about the extradition and incarceration of Irish citizens. Demand that your courts of law promote justice.

Britain, you have broken faith with your Irish partner, as you always have throughout history. Ireland's terrible beauty was born and has been raised in your shadow. Yours could be the first generation to keep faith with the Irish people.

But that will never be accomplished in a hollow accord, or in an empty promise. You can only reverse centuries of mistrust, neglect and broken promises by making one good decision at a time, right here and right now.

Start with this past month: don't turn your back on coverups, illegal detentions, and official murders. Your actions will answer our hopes and prayers for peace and for progress. Will you answer yes?

### TRIBUTE TO CAPT. THOMAS DICKSON

#### HON. CHRISTOPHER SHAYS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to acknowledge the achievements of a citizen of Southbury, believed to be the oldest living man to have rounded Cape Horn five times under sail.

Captain Dickson's career began in 1915 when he, holding both British and United States masters licenses, sailed as a cadet on the *Medway*, a four-masted British training ship. This 2,200-ton historical vessel is one of the last of its kind to round the cape.

In 1930 Captain Dickson emigrated to the United States, going to work for the United Fruit Co. During World War II, though not yet a citizen, Captain Dickson, served with the merchant marines, carrying supplies to GI's around the globe. This duty included operating in the Atlantic Theatre (1942), the Aleutians (1943), and the Southwest Pacific (1944-45).

In 1946 the captain became a U.S. citizen—quite an accomplishment considering the fact that he served under foreign flag vessels.

This Saturday, February 27, 1988, Capt. Thomas Dickson will celebrate his 90th birthday with his wife, two children, and four grandchildren. In recognition of this special day, I am honored to bring to my colleagues' attention the achievements of this unique American citizen.

### HONORING 70 YEARS OF MARRIAGE

#### HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. John Humphrey (Antha Hutchison) celebrated their 70th wedding anniversary on January 20. They were married in Union County, TN, in 1918. Mr. and Mrs. Humphrey moved to Knoxville in 1947 and have been in the same house on Jefferson Avenue for 40 years.

Mr. Humphrey held many jobs during his career from farming to carpentry and Mrs. Humphrey worked as a seamstress. The Humphreys have four children, six grandchildren and three great-grandchildren.

Mr. and Mrs. Humphrey have made good use of their many years together. I do not know of anyone who has more friends and I am sure it must be a great source of pride and pleasure to have reached this milestone together. I wish to congratulate the Humphreys on this special occasion and extend my good wishes to the entire family.



TRIBUTE TO GERALDINE  
CAMILLERI-BEHME

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a good friend and a fine, fine person, Geraldine Camilleri-Behme.

Geraldine's death from lung cancer on February 16 was a loss not only to pet owners and the pet industry, it was a loss to me personally. In her 68 years, Geraldine cared for small animals with a manner and a devotion we can all admire. She was an activist for pet owners and for the pet industry. Indeed, she owned Andy's Pet Shop in San Jose for more than 36 years.

I'd known and worked with Geraldine for nearly 20 years. I first met her when I was a member of the San Jose City Council and she was striving to found the Bay Area Pet Industry Association, which did indeed come into being in 1971.

My admiration for her efforts grew as the years passed. Geraldine believed in nothing but the best for our pets and for their owners. In 1972 Geraldine organized a pet show at San Francisco's Moscone Center: a first for the city. In 1976 she brought about the west coast's first successful consumer pet show at the Santa Clara County Fairgrounds in the South Bay area. This production paved the way for the first American Pet Show, which was held in Anaheim in 1981.

Geraldine's work was recognized nationally. She was the first woman member of the Washington-based Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council. From 1978 to 1985 she was also a member of the council's board of directors.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that we are poorer for the loss of Geraldine. I ask that our colleagues in the House join in tribute to Geraldine and in wishing the very best to her family at this time.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS FRANCIS  
JOHNSON

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise with sadness to pay my respects to Congressman Thomas Francis Johnson, who was killed February 1 in an auto accident. Mr. Johnson was a former Democratic Representative of Maryland's First District, serving in the 86th and 87th Congresses. He was a tireless worker for the First District, and we will miss him greatly.

Congressman Johnson was a native of his district, having been born in Snow Hill, MD, in 1909. He attended schools in Worcester County, MD, and received degrees from the University of Virginia and the University of Maryland. He was admitted to the bar and returned to Snow Hill, where he established his law practice. In 1932 he was elected chairman of the Board of Commercial National Bank in Snow Hill. Even after Congressman Johnson

left the House he remained an inhabitant of the First Congressional District, living in Berlin until the time of his death.

Mr. Johnson had a long and distinguished career in government. In 1934, he became Maryland's youngest State's attorney at the age of 24. In 1938, he was elected to office as a State senator, and he served in this capacity until 1951. At the time of his first election, he was the State's youngest senator. Later, in 1958, he was elected to his first term in the U.S. Congress, and served until 1963. After his retirement from the House, he returned to his law practice, specializing in international law.

In his brief career in the House, Mr. Johnson served Maryland's First District with honor and distinction. He was involved with foreign affairs, his first love, becoming a congressional expert on the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. However, his first priority was his district. He worked hard for the First District, introducing bills to study the Rock Hall Harbor, to survey the Hoga River and Tar Bay, and to aid the Delmarva Peninsula's wild duck and geese population. These measures worked to better the livelihood and enjoyment of the First Congressional District.

Representative Thomas Francis Johnson was a good man, representing the First Congressional District to the best of his ability. As his former constituent, I thank him for his actions. The death of Representative Johnson is a blow to the Eastern Shore and all Maryland. We lose a staunch defender of our hopes and dreams. He will be missed.

TRIBUTE TO STUART AND  
CAROL SOLOMON

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my good friends Stuart and Carol Solomon, two wonderful people who have tirelessly devoted their energy and resources over the past 18 years to the Jewish community of the San Fernando Valley. The University of Judaism and Valley Beth Shalom will honor Stuart and Carol at a tribute breakfast on February 28, 1988, for their many years of outstanding service.

Stuart's extensive volunteer and business affiliations testify to his commitment to the many facets of Jewish life. Not only is he president of Genesta Realty Services, Inc. and Genesta Property Management, he serves on the boards of the United Way North Angeles Region, the Community Relations Committee, the Valley Presbyterian Hospital Foundation, and the Jewish Federation Council-San Fernando Region. He is president of the Basin Recreational Environment Committee Non-Profit Foundation and a member of the Young Presidents Organization. Stuart is a past president of the Valley Industry and Commerce Association and was a member of the Jewish Federation Council Synagogue Affairs Committee.

Stuart has also given dedicated service to numerous committees of Valley Beth Shalom.

He served as the vice president of the board of directors, the vice president of both administration and finance, and he chaired the selection committee for associate Rabbi and executive director. Presently, he is the vice chairman of the Board of Governors.

Carol enjoys a successful career as the owner of a manufacturer's representative group which wholesales stationery, greeting cards, and gifts throughout California. Over the years, she has shown great devotion to the education of Jewish youth. She was the first chairperson of Valley Beth Shalom's Bar/Bat Mitzvah counseling program and has also chaired the Multi-Interest Day Care Program, the Passover Basket Program, the educational director search committee and served as the cochair of the Valley Beth Shalom Food Bank. She has been active in the Valley Beth Shalom choir and the Mitzvah needlepoint group.

Stuart and Carol have three fine sons, Jeff, Owen, and Mike, who share the community's pride in their parents.

It is my honor and pleasure to join the University of Judaism and Valley Beth Shalom in paying tribute to Stuart and Carol Solomon for their outstanding contributions and commitment to the Jewish community.

WE THE PEOPLE 1988 TOURNA-  
MENT OF ROSES SALUTE TO  
THE CONSTITUTION'S BICEN-  
TENNIAL

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1988

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the citizens of California and the United States, the California Bicentennial Foundation for the U.S. Constitution sponsored a "We The People" float in the world's most observed annual parade, the Tournament of Roses Parade, on January 1, 1988, in Pasadena, CA. The float was intended to remind all Americans of the ongoing 4-year commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the Constitution.

The float, entitled, "The Constitution: 200 Years of Communicating Liberty," carried the largest American flags ever assembled of roses which symbolically joined the birth of our society, represented by a replica of Independence Hall, with our next great frontier in space, symbolized by astronaut Buzz Aldrin standing on the landscape of Mars.

Along with astronaut Aldrin, the pilot of the *Eagle* lunar lander, other American living legends included Muhammad Ali, representing the continued vitality of the Constitution in protecting the rights of all Americans, and Mickey Mouse, America's most beloved good will ambassador to the world.

Other float riders, representing the diversity of the American experience, included Olympic Gold Medalist Paul Gonzalez, Multi-Cultural Broadcasting Representative Yuko Sakamoto, Boy Scouts of America Cub Scout J. Parker Paul, "We The People" invitees Sarah Beth Heller and Marlene White, Filipino-American representatives Lou Baron and Melanie Cue-

vedas, chairman of the California Bicentennial Commission Jane Crosby, spokesman Mario Machado, and mascot Biscotennial Ben.

This unique internationally observed tribute and salute to the Constitution was made possible by individual donations of rose sponsorships by thousands of Americans from around the Nation whose support should be recognized in this record along with the support of the Filipino-American community, the largest Asian-ethnic community in the Nation, the Walt Disney Co., marking the 60th birthday of America's good will ambassador Mickey Mouse, and the California State lottery. We salute the following individual rose sponsors and invite all Americans to continue commemorative and educational projects increasing awareness and appreciation of the cornerstone of our society, the Constitution.

#### 1988 WE THE PEOPLE FLOAT SPONSORS

ACH Mgmt., Al-Kadosh Shrine Temple #14, Alamar Hope Ranch RWF, Aldaron, Inc., Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc., Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Alta Vista School, American Association of University Women, American Business Women's Assn., City of Livermore, American Federation of Gov't. Employees, American Legion Auxillary, Anaheim Kiwi Club General Fund, Anaheim Republican Women, Aseprol Insurance, Clarisse M. Austin, Baldy View Driving School, Boy Scouts of America, Chaffey Federal Credit Union.

Chapter ES P.E.O., Chevron U.S.A. Inc., Chinese Historical Society, Church Women United, City of Carson, City of Redlands, City of Santa Paula, City of Seaside, Civil Air Patrol, Class of '90, Columbus Elementary School, Cool Area Republican Women Fed., Creative Art Enterprises, Cua & Gan Medical Corp., Cypress High School, DAR-Caleb Gilbert Chapter, DAR-Temescal Chapter, DAR-Don Jose de Ortega Chapter, Del Mar Republican Women Fed., El Dorado County Republican Central Committee, Eureka Log Homes, First City Trust, First Congregational Church, Fullerton Firefighters Assn.

Fullerton Republican Women, Garden School of Fountain Valley, Gilbert Vasquez & Co., Glendale Library, Glendale Republican Womens Study Club, Fed., Goethals & Gaule, Grace Brethern Church, Granada Hills Women's Club, Honda of Pasadena, Huntington Harbour Republican Women, Jake's Refrigeration, Jose Maria Amador Chapter, KCIN Radio, KPSI Radio, Kwikset Credit Union, L.A. Community Colleges, L.A. Express Courier Service, Ladies Auxiliary to V.F.W. Post 2323, Ladies Auxiliary VFW #2563.

Lake County Council of Republican Women, Latham & Watkins, League of Women Voters of Beverly Hills, Leyte Samar, Inc., Local 1061, Long Beach Gentelco Federal Credit Union, Los Angeles Federal Executive Board-GSA, Millbrae Bicentennial Commission, Monterey Bay Republican Women's Club, Montrose Travel, Naval Aviation Depot, Newport Harbor High School Associated Student Body, Nomad Shrine Club Ghom Islam Temple, Northridge Elementary School PTA, Oasis Garden Club of Indian Wells, Ocean View Masonic Lodge #144.

Orange County Republican Women Fed., Palos Verdes Peninsula Rep. Womens Fed., ParkLaBrea Republican Women's Club, Periscope Productions, Pollock Pines Republican Womens Fed. #1726, Preceptor Kappa Omega-Beta Sigma Phi, Professional Nursing Services, Inc., Rancho La Habra

Republican Womens Club, Rancho Mirage Republican Women Fed., Rancho Mirage Republican Womens Fed., Redlands Com. Music Assn., Inc., Redlands Daily Facts, Redlands Senior High School, Redlands Unified School District, Republican Women of the Fort Bragg Area, Richard's Charters, Rose Court 1987, San Fernando Valley Girl Scout Council, San Fernando Valley Rose Society.

San Francisco Republican Women Fed., San Marcos Historical Society, Segraves Associates, Sequoia Garden Club, Shadow Hills Republican Womens Club, Sigma Sigma Chapter, Solano County React, Sorptomists Int'l of Visalia, Stephen J. Cannell Productions, Swaner Hardwood Co., Inc., The William Lyon Company Building Division, Tirso del Tunco, Twin Lakes Elementary School PTA, U.S. Postal Service, University & State Employees Credit Union, University of Riverside, Valley View Republican Women Fed., Vernon Brothers Pharmacy, Vina F. Danks Middle School, Visalia YMCA, Vista Republican Women Fed., Wells Fargo Bank, White K. Baldwin Insurance Agency, Inc., Womens Club of Burbank, Zeta Kappa Sorority of Pepperdine University.

Loretta Abatti, Omar, Catalina & Anne Abuhakmeh, Tomas Q. Aceves, John Acosta, Kenneth Eugene Adams, Joan M. Adams, Helen V. Adams, Clarence Adams, John E. Adams, C. Dy Addison, Greg Adjelman, Mike H. Aguilar, Julia Aguilas, Emilio L. Aguinaldo, Arthur P. Ahner, Elizabeth A. Alcorn, Aurelio Aleman, Nereida Aleman, Fred Aleman, Theresa Aleman.

Aurelio Aleman, John Aleman, Billy Alexander, Doris Alexander, Joanne Alf, Dennis V. Alfieri, Stephen W. Allen, Catherine Allen, Vickie A. Allen, Lynda Allen, Orville Allen, Eddie & Jo Ellen Allen, Maxy Pope Alles, Cathy Allin, Nancy Almind, Angelina Alpentar, Mary Fiedler Althoff, Sally Altick, Rao L. Alturi, Benita G. Alvarez, Raul & Kathy Amaya, Josh & Troy Amaya, L.H. Anderson, Marilyn J. Anderson, David S. Anderson.

Doris D. Anderson, Willard N. Anderson, Andreas Anderson, Bob Anderson, Eleanor Anderson, Willard N. Anderson, Michele J. Anderson, Rose H. Anderson, Laverne Andresen, Pamela Andrisani, Dave Angelo, Heather Antolic, Fred Antonio, Agnes M. Arakawa, Robert C. Archer, John Area, Allison Area, Mary Lou Area, Jack Area, Frank Arevalo, Christian Armas G., Virginia Arnold, Alvaalee C. Arnold, Roscoe J. Arnold.

Michael Arrow, DeLoris E. Arterburn, Yvonne Arthur, Floy Ann Aschemeyer, Manny Aschemeyer, Tami L. Ashley, Barbara Ashwill, Angela Atkins, Robinson & Christopher Atkins, Suzanne Atlas, Vart Rose Avakian, Jan Averill, Edgar W. Averill, Jr., Alice O'Neill Avery, Fe B. Avincula, Ethel L. Axtman, Maria Ayala, Dale K. Babb, Jean Babbitt, Leroy B. Bachmeier, Arthur D. Bachtel, Robert E. Badham, M.C. Daniel L. & Dana Bagley.

Darron Baida, Gerald E. Bailey, Gerald E. Bailey, Willie Baker, John H. Baker, Peter C. Balacuit, Amy Baldridge, MaryLou Baldwin, K. Baldwin, Minnie W. Ball, J. W. Ballard, Jr., Horacio Balvaneda, Chaise M. Banks, Vivian L. Barber, Le Roy Barber, Louise Barker, Beau Barnhart, Hector R. D. Baron, Lourdes Baron, Gregg Baron, Stephanie Baron, Carlton Barrett, Yvette Barry, Victoria Bartholomaus, Richard Bartholomaus, Gwen Bartholomew, Arthur B. Bartlett, Arthur B. Bartlett, Faye E. Bartoletti, Ruth A. Bassignan, Jacqueline M. Battle, Nona Battle, Lorene Baustian, Ruth Baylies.

Julie Beard, Barrett L. Beard, Ken Beasley, Ann Beasley, Earl Beasley, Dave Beasley, Julie Beasley, Mary Beasley, James Beasley, Justin Beasley, Jeanna Beasley, Jeff Beasley, Kenneth E. Beaver, Jonathan Moss Becker, Nancy E. Becker, Dan Becker, Sirre Bell, John Benaphi, Vera Benedict, J. R. Bennett, Joan W. Bennett, Paul V. Bennett, Catherine E. Bennett, Dorothy D. Benson, Joseph I. Bentley, Astra Benton, Martha Benvenuti, Mary B. Benz, Sandy Berk, Michael D. and Karen Berk, James Dee Jeffy Berry, Joan, Chris Berry.

Anna Mae Berta, Randal L. Besch, Carole Beswick, Rich Beth, Tara Beth, Alan Bethanis, Randolph J. Betts, Ricki L. Binger, Joseph & Marilyn Binggeli, Dorothy Birgbauer, Vernon Bishop, Karen A. Bishop, Doris Hoyt Bishop, Lucy A. Bittner, Loretta Blackburn, Herbert L. Blackburn, O. M. Blackwood, Robert W. Blake, Betty Blake, Tiffany Blakemore, Marion & Kenneth Blanck, Marion & Kenneth Blanck, Mary Nell Bland, Richard Lane Bloom, Richard Bloom, Bennie Boac, Les Boesl, Myrna R. Bohall, Bonnie Bohlig, Carroll J. Boles, Rosemarie Boll, Anna Bond, Marguerite K. Bonswor, Gene Booher, Susan Booher, Mary Lou Booher.

Patrissha Booker, Alicia Borrego, Audrey M. Borsch, Ralph K. Boulanger, Frances M. Boulanger, Fred W. Bowen, Alice D. Bowen, Jamie K. Bowman, Carolyn Bown, Howard Bown, Deborah Bown, Virginia Bown, Harold Bowren, Matthew J. Boxer, Rubin and Pearl Boxer, Carol Boyce, Elvis E. Bozarth, Elvis Bozarth, Dean F. Bradley, Nancy J. Brahmst, Beverly G. Brand, Sybil Brand, Henry Braun, Mary E. Brekke, Zella M. Brewer.

Joanne Brewster, Peggy D. Brier, Wes Brier, James W. Brier, Donald W. Brier, Carol L. Brier, Deborah Bright, Christopher Bright, Gilbert B. Brink, Marion Brinson, John J. Bristing, Else Bristing, Jeff Broadwater, Olivia R. Broadwater, George C. Brock, Rita Brock, F. S. Bromberger, Arthur Bronson, Sylvia Brooking, Diann J. Brooks, L. B. Brookshire, Todd Brown, Marie Asteris Brown, Eloise Brown, Victor Brown, Sylvia Brown, Erma M. Brown, Gaye Brown, Scott Brown, Edna M. Bruechert, Elinor Bruhn, Carolyn Bruskin, Sheila J. Bryan, Robert Buccino, Robert S. Buck, Gloria Buckley.

Jasmine Budhu, Ben Budhu, Rhea E. Budreck, William H. Budreck, Eileen V. Buff, Olga C. Bullock, Noel Burch, Rick Burch, Larry Burgess, Alison Burk, Andrew Burk, Valerie Burkhart, Helga Burkley, Evelyn B. Burmester, Richard Burnett, Gabriela Burnette, Margaret Bursiel, Frances L. Burton, Viola J. Buseth, Michael W. Bustos, Rhea Butler, Jettie K. Butler, Jasson N. Byrd, Deborah M. Byrd, Patricia S. Bystrom, Angelina Cabales, Frances G. Cabrera, Willie Mae Caldwell, Chenoa Calvillo, Stevan Calvillo.

Alida Calvillo, Chelsea Calvillo, Anna S. Campbell, Robert T. Campion, Marianne Canepa, Alice C. Cannon, Rita Cano, Priscilla Capellan, Ruth Caprio, Ulysses M. Carbal, John A. Cardoza, Manuel Carillo, Donald L. Carmody, A. Sheryl Carnakis, Fran Carpenter, Georgia A. Carter, Mary A. Casey, John Cassell, Marina Castle, Teresita de Jesus Castro, Teresa Ruiz Castro, Gene Cathey, Nancy Cathey, Buck Catlin, Norma G. Centner, Stela Cepoi, Doris M. Chadwick, Kathy Champion, David L. and Sharon K. Chandler.

Jennifer Chandler, Mortimer Chandler, Joson Chanel, Violet R. Chappelow, Noema Chavarria, Crispina A. Chen, Darlene



Cheney, Layol J. Chilner, Virginia B. Choate, M. Choy, Grace Chu, Natalie Chuhak, David Cibulk, Nicholas Cicco, Francine Cintora, Janet Citron, Michael Cizek, Joseph Cizek, Michael Cizeks, Patricia Clark, B. L. Clark, Athalie R. Clark, Thurmond Clarke, Cheryl Clarke, L. T. Clarke, Vallarie Clarkin, Karla Clarkin.

Quint Clarkin, Paul Clatworthy, Elizabeth F. Clements, Katherine E. Cleveland, Susan Clifton, Paul Clifton, Alan Clifton, Beverly

Clifton, A.R. Cline, June A. Clunie, Mary Cobb, Hal P. Cochran, Dale, Jackie, & Jennifer Cochran, Claudia M. Cochran, Charlene K. Coffey, Cloyd W. Coffey, Constantina Colina, Deborah Colson, Kenneth Compton, Charol Conley Ruth Conrad, Jean Conroy, Brad W. & April E. Constantine, Augustin H. Constantine.

Robert L. Cooch, Peggy A. Cook, Jean T. Cook, Nadine Cook, Odie B. Cook, George E. Cook, Margie Cook, Jean Ojala Coolbaugh,

Jean C. Cooley, David Cooper, Dean C. Cooper, Michael Cooper, Rosemary Renette Corbett, Barbara Corkill, Carl Corley, Virginia Cormier, Frank C. Cornell, Lucy M. Cornell, Isabel M. Coronel, Karen Coropassi, Vivian Corr, Louis M. Corralejo, Carmen Cortes, Arthur A. Cortner, Paul S. Cosman, Ben Cossart, Gilbert Cota, William H. Cotter, Paul S. Cowan, Donna C. Cramer, Beverly Crandell, D. Ellis Crane.