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fifth suspect was arrested this week in Savannah.

Dennis Webb, who has owned the jewelry store in Springfield for 20 years, said this was his first (he began to have doubts about the height of our Son Fe or tumbling season. I continue to evaluate from time to time. Being on these panels was a real "hands on" situation in this grant process and I found that process to be very fair. An effort is made to give the hundreds of applications the attention and concern they deserve. Panelists are rotated off every two years in order to bring in others with new and fresh points of view and provide these people with the satisfaction of feeling well.

The experience for me was invaluable. I honestly think that the funding procedure the NEA now incorporates is the best, in that a national peer group discusses, trades information and evaluates companies and individuals for funding recommendations. Policy making is done to involve people from different areas of the country.

I would be definitely opposed to funds being appropriated to the states for grant distribution. Most charitable entities, do not have a large enough pool of expertise on the state level. Can you imagine having the likes of (name a few) Artistic Director, Art Administrator, commentator from around the country, etc. on the same panel at the same time? Is that possible on a national level and have the pleasure of being on that panel. Pretty mind-boggling for a little girl from Taos, New Mexico!

I don't think any of us would argue what the NEA has done to enrich our cultural life and what the NEA has done for countless organizations and artists throughout the country. In comparison, we, being the richest country in the world give less for the arts per capita than European-Socialist countries. Nevertheless, our policy is far broader in terms. For example, young, emerging artists in Spain have little chance of competing with more established artists and other major organizations are not "rotated off" but may stay on for years with their views and biases. The Spanish government does not have to turn off that panel. It's a tough panel and I have learned a lot.

I am very happy to have made it through the grant process, troublesome and problematic as it is. I am still going through the process and will continue to do so. Since the mid-70's, my company, with the help of the NEA, the National Endowment for the Arts has received over $40,000 in NEA grants. We have performed throughout the United States and have been received in Europe. We have received grants from the NEA and its grant making procedures. We have added that we have received "virtually nothing from the Santa Fe community" in regards to the controversy that now surrounds that organization. One reason may be that the Santa Fe community has not been sufficiently informed of the situation. Reading the paper was the first time I heard of it. I hope my letter will not be the only one that you receive.

Another reason may be that what might appear as an indifferent attitude from artists from this area concerning the NEA. But perhaps it is not so much an indifference, but a feeling of not being able to compete on a national level and, most of all, a feeling of inadequacy when it comes to fulfilling mountains of complicated forms and confronting the bureaucratic process of grant making and awarding. I certainly felt that way when I first started in the early seventies. I had to be practically tarred and feathered before I was persuaded to get into the process. In my ignorance, I felt I had absolutely no chance of competing with say, large companies like the NYC Ballet or Martha Graham, so why bother? In my ignorance, I did not know that I would NOT have to compete with them directly because of certain criteria such as dance form and operating budget. The odds for me, in the beginning, was between 1:100. I didn't become a non-profit organization (I was the first dance company in New Mexico to do so) the first time I didn't have much of one here but did have in Spain), deal with budgets (of which I had no experience whatsoever) to understand the unique language of arts administration, etc., only to be turned down for my efforts the first couple of times. After being turned down for what seemed like months, I understood that I had to learn to adjust ourselves to it. We all want to be in the studio where we belong, and, of course, would much prefer not having to deal with such mundane matters as having to pay the rent this month, where the next buck is coming from, contract negotiations, the care of legal matters and all of these decisions that have nothing to do with our particular artistic expression. But that is a total luxury that most of us will never be able to afford unless we are unbelievably wealthy and few of us are that. If younger, less-established artists are forced to take full-time jobs to support themselves, they will never have the time or energy to develop as artists. We must pursue not only our own works and the support, but also learn to make ourselves sophisticated in the art of survival as well. Besides performing revenue, which are haphazard at best, the one major art is the cultivation.

The NEA's advisory commission to the Institute, peer review panels, are not 'rotated off' but may stay on for years with their views and biases. The Spanish government does not have to turn off that panel. It's a tough panel and I have learned a lot.
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will be painful. Many people have had many amendments.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, let me ask unanimous consent that we revert to the order of morning business. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FUNDING FOR NEA

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, again speaking about the criminal code, which is not before us—the pending business is the Amtrak veto measure, but in any event we hope that we can get to the things we all know we want to get to in the crime package. This would be the reform of the habeas corpus, which is not before us—the pending business is the Amtrak veto measure, but in any event we hope that we can get to the things we all know we want to get to in the crime package. This would be the reform of the habeas corpus, which is not before us—the pending business is the Amtrak veto measure, but in any event we hope that we can get to the things we all know we want to get to in the crime package. This would be the reform of the habeas corpus, which is not before us—the pending business is the Amtrak veto measure, but in any event we hope that we can get to the things we all know we want to get to in the crime package. This would be the reform of the habeas corpus, which is not before us—the pending business is the Amtrak veto measure, but in any event we hope that we can get to the things we all know we want to get to in the crime package. This would be the reform of the habeas corpus, which is not before us—the pending business is the Amtrak veto measure, but in any event we hope that we can get to the things we all know we want to get to in the crime package. This would be the reform of the habeas corpus, which is not before us—the pending business is the Amtrak veto measure, but in any event we hope that we can get to the things we all know we want to get to in the crime package. This would be the reform of the habeas corpus, which is not before us—the pending business is the Amtrak veto measure, but in any event we hope that we can get to the things we all know we want to get to in the crime package. This would be the reform of the habeas corpus, which is not before us—the pending business is the Amtrak veto measure, but in any event we hope that we can get to the things we all know we want to get to in the crime package. This would be the reform of the habeas corpo...
tell you that. I have not the slightest doubt whatever but that John Frohnmayer will do an outstanding job at the endowment, if we will just leave him alone long enough to do it. Let me read a letter which I received from John Frohnmayer the other day. It says:

'I oppose obscenity unequivocally. Obscenity is the antithesis of art: it has no soul; it has no redeeming value and it will not be funded under my administration.'

That, in my mind, is a pretty concise and complete statement of what we can expect from our fine NEA Chairman, and as far as I am concerned it should close the issue. Not only have we already dealt with the obscenity question satisfactorily, but moreover all of this hand-wringing and hyper-ventilating has to be interfering with the ability of the endowment to do its job right. Ever since John Frohnmayer agreed to step into the hot seat this good and sincere man has had to respond to sordid attacks and vapid criticisms from every corner; and yet in our society, too—have been answered with such thoroughness and punctuality that I can only believe that tremendous energy and effort is being expended over there to deal with these constant, half-hysterical questions.

In my mind it is high time that we allow John Frohnmayer a graceful exit from the spotlight so that he can do the job he was appointed to do—and will do that valiantly—to the benefit of all of our constituents. Obviously we cannot control what others say and write about John Frohnmayer or the Endowment—but if we can only bring ourselves to forgo a thundering speech or two on this subject or a few grops of rhetorical excess in the coming weeks and months I think we will be doing Mr. Frohnmayer, our colleagues, the world of art, culture, and letters a remarkable favor. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

DESPITE PRESIDENT'S STEEL PROGRAM, SUBSIDIES CONTINUE

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments of my colleagues' time to discuss some events that have transpired since the time early this year, March 31, to be precise, that the President implemented the steel voluntary restraint agreement program. As our colleagues will recall, the President decided to extend that program through March 31, 1992, and the major policy debate over steel was therefore temporarily concluded last year.

During what will amount to a 30-month transitional period, the President pledged to seek an international consensus on removing unfair trade practices in steel, and allowing a return to a fair and free U.S. market for steel at the end of the transition period.

I take the floor today because I want to report that substantial obstacles to the achievement of this goal still remain and the behavior of the President's behavior is far from imminent. In January of this year, the six leading American steel companies commissioned two independent analysis firms to evaluate the performance of some 21 nations and to do so with regard to their bilateral consensus agreements with the United States. Since many of the principles on which the President hopes to build an international consensus on steel are contained in these bilateral agreements, it would be most disconcerting to learn that most of the 21 are violating their pacts.

Yet disconcerting as it would be to learn that that is precisely the message of the recently released report, "Steel at a Glance." It documents the violations of the various countries, some less flagrant than others, but all impediments to obtaining a worldwide consensus for our domestic steel industry. Today's subsidy of the day comes from Brazil. The subsidization of steel production continues to run rampant in this country despite recent changes in economic policy. According to the report, "Steel at a Glance,"

Acominas, a state-owned integrated mill, transferred a large part of its debt to government-owned Siderbras under a "financial restructuring agreement," and other operating companies reportedly have done the same, thereby improving their financial performance.

Furthermore, it turns out that Siderbras itself is being dissolved during President Collor's restructuring of the Government. Instead, the holding company's debt, totaling nearly $13 billion U.S. equivalent, will be administered by the Banco de Brazil under the auspices of the Economic Ministry. That means the Government will also take on the financial rescue packages offered by Siderbras to two other ailing state-owned mills, Cosips and CSN. These packages will provide $400 million and $600 million, respectively.

These are conclusive examples that Brazil is continuing its subsidy practices notwithstanding its agreement with the United States. And these are only two of the scores of examples that we have been gathering over the last year of the developing world's misdirected subsidies that are systematically violating the spirit and letter of international agreements, and are also distorting the market for the domestic steel producers. I have told the President and the Senate in previous remarks that these subsidies are the most important issue facing the American steel industry, and I will continue to try to awaken the Senator and the Senate to the seriousness of this situation.
both parties have raised a new condition: movement toward granting Lithuania's demand for independence from Moscow. That approach is particularly surprising since Soviet-bashing no longer commands wide support among voters. Only a fourth of those who responded in an April poll for The New York Times said that Soviets should be brought up as an issue by candidates.

Shulman said the U.S. "should pressure the Soviet Union to give Lithuania its independence." Almost two-thirds judged the demand for Independence from Moscow.

European ancestry nurse a long-standing movement toward concessions in return. The United States Agency for International Development last month awarded a 15-month grant of $230,000 which will allow the World Council to complete the first two steps of a three-step program.

have now learned that the first step is under way—a detailed technical team analysis of the market, legislative, and financial climate in Poland. The second and third steps will be the design of a credit union development program for Poland. Earlier this month, a technical team consisting of representatives of the World Council and the Solidarity Polish Credit Union Working Group traveled to Poland to begin the development of a national credit union movement in that country. The team's work follows up on a February-March credit union study tour of the United States, Canada, and Ireland by six Solidarity representatives.

A development strategy will be written and presented to the Polish Credit Union Working Group before the team leaves on June 29.

In addition to aid, financial support for the month long trip by the 17-member team comes from a number of sources within the international credit union movement, the CUNA Foundation, CUNA Mutual Insurance Group, the Credit Union Executives Society and the various organizations represented by the participants.

A new term is being used in Poland, "Savings and Credit Unions." It emphasizes that savings will be the principal source of funds. Mr. Speaker, I might also add that the first 10 savings and credit unions are expected to be organized and operating in Poland by the end of 1980. This is a long cry from the situation less than a year ago when I urged that the United States provide financial and technical help to Poland because the people had lost faith in government-run institutions there. The Polish people had literally stuffed their savings—estimated at $7 billion—in mattress, or under floorboards, or in cookie jars, because of fears of confiscation by the state.

ENDORSEMENT OF NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

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

[Mrs. LOWEY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CHAIRMAN ANNUNZIO REPORTS ON POLISH CREDIT UNION DEVELOPMENT

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, periodically I have given the House a report on the latest information on the development of credit unions in Poland and other Eastern European countries. Poland currently lacks financial institutions serving the savings and credit needs of that country as it moves toward becoming a democracy. The Solidarity union movement has chosen credit unions for this role because of their worldwide success during the last 140 years.

As chairman of House Banking Subcommittee on Financial Institutions, I proposed and received the endorsement of the Credit Union National Association and the World Council of Credit Unions to work with Poland's Solidarity in providing technical training to create a credit union system. I also urged the administration to provide funding for this endeavor. The U.S. Agency for International Development last month awarded an 18-month grant of $230,000 which will allow the World Council to complete the first two steps of a three-step program.

have now learned that the first step is under way—a detailed technical team analysis of the market, legislative, and financial climate in Poland. The second and third steps will be the design of a credit union development program for Poland. Earlier this month, a technical team consisting of representatives of the World Council and the Solidarity Polish Credit Union Working Group traveled to Poland to begin the development of a national credit union movement in that country. The team's work follows up on a February-March credit union study tour of the United States, Canada, and Ireland by six Solidarity representatives.

A development strategy will be written and presented to the Polish Credit Union Working Group before the team leaves on June 29.

In addition to aid, financial support for the month long trip by the 17-member team comes from a number of sources within the international credit union movement, the CUNA Foundation, CUNA Mutual Insurance Group, the Credit Union Executives Society and the various organizations represented by the participants.

A new term is being used in Poland, "Savings and Credit Unions." It emphasizes that savings will be the principal source of funds. Mr. Speaker, I might also add that the first 10 savings and credit unions are expected to be organized and operating in Poland by the end of 1980. This is a long cry from the situation less than a year ago when I urged that the United States provide financial and technical help to Poland because the people had lost faith in government-run institutions there. The Polish people had literally stuffed their savings—estimated at $7 billion—in mattress, or under floorboards, or in cookie jars, because of fears of confiscation by the state.

ENDORSEMENT OF NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

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

[Mr. LOWEY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

STATEMENT ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

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

[Mr. GINGRICH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]
tlemen from New York [Mr. Weiss] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) comes before Congress for reauthorization this year in the midst of a political tempest. Strangely, at the eye of the storm lie a few small photographs, notably some taken by the late Robert Mapplethorpe. The tiny group of outspoken legislators and other individuals who are generating these menacing winds thunder for restrictions of what NEA-funded artists may produce. In doing so, they are ignoring several critical realities.

First, a majority of their constituents supports Government funding of the arts without content restrictions based on political judgment. A recent nationwide poll reveals that 61 percent of the American public feels the NEA is an appropriate use of public funds. A governmental body that purportedly supports the arts against its critics in the current debate.

Second, NEA-funded artists do not have a perfect track record. In the NEA's 25-year history, less than 0.5 percent of all applications have been denied on the grounds of obscenity.

Rather than celebrating this unique record of success, however, NEA critics focus on the handful of grants that have received negative attention, and seek to revise or destroy the whole NEA grantmaking procedure. Instead, these critics should focus on the NEA's monumental achievement.

To date, 3,000 grants have been made, $1 billion in public funding has been given to professional artists, and 400 magazines, 100 films, and 680 professional theater companies and 400 theaters have received support. Each of these achievements have grown exponentially.

This government-generated phenomenon of the arts profoundly impacts the economy of our country. Economic studies demonstrate clearly that the arts are a major generator of income. In a 1985 report, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce estimated that the overall economic impact of the arts in the area amounted to nearly $5.1 billion per year.

A 1987 report on the New York City and New York-New Jersey metropolitan area states that the arts have a $9 billion impact on the economy, creating more than $2 billion in personal income and over 117,000 jobs. The more than 1,900 arts institutions in the region entertain an annual audience of 64 million—13 million of whom are visitors from outside the region. These visitors, who come primarily or extend their stay for arts and culture, together with the proceeds of touring companies, generate an estimated $1.8 billion for the area.

Among the most important ways that the NEA is supporting the arts is by helping to fund the arts as a business. The NEA helps the arts industry to increase its market share, to reach new audiences, and to increase its profitability. In doing so, the NEA is helping to create jobs and to increase the gross national product.

One last point that grant restriction advocates must keep in mind: restrictions based on political content of art are a violation of the First Amendment. Many constitutional scholars believe that such restrictions violate the first amendment guarantee of freedom of expression. The New School for Social Research recently filed suit in a New York federal district court based on this claim.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the first amendment does not disappear just because the taxpayers pick up the tab. In 1985, in Spertus vs. California, the Supreme Court held that a rule requiring any one who sought to take advantage of a property tax exemption to sign a declaration stating that he did not advocate the forcible overthrow of the Government of the United States. This Court stated that:

"to deny an exemption to claimants who engage in certain forms of speech is in effect to penalize them for such speech (Id., at 518, 79 CT., at 521)."

One can clearly see the parallel of this case to the current obscenity pledge artists are required to sign if they are to receive an NEA grant.

In Perry versus Sindermann (1972), the Court stated that:

"neither by subsidy nor penalty, may the government impose a prior restraint on speech."

And, in unanimously opinion in the 1983 case Regents of the University of California, Chief Justice William Rehnquist wrote that neither by subsidy nor penalty, may the Government "aim at the suppression of dangerous ideas."

Again, in Federal Communications Commission versus the League of Women Voters of California (1984), the Court held that editors, however controversial, may not be banned from the airwaves—even though the taxpayers foot the bill for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

A nation that has long distrusted loyalty oaths should not jump to the conclusion that they do not breach the line of acceptability. As Justice Thurgood Marshall once put it, the problem with a sword of Damocles is that it does not disappear.

Obviously, the Government must exercise some control over publicly funded obscene art. Perhaps the NEA could make a stamp which says "Government Approved: Not Obscene" and on every piece
of art with Government funding we can put that stamp "Government Approved: Not Ob-scene." I don't think we want that either.

No, I think the best solution by far is to accept the fact that we may at times have disagreements over what should be funded, but to retain our policy supporting the National Endowment for the Arts without censorship. Surely, the principles of free speech and support for the arts are more important in the end than disagreements about a very few pieces of art.

Mr. Speaker, the President has stalwartly supported the NEA, and Chairman John Frohnmayer so far, and I congratulate him for his splendid stance, and encourage him not to capitulate to narrow-minded censors now.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has always been a leader in the free expression of the human spirit. Though other countries have histories thousands of years longer than ours, we have quickly become a major contributor to the arts and humanities, to letters, but we have not done well enough.

According to Executive Director of the NEA Frohnmayer, to fully achieve its goals, NEA needs $300 million.

According to studies of the NEA, each Federal dollar invested in art by the NEA generates $10 in private donations, a 10-1 to 1 positive economic impact.

In 1988, $119 million was distributed by the NEA in the form of grants, which in turn generated almost $1.4 billion in private donations.

The United States spends about $3 per capita each year on Federal funding for the arts. Germany spends $274, the Netherlands spends $23, France spends $22, Canada spends $21, and Japan spends $7.

If you compare Federal spending per capita, the United States still spends only $28 per capita each year.

Mr. Speaker, before the NEA, you had to travel to New York to see a play, and opera, or a major art exhibit. The NEA has brought art and culture to the people all over the country.

And a single community arts center receiving an NEA extension grant provides other fine benefits: programs that target children at risk, schoolchildren, the disabled, and minority populations. The outreach of the NEA is encouraging and very cost effective. But we need more.

It would be a travesty not to expand the cultural horizons of our country, especially our children. I urge my colleagues to view the NEA as an investment in our children's future.

Mr. Speaker, I also condemn any efforts to restrain the creative energies of NEA grant recipients. Art is a beacon of freedom. To confine the arts, or to put a price tag on what they can achieve is to confine our country.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a travesty to turn our back on the benefits of the NEA. We measure up to other nations poorly in so many ways: education and health outputs, mass transportation, infrastructure, and most disappointing treatment of America's children, our most precious asset. Let us not add failing support for the arts to that embarrassing list.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe the opportunity to participate in this special order on the National Endowment for the Arts [NEA] and I wish to thank my colleague from New York, Mr. Weiss, for organizing this time so that we can recognize the outstanding work of the NEA in fostering the arts in the United States.

I am privileged to represent New York's 15th Congressional District, which is home to many of America's great cultural institutions: the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Museum of Modern Art, the Guggenheim Museum, the Whitney Museum, the Frick Collection, the Jewish Museum, Carnegie Hall, Town Hall, and the theater district. In addition to the famous museums and theaters, the vibrancy of New York's cultural life is augmented by countless repertory theaters, small and medium-sized museums, dance companies, concert halls, cabarets, poetry readings, crafts festivals, art galleries, outdoor art shows, and film festivals in number, film festival varia-

ty, and the overall outstanding quality of those cultural entities that have made New York City one of the cultural centers of the world.

However, one of the fascinating changes in the arts has been the ability of the NEA to extend the range of art that is being created. The privilege of those who live in or able to travel to a major metropolitan center like New York City is one of the most special blessings that we have experienced as a nation. The NEA has come about because the National Endowment for the Arts has provided seed money, local artists, art and grants that have enabled local artists to begin writing, painting, composing, and developing projects and to thrive.

Mr. Speaker, I have a quote from one of our Presidents: "I am proud to speak this evening in strong support of reauthorizing the National Endowment for the Arts..."

Mr. Owens of New York. I am proud to speak this evening in strong support of reauthorizing the National Endowment for the Arts...
As Mr. Reegan and thousands of other people who are knowledgeable about art assert, artists create art to reflect society, to explore societal ideas and concepts. They do not choose to paint what is comfortable and acceptable to us. If they did art would be universally boring; there would be nothing new, nothing daring, nothing to make us think about the art itself and about what it is reflecting.

A person who grew up in the savage ghetto of an inner-city, who lived in run-down housing projects and went to school in a crumbling, rat-infested school, who's family was left out of the trickle-down economics theory of the Reagan era, is not going to paint a pretty portrait of the former President. That artist is also not going to paint pretty pictures of landscapes and fruit bowls, and flogging kittens. That artist's portrayals are more likely to reflect the experiences of his or her life and the anger of being shut out from the prosperity apparently being realized elsewhere in society.

When that artist paints pictures of ugliness and despair and we condemn that art as bad or inappropriate, we are saying about that person's life? Are we saying it was bad, not legitimate, and not worthy of a true portrayal? Yes; we are. And what are we then saying about that person?

These are some of the human dynamics of this debate. I do not see how we can condemn art which is ugly, art makes us think about realities that we may not have experienced. This art is reflecting things that are happening in our society, and closing our eyes will not make those things go away. Such art can help us recognize other influences in our culture, and even help us understand them. And if it does not help me or you specifically, you can be sure that it is helping someone, somewhere, who can relate to it.

This is what the freedom of expression is all about. The freedom to depict images and realities which may be offensive, but which help us explore influences in our culture that we would otherwise not experience. An image or a picture in a book can travel across the world and affect people all over the world. People who live in remote communities, even in the United States, may have access to a library program which contains books of stories or books of art which can allow the people in that community to explore the arts and to witness the images of the experiences of people from all corners of the world.

The NEA has financed many programs which promote access to the arts for people who otherwise would not be able to experience art. These programs may include bringing a dance troupe into rural areas on a tour, or it may include sponsoring a musical exploration program for poor students in the inner-city.

In my district in central Brooklyn, the NEA has funded many small and worthwhile community programs. One such program is operated by the Bedford Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation. This program is a safe haven for artists workshops, weekend youth programs, exhibitions of works of artists from around the world, writers workshops, poetry readings, and other such programs. Students who have participated in this program have gone on to work at such renowned institutions as the School of the Visual Arts and Pratt Institute. The center received a $36,000 grant from the NEA last year to help fund this multicultural center. With such programs, restoration has become well known and attracts children and adults from throughout the city.

Another cultural program funded by the NEA in my district is New Radio and Performing Arts, a pioneer in the fields of experimental documentaries, contemporary radio drama, and experimental art radio and sound experiments for the broadcast media. Endowment support over several years has helped this organization to explore new projects about women poets of color and identity new talents underrepresented in the nuclear families and the community. One example of this is a new weekly program in which a young black journalist will document black student activism in the nineties. New radio and performing arts is reaching out to young audiences and is committed to reaching a culturally diverse audience. They will use their most recent grant of $75,000 to support "Bluesstage," a weekly series on the blues in America.

Endowment support to another institution in my district, the Brooklyn Museum, has funded a variety of projects intended to showcase specific new art forms as well as to provide broader institutional support. These include a $1 million challenge grant for critical facility repairs, funds earmarked to mount the museum's collection of African art, and funds to aid in the preparation of a comprehensive catalog of the museum's American paintings collection, considered to be one of the five most significant in the country. Smaller programs targeted to the local multicultural community seek to increase access to different art forms and exploration of the arts by children and the community at large. These programs include a series exploring African-American video which study issues of importance to the community, "The Feminist 'I'; Video Programs From the Women Make Movies Collection," exploring a variety of multicultural feminist issues in approximately 40 tapes, and "VideoNet for Kids," a program which will begin this fall and introduce children aged 6 to 18 to this vital electronic art form through screenings, discussions, and hands-on workshops.

These and many other worthwhile community programs which have been funded by the NEA, and thousands more have been funded nationwide. Mr. Speaker, of more than 80,000 grants, only 20 or 25 have been considered controversial. For this, some members of this body are advocating that we eliminate the entire program.

Members are rising up in arms because tax dollars have been spent on funding these controversial projects. Mr. Speaker, each taxpayer is responsible for only 82 cents of the total yearly budget for the NEA. Compare that with the cost per taxpayer for each $20 million rocket that blows up, or the astronomical cost of the $500 billion S&L bailout. Where is the outrage over the cost to the taxpayers of these million- and billion-dollar black holes?

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. Wolfe). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Delay) is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. Delay, addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Owens) is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. Owens of New York addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE NOTCH YEARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Machtley) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.
fits of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. The disease prevention and risk reduction attributable to reducing the top 25 will be authoritatively assessed. Given scientific uncertainty, this assessment will necessarily involve a range of plausible benefits.

The decisions we are making with these Clean Air Amendments of 1990 to improve air quality are perfectly well intended but relatively uninformed. We do not know the extent of the public's actions of various levels of exposure through the emission reductions achieved under current law. We do not know which of these reductions have been more beneficial or which targets for future reductions would be the most promising. This Fitter amendment would assure that the next round of clean air decisions will be both well intended and well informed.

The Fitter amendment is needed to supplement the section 903 accountability provision of the committee reported bill, because understanding the economic consequences—the costs of reducing emissions is not enough for society to manage its resources. The extraordinary scientific uncertainties involved in determining the least, the amount of exposure to potentially toxic compounds must be examined, and the implications of this uncertainty for resource management better understood, if Congress is going to be able to achieve the full range of beneficial effects we desire from our clean air program. Overall, I conclude that, while it may be prudent to evaluate post-MACT residual risks and to implement additional emissions reduction measures in appropriate cases, we should not at this late stage be legislating black-line residual risk standards that could result in plant closures and have other severe social and economic impacts. At least until we can be more confident in the numbers resulting from cancer risk assessment calculations, we should adopt a more flexible approach to regulating post-MACT emissions from productive industrial facilities. In particular, some allowance should be made for considering the feasibility, the cost, and the economic and social implications of actions that might be required to achieve further reductions in post-MACT residual risks. The most appropriate means of addressing any residual risk must take into account the unrealistic assumptions that have been made regarding such assessments, and the potential misuse of risk assessment for setting black-line regulatory standards.

PROTECT THE TAXPAYER'S MONEY

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1990

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal printed this interesting editorial on the continuing argument over the National Endowment for the Arts [NEA]. I feel this editorial further confirms my belief that we must strive to spend the taxpayer's money in a responsible manner, as the journal states that the NEA is "no longer the dispenser of arts but the dispenser of public funds". (From the Wall Street Journal, May 21, 1990.)

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

What they're showing to the public at the New Orleans Museum of Art is in an exhibition called Gifts to the Visual Arts? Yes, it is true that redens from BMW of North America and the Rockefeller Foundation of Clevelend have contributed to reducing the outbred heard over Serrano's crucifix in urine or the most marginal Mapplethorpe photographs. That is because, with a few exceptions, their standards are not too high. Theirs don't shock or amuse or inspire or do much of anything.

There are indeed serious issues involved in the dispute over NEA. There has been a need to reduce the public's money to the arts establishment. NEA, academics, some curators, many newspaper art critics perpetuate the idea that the work isn't the most interesting. Thus, NEA's scarce support is not being used as intended.

In a remarkable op-ed piece in the New York Times last July, the well-known American artist Helen Frankenthaler argued that notwithstanding the incendiary issues of Serrano and Mapplethorpe, more attention might be given to what she called "artists at enterprise."

As a member of an NEA advisory council, Ms. Frankenthaler said, "I myself find the 'crucifix in urine'-the representations of the panels and the grants given of increasing dubious quality, that increasingly more and more..." Professors, respondents, I feel there was a time when I experienced loftier minds, relatively unloaded with politics, fashion and chic.

Well, of course, Ms. Frankenthaler's plea for the restoration of quality sank like a stone. Behaving like some threatened bricklayer's union, the arts establishment has locked arms to oppose anyone who dissents from the orthodoxy they've imposed on American art.

And it is indeed on orthodoxy, of a much more recent sort, that the NEA has most been attacked. Here, no matter how reductionist or outrageous, has to be "understood." If they have created a movement, it would have to be called hyperbolic, the new school of criticism that has grown up with a relentlessly empathetic. This is from a very prominent newspaper art critic's review of Mr. Serrano:

"One of the more alarming aspects of the attack on the endowment has been the assumption of many of those doing the con- demning that there is no responsibility to consider the art as it was meant to be seen."

He ends, "how can anyone find in his work lust, obscenity and disrespect? It is hard to believe that anyone whose faith is searching and secure would not be grateful for what Mr. Serrano has done." Few critics or administrators today speak rank intellectually from this orthodoxy. The director of the Corcoran in Washington, who dissented from the majority on Mapplethorpe, was driven from her job.

We are not reopening the famous debate over modernity and American society. Modern, or avant-garde work, is not the problem. The problem is that the artists and intellectuals who cry "free expression" to disallow any forceful critique of their enterprise have achieved so little with their freedom. Nor is it the publicly funded artists alone whose achievement is so insubstantial.
The securities markets, lowering the cost of capital further and stabilizing the dollar. Both our balance of trade and our ability to invest abroad will be strengthened. The balance of the funds, about $250 billion, would be used for direct assistance to local governments. Enormous pressure has been put on state and local governments to deal with social problems that are national in scope: education, health care, crime, housing, the environment, etc. With a slowing national economy and the continuing budget cuts, local governments have had to raise taxes and cut services time and time again. The year 1990 is likely to be a year of transferring responsibilities to local governments and having them financed locally. This is terribly destructive. A national investment program for our own wealth, the local governments by making it possible for them to reduce their own taxes by an amount equal to the Federal contribution, and to keep a pool of local sales taxes, property taxes and income taxes. Such a program, a different version of revenue-sharing, would stimulate local economies, allow them to develop new sources of revenue to cope with national problems, while causing a rollback in some of the more regressive local taxes. Local governments should be given the option of using up part of the Federal funds for high priority areas of social need such as public education and the fight against drugs. It is not enough for the President and the Nation's Governors to set ambitious goals for public education by the year 2000. The States have to be given the means to carry out those goals.

If we continue on our present road, of borrowing and spending and selling our national assets; of neglecting our environment, our cities and our children; of giving up one industry after another to foreign competition; in short, of ceding the United States' position in the world whether or not we have a financial crisis. We will not be in a position to play an important role in the reconstruction of Eastern Europe, or to regain a position of world leadership. We will also see a steady erosion in our standard of living and in the polarization of our society. Dealing with our budget problems is easy; we should simply stop acting like a poor country. However, for a change to occur, political leadership is required; leadership forward. The Democratic party should produce that leadership, at some political risk, by proposing to invest in this Country and by defining a role for government in partnership with other constituencies. We will have to develop a national consensus to manage our affairs differentiy as we approach the year 2000 if we are to retain a position of world leadership. The world is changing very rapidly and, in Japan as well as in the West, we can see governments working in partnership with business without creating corporatism or government domination of the economy. We cannot afford an ideology that leaves us less and less competitive. There is always a risk in saying: "The emperor has no clothes," but that risk is small compared to the risks run every day by the Lech Walesa, the Vaclav Havel, the Mikhail Gorbachev, the Nelson Mandela and F.W. de Klerks and by the people demonstrating in the streets of Eastern Europe. Democratic presidents should raise their sights, and ask this Country to live up to the ideal the world is striving for.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 22, 1990]

AN IRELEVANT PARTY

(By Robt. Rowe)

Felix Rohatyn, the investment banker who helped save New York City from bankruptcy 15 years ago, came to town a few days ago and tried to snap a decadent Democratic Party out of the doldrums. It was a wake-up call from a lifelong Democrat.

"Ever since I came to this country, at the age of 14 from occupied France," he said at the Women's National Democratic Club, "the Democratic Party stood for what I believed in: internationalism and the defense of freedom abroad and fairness in the distribution of wealth."

But in recent years, Rohatyn charged, Democratic presidents have been the GOP's "conservative, if not reactionary" stance on abortion, school prayer and gun control, as well as its commitment to the wealthy through tax cuts and deficits in the markets. He asked: "What does the Democratic Party stand for as an alternative to this [Republican] program? It is exceedingly hard to tell because the Democrats are not an opposition party. The Democrats share power, they do not seek it... [In Congress] they are part of an existing power structure, almost a coalition government with a Republican administration."

Rohatyn charged that today's Democratic leaders, secure in the statehouses, have fallen into a Republican trap by shunning the dreaded T-word (taxes) and equally feared L-word (liberal). That means that "no rational discussion of resource allocation or of fairness can take place... that no rational discussion of an active governmental role anywhere can take place."

The Joint Republican-Democratic abandonment during the 1980s of a cohesive role for government produced today's sad state of affairs: the country is reeling from a budget deficit, unable to help finance the great victory of democracy over communism in Eastern Europe, the United States sits by helpless, as the S&L, the lax government policy in Europe, and Asia increase their domination of the global economy. An overflow crowd of Leftists at the Democratic club, accustomed to being fed Pablum-like reassurances from party leaders, was held spellbound by the disillusioned Rohatyn. At the end of the talk, they gave him an ovation.

But Democratic Party loyalists don't take kindly to Rohatyn's challenge. The party loyalists would rather remind you that they have controlled the House since 1957, have a majority in the Senate and 29 of the 50 governors. But not the White House.

There, the Democrats have been shut out since Jimmy Carter. The House Republican agenda, as the public perceives it, is too close to George Bush's popularity, no leading Democratic politician is making an open bid for the dubious honor of successor to Bush's senatorial nomination. Ambitious Democrats would prefer to battle Dan Quayle in 1986—a chance they may not be granted by more clever Republicans.

The Democrats should be dealing with the real world of today, not some dream scenario of the future. But every time some ven}
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the compromise left a bad taste in everyone's mouth.
I was active in last year's Senate debate on the NEA, and was one of the two Members who rose last July to speak against the Helms amendment. Why? Not because I am a big fan of the Mapplethorpe portfolio. Not because I think art should be offensive, or pornographic. And not because I believe lascivious art should live high off the hog on taxpayers' money.
I rose because the amendment came dangerously close to prescriptive what constitutes art. And for me, that comes dangerously close to censorship—very, very slippery area. I certainly do not endorse pornography. But I also do not endorse attempts to muzzle our much-admired American spirit, our ability to express ourselves freely and creatively. As President Bush said recently:
I would prefer not to risk censorship, or risk the Federal government into telling every artist what he or she can paint, or how he or she might express themselves.
There is another argument expressed by the government has no business funding the arts at all, especially in this time of budget deficit. Reinforcing that view is the constant reference made to the sick art and immoral trash funded by the NEA. Those references gave many the impression that a radical, independent agency known as the NEA has been running amok promoting offensive art since 1965.
I agree that we must be careful to spend money on only those programs that are worthwhile. But I do not think that the majority of people realize that the NEA has touched their communities—its an agency that has proven itself to be not only worthwhile, but exemplary.
The NEA was created with bipartisan support in 1965 to foster professional excellence of the arts in America, and helping create a climate in which the arts may flourish. To that end, the NEA has successfully provided $82,900 grants since its inception in 1965. Of these, less than 25 have been the subject of controversy. That is a track record to be very proud of.
My home State of Rhode Island is small in size, but rich in cultural and artistic activity. For us, the NEA has had a far-reaching and positive impact on our children, our communities and our economy. From schools to cities and towns in Rhode Island participated in arts programs, and more than 125,000 people attended non-profit arts events sponsored in part by the NEA. Rhode Islanders invested $76,900 in fiscal year 1989 in NEA-funded projects, benefiting 125 organizations, 400 schools, and 80 artists. The net result of all this, popular public programs flourish.
I might add that NEA moneys are often matched 3 to 1 by private sector funds, thus generating a tremendous amount of support for, and stimulating public/private partnerships in, the arts. Those partnerships bring communities together for the enjoyment and benefit of all involved.
Furthermore, contrary to popular belief, NEA funds are not reserved exclusively for artists and art institutions. In fact, the broad, diverse range of individuals and groups that receive NEA support come as a very big surprise to most. Schools, churches, community groups, groups for seniors with mental or physical handicaps, libraries, boys and girls clubs, parks, theaters, and even prisons have received NEA funding in a work-related program.
NEA-sponsored projects are not elite, radical activities that are of interest only to a very few. They are projects that are accessible to everyone, projects that improve the quality and richness of our—and our children’s—lives. Most of us have probably taken part in NEA-sponsored events without ever realizing it. For example, here are just some of the hundreds of NEA-sponsored Rhode Island projects:
"Project Discovery," which allowed 18,500 students to attend 41 performances at Trinity Repertory Co. in Providence:
The West Warwick "chance to dance" afterschool activity for 100 fifth- and sixth-graders;
Museum tours and programs for 12,000 students at the R.I. Museum of Design;
A Pawtucket art program for persons with cerebral palsy;
The Providence first night celebration;
The Newport Folklore Society;
The Cranston "Big Sister" Association; and
The Boston Museum of Fine Arts’ Renoir exhibit.
That is an impressive list. If there is any debate today about the importance of the NEA, it should be framed in terms of the overall record of the agency, not in terms of a few individual grants that may have escaped careful scrutiny. A new reportables in the bunch should be viewed for what they are—anomalies—instead of being assumed as the yardstick by which the entire agency is judged.
Let us let the fires of originality burn. Sure there will be some singeing, but I think that is a risk worth taking if we want to allow American creativity to shine. I do not think we want to see safe art—that of the lowest common denominator—become the only art supported by the NEA. The NEA has helped our arts programs flourish. That is what it was created to do. And it is working.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

March 29, 1990

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL'S SELECTED CANCERS STUDY OF VIETNAM VETERANS

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today Secretary of Veterans Affairs Ed Derwinski took quick action to compensate Vietnam veterans ill with non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma. His action came in the wake of an announcement by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) that the CDC Selected Cancers Study (SCS) found an association between service in Vietnam and subsequent development of non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma, a form of cancer. Secretary Derwinski had announced in January that he would make a decision on compensation for non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma when the results of the SCS became available.
I commend Ed Derwinski for his quick and decisive action. He has once again demonstrated that he is more than a mere advocate for veterans. He has shown that he will back up his words with action.
It has been a decade since the Congress became concerned with a possible association between service in Vietnam and subsequent disease. The Congress long ago gave VA the authority to administratively determine that compensation should be paid if such an association is actually demonstrated. The study released today, which found a 50-percent increased risk for non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma, and which also provides no evidence to support the hypothesis that soft tissue sarcoma or other cancers can be associated with service in Vietnam, will be the most complete study on this question we will ever have.
The Centers for Disease Control study, mandated by Public Law 96-151, is a case control study designed to determine if there is an increase among Vietnam veterans in the incidence of several serious, but relatively rare cancers—lymphoma, including non-Hodgkin’s and Hodgkin’s lymphoma, soft tissue sarcoma, and nasal, nasopharyngeal, and primary liver cancers.
According to Report 101-82, published by the Senate Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to accompany S. 1153, the selected cancers study is an extremely powerful one. It has a 98 percent chance of identifying a doubled risk of soft tissue sarcoma and a 99 percent chance of finding a doubled risk of non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma. The study design and implementation were monitored by the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), an independent arm of the U.S. Congress. In a letter dated March 27, 1990, OTA reported the study is “very well designed, conducted, and analyzed.”
In September 1987, when I introduced S. 1692—the first Senate bill to call for automatic compensation for veterans with non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma—I said: “The evidence is not perfect, but it will never be perfect... The essence of leadership is to
President Gorbachev faces this challenge. He knows that communism has only proven efficient at murdering millions and producing stagnation. He has yet to demonstrate a knack for trying to make Soviet society more just by only tinkering with a system designed to prohibit its own reform. But Lithuania’s independence is a necessary condition for Gorbachev’s success as a reformer. His political position within the Kremlin can only weaken if the gridlock over this issue continues.

At the same time, Mr. President, the Lithuanian Government is not simply waiting for Gorbachev to negotiate. On the contrary, it has repeatedly invited him to do so. President Landsbergis has offered to directly discuss every Soviet concern about Lithuania until both sides can reach an agreement.

He has explicitly acknowledged Soviet military interests in having a secure and stable border with Eastern Europe. He has appealed for a close relationship of trade and economic exchange with Moscow.

He has directly offered to discuss the sensitive problems of service in the Red army by Lithuanian residents and the land ownership claims of the U.S.S.R. And he has opened the door to a gradual, orderly withdrawal of his Republic from the Soviet Union.

The United States, Mr. President, must continue to actively support the Lithuanian Government on each of these points and work to achieve the needed international recognition for President Landsbergis so that he can go to the Kremlin as a credible leader of his people.

We cannot hesitate in reminding the Soviets that America, as one of the world’s great friends, will never stop defending Lithuania’s natural right to sovereignty.

Gorbachev is running out of excuses. Rumbling tanks and puppet prosecutors will not abet his problems or those of the Lithuanians. We must impress upon him the moral and political imperative to deal with President Landsbergis in a dialog leading to self-determination for his people.

I am confident, Mr. President, that the Lithuanian leaders will deliver the democratic promise to their land. They have once again taught the world a lesson that men and women can build institutions of tolerance and prosperity if they are only left alone.

In this case, the solution exists. It only awaits implementation by a realistic Soviet state and a willing Lithuanian Government.

---

EDWARD MARTENSOON ARTICLE
“PUBLIC SUPPORT: A CONTRACT WITH THE ARTS”

M. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, much has been said lately about the Government’s role in forming the arts, and the role of the National Endowment for the Arts in providing that funding. I ask to submit for the Record an article by Edward Martenson, “Public Support: A Contract with the Arts.”

I believe carefully points out the societal benefits of Federal funding of the arts and the need for continued support.

The article follows:

PUBLIC SUPPORT: A CONTRACT WITH THE ARTS

(By Edward A. Martenson)

Taxpayer support for the arts is not a handout. It is recompense for public service. In 1965, the government began to subsidize the arts modestly, in ways that were carefully designed to address some important public purposes. Specifically, these public purposes were:

1. advancement of the arts, and elevation of American culture;
2. de-centralization, or enhanced availability of indigenous art in all regions; and
3. price moderation, so that the arts are affordable to all citizens.

These public purposes are consistent with, but not predicated on, the priorities of the artists whose activities are subsidized. Understandably, their primary focus is on creativity and command of craft.

In general, it is most reasonable for the government to support the arts as a public good, and for artists to produce it as a public service. The government may regulate and control the marketplace, thus making it market-friendly.

This fact is of concern to the public as well as to artists and private philanthropists. While private philanthropy can ensure the availability of art to the private patrons, public support is our way of ensuring that the arts are not limited to wealthy foundations or government-sponsored institutions. Therefore, public support for the arts is a critical component of the national service legislation that must be available to us.

While government is not obligated to support the arts, a free society is obligated to guarantee the freedom for expression that is art’s lifeblood. Not less than in the field of journalism, an atmosphere of free expression is essential to the vigor with which artists perform their function in society. It is no more in the public interest to tame the arts than it would be to hamstring the press.

Because freedom of expression is inconsistent with all exercises of public approval over the content of any art, the very concept of the critical, self-restrained critic is without meaning. In effect, the public accepts the possibility of an art work that offend-as-spiritual, to be paid for the greater good of a widely-beneficial availability of the art in general.

In general, it is most reasonable for government to contract for public art support, as a public contract, as a public service, and for artists to produce it as a public good, with the government to purchase and distribute. The government determines the availability of the arts and the absence of censored price barriers, the exchange is defined in terms of the national interest, and the arts are not left to commercial exploitation. An atmosphere of artistic freedom is created, and artists desire financial assistance, and they change their behavior to produce and distribute work that serve the public purposes described above.

Obviously, this fragile arrangement can be jeopardized when taxpayers are并对 artists they have helped to finance. That they may be offended is both understandable and legitimate. Art often reflects the extremes of society, and a policy that leads to a public devaluation of the human condition in all its forms, including aspects of our behavior that some might find more than a little uncomfortable.

The solution is not to abandon public policy, nor to avoid controversy. A balance must be struck between the arts that are supported by government and the arts that are supported by private philanthropy. The government must continue to support the arts with the public purposes in mind, but it must also continue to support the arts with the public purposes in mind. This is a delicate balance, and it must be maintained if we are to avoid a loss of freedom for the arts.

---

BROWARD COUNTY, FL SENIORS HONORED

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to honor several Broward County, FL seniors on the occasion of their March 14, 1990 induction to the Dr. Nan S. Hutchinson Broward Senior Hall of Fame.

It is my pleasure to congratulate Sara L. Fetts, Louise and Robert Creider, Nora L. Goldner, Faye Holander, Lester B. Trussler, Marle Young, Joanna Bloneva Hayes Bradley, Gerald Kirschenberg, Irvin Footer, Adele Jacobs, Esther Grossman, and Rose R. Sandle for their extensive community service efforts.

Each of these outstanding individuals has resided in Broward County for at least 10 years and consider this county their home. The seniors have volunteered with area hospitals, the Foster Grandparents Program, and the Meals on Wheels Program, among others. Many of these folks have logged in impressive volunteer schedules of tens of thousands of hours.

By honoring these seniors through induction at the Broward Senior Hall of Fame, they are being recognized for their selfless dedication to the community. These efforts have been especially effective and generous in deploying their time to volunteer service in Florida. That is why I introduced national service legislation in 1989 to promote senior citizens volunteering and convened a hearing on elderly volunteers in Boca Raton, FL.

Mr. President, I ask you and my Senate colleagues to join me in congratulating these impressive Americans. Their accomplishments serve as an example to all of us, and I encourage them to continue their national service endeavors.

---
What damage would be caused by the breakdown of public arts support? Some suppose that the "punishment" would be for the arts institutions, and, of course, it is true that the financial shock to them would be significant. Artists—actors, orchestra musicians, ballet dancers, and visual artists—would be hungrier than they already are. But the greater effect would be measured by a decline in the quality, quantity, and scope of cultural services offered to the public. In particular, the arts would be far less accessible to those who need them. Moreover, the people involve the arts would be less able to defend the public interest in art and the public support for the arts. The NEA paid the entire cost of the public arts support. For this reason, systematic and comprehensive approval over the art's content.

It is true that the withholding of subsidy on grounds of disagreeable content would not be a one-for-one match for its grants; an important implication is that federal money to any private institution, unless it also is validated by private gifts and audience interest. The NEA is far from alone in having seen merit in these projects, and it was a minority partner in financing them.

ST. BARNABAS MEDICAL CENTER CELEBRATES 125 YEARS
Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, on May 12, 1990, the St. Barnabas Medical Center in Livingston, NJ, will celebrate the 125th anniversary of its founding. I rise to congratulate this outstanding medical facility which was incorporated in 1865.

Over the years this outstanding medical facility, the first incorporated hospital under New Jersey law in the State, has been recognized throughout the country for its many achievements. The first kidney transplant in New Jersey was at St. Barnabas, and today the medical center is a national leader in treating end-stage renal disease and transplantation.

Thousands of critically burned patients have received treatment and care at the St. Barnabas Burn Center, New Jersey's only certified burn unit. Today St. Barnabas is one of the five leading gynecologic oncology centers in the Northeast. Its radiation oncology department is recognized for its treatment, training, and research programs. More than 70,000 babies have been delivered at St. Barnabas, and this year its high-risk maternity center will deliver over 5,000 infants.

I am pleased to commend the many achievements and contributions of this outstanding medical facility. I congratulate St. Barnabas as it celebrates its 125th year, and may its fine work continue for many more years to come.

SALUTE TO THE RECYCLING EFFORTS OF ALCAN RECYCLING
Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the efforts of a company in Kentucky is making to address three vital issues facing our Nation: solid waste management, energy conservation, and clean air. Alcan Recycling, a division of Alcan Aluminum Corp., recently opened the world's largest aluminum can recycling facility in Berea, KY.

This facility, Mr. President, will produce about 120,000 tons of recycled aluminum a year. To do so, the plant will operate 7 days a week. 365 days a year, recycling 6 billion cans annually. The facility will support about 100 industrial jobs and provide a substantial boost to the economy of the region.

Through its new recycling facility, Alcan is directly addressing the issue of solid waste management. Recycling is one of the four cornerstones of any responsible solid waste management program. The other three are source reduction, landfills, and combustion.

As our Nation's landfill capacity dwindles and local opposition discourages the sitting of new landfills, we are rapidly running out of space to put our garbage. Combustion of solid waste involves certain environmental and health risks, and, again, local opposition makes siting of new combustion facilities. Recycling has, therefore, assumed an increasingly important role in municipal solid waste management. The Alcan facility in Berea will contribute significantly to this recycling effort in general and of Kentucky specifically.

Alcan is also addressing the issue of energy conservation. As a Nation, we need to reexamine our energy conservation policies. Environmental concerns and resource availability dictate that we must develop new ways to conserve our energy resources. Recycling in general, and recycling of aluminum in particular, is an important step in this direction. At the Alcan recycling facility, creating a new can from an old can requires only 5 percent of the energy needed to create a new can from virgin materials. I'm told that, in 1 year, the energy saved from aluminum recycling would light every home in Kentucky.

Finally, Mr. President, Alcan is addressing the issue of clean air. Clean air, as we all know, has become a very important issue in this Nation. This Congress will soon debate the first major overhaul of the Clean Air Act in 13 years. One of the problems with which we will wrestle is how to balance the need for clean air with the need to maintain a healthy, industrial-based economy. Well, Mr. President, Alcan is doing its part to balance these needs. Alcan's Berea recycling facility is equipped with over $9 million of state-of-the-art pollution control equipment, meaning that over 20 percent of the cost of the Alcan facility is devoted to clean air.

As President, I am proud to represent in the Congress a company so committed to environmental stewardship. The executives and employees of Alcan and are to be applauded for their foresight and their understanding of the challenges of our day and for their dedicated efforts to meet those challenges.
The Embassy is currently requesting the Ministry of Finance to exert its good offices to resolve the dispute, based on the decision of the Bankruptcy Court. A settlement would relieve SIAMTEC from having to initiate a civil suit in Thailand, an action which SIAMTEC states would be expensive and time-consuming.

URUGUAY—SAYOUS

Background
Mr. Sayous alleges that in 1965 the GOU began a calculated harassment of his businesses (beef slaughterhouse and canned foods factory) that finally caused his business to decline to the point of bankruptcy. In 1967, the businesses sought judicial action in order to take steps towards one of its properties to satisfy judgments of creditors. The moratorium was granted; however, Mr. Sayous was unable to obtain sufficient financing to pay his debts and was unable to reach an agreement with his creditors which would have allowed him to reopen his businesses. In November 1988, the Sayous plan was adopted by the Uruguayan legislature. Mr. Sayous says he has been in litigation in Uruguayan courts since 1967. Uruguay states that Sayous' valuation of his businesses and argues that Sayous is stopped by laches.

Recent developments
In July of 1989, the GSP Subcommittee accepted an expatriation petition filed by Mr. Sayous. Mr. Sayous requests that the President suspend GSP eligibility because of the alleged violation of Section 502(b)(4)(A), (B) or (C) of the Tariff and Trade Act of 1984. In addition, the Group was asked to determine whether Uruguay has made or is making good faith efforts to provide prompt, adequate and effective compensation to the petitioner or is otherwise taking steps to discharge its international obligations under Section 502(b)(4)(D). The Expatriation Group's determination will be submitted to the GSP Subcommittee in February 1990.

The process by which U.S. investment disputes are resolved
In the September 13, 1989 Report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, 1989 (H.R. 2839) the Committee on Foreign Operations expressed concern that disputes between U.S. investors and foreign governments take too long to resolve. The report raises the question whether the U.S. Department of State should be more active in assisting a speedy resolution of such disputes and whether additional resources would be helpful. This paper outlines the process by which U.S. investment disputes may be resolved.

In many cases, investment disputes are resolved promptly and amicably through negotiation between the parties. In other cases, one or both of the parties take positions that preclude a prompt resolution. In such cases, the U.S. law generally requires that local remedies must be exhausted by the injured investor. This allows the host government to provide redress for the injury through its own legal system and reduces the number of international disputes between governments. Exhaustion of local remedies under U.S. law helps to refine the issues of fact and law, as the two sides have to explain and document their positions. This gives the U.S. Government improved information on the dispute to use in its efforts to assist the U.S. investor.

While local remedies are being pursued, the U.S. Government seeks methods to facilitate an expeditious resolution of the dispute, for example by bringing the dispute to the attention of the appropriate ministry, or by identifying the individual within the host government the U.S. Investor should contact to discuss the dispute, or by recommending government of the obligations under international law and treaties.

The Interagency Staff Coordinating Group on Expropriations (the "Expropriation Group"), chaired by the Department of State, meets regularly to review the development of GSP-related issues, recommending steps that might lead to a resolution. These steps include direct negotiations between the parties, facilitating actions by the U.S. government, exhaustion of local remedies, and international arbitration or other dispute settlement procedures upon which the parties might be able to agree.

When direct negotiations and local remedies fail to lead to a resolution, the Expropriation Group determines what further action the Department of State should take. Using the information provided by the parties, which should include their positions and evidence developed during the course of their negotiations and efforts to resolve the issue in the host country—the Expropriation Group analyzes, inter alia, whether an expropriation (without adequate compensation) or other violation of international law has occurred. Where there has been such an expropriation or violation, the U.S. Department of State makes a formal demand to the host government to provide prompt, adequate and effective compensation for the U.S. Investor. The Expropriation Group also considers whether the Hickenlooper Amendment, the Gonzalez Amendment, the GSP provision of the Trade Act of 1974, and other relevant statutes are applicable and recommends to the appropriate authority (USITC, Secretary of State or Secretary of Treasury) whether statutory sanctions should be applied.

Unfortunately, there are cases where U.S. Investors seek to bypass the initial stages of dispute settlement and to go directly to application of sanctions found in U.S. domestic legislation. The U.S. law generally requires that the host government enter into direct negotiations with the host government, seeks facilitative good offices from the U.S. Department of State, and exhausts all local remedies. If these steps do not yield results, the investor should discuss international arbitration or other dispute settlement procedures with the host government.

In summary, a U.S. investor's dispute with a foreign government will be most quickly and efficiently resolved if the investor enters into direct negotiations with the host government, seeks facilitative good offices from the U.S. Department of State, and exhausts all local remedies. If these steps do not yield results, the investor should discuss international arbitration or other dispute settlement procedures with the host government. If local remedies and voluntary dispute resolution mechanisms fail, the investor should discuss the provision of good offices from the U.S. investor's position to the Expropriation Group and request that the Group take action pursuant to applicable U.S. statutes.
paintings as obscene. She would never have gained the additional publicity of being depicted in the Washington Post.

However, the freedom to create according to her own thoughts and imagination was just as important to Georgia O'Keeffe as it is to every creative person. Of course, I did not have to take advantage of that freedom. It took enormous effort and energy for her to do so. The discipline required of her and other gifted artists taken in an atmosphere of freedom is what enables creation and discovery to occur.

There is a wonderful couple of paragraphs by Georgia O'Keeffe which illustrate the importance of our accepting the recommendation of the National Endowment for the Arts:

"It was in the fall of 1915 that I first had the idea that what I had been taught was of little value, and some except for the use of my materials as a language—charcoal, pencil, pen and ink, watercolor, pastel, and oil. I had become attached to them when I was young that they were simply another language that I handled easily. But what to say with them? I wasn't going to spend the rest of my life walling the work that I had been doing for several months. Then I sat down and looked at it. I could see how each painting or drawing had been done according to one teacher or another, and I said to myself: "I have things in my head that are not like what anyone has taught me—shapes and ideas so near to me—it is natural to my way of being and thinking that it hasn't occurred to me to put them down." I decided to start anew—to strip away what I had been taught—to accept my own true thinking. This was one of the best times of my life."

There was no one around to look at what I was doing—no one interested—no one to say anything about it one way or another. I was alone and no one except for the use of my own—unknown—no one to satisfy but myself. I began with charcoal and paper and decided not to set any rules and color until it was possible to do what I wanted to do in black and white. I believe it was June before I needed blue.

Mr. President, there is more than good advice for us concerning the National Endowment for the Arts in these good words. There is advice for good living and good politics. But that's the way it is with artists. They are apt to inspire us to do things we did not believe we could do.

REMEMBRANCE OF AMERICAN HOSTAGES IN LEBANON

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, today I join the students, faculty, and administration of Burrville High School in recognizing March 16, 1990, as the anniversary of the kidnaping of Associated Press Bureau Chief, Terry Anderson.

With him are seven other Americans being held by pro-Iranian extremists. I would like to read the names of those individuals in hope that Americans across this Nation will continue to remember them:

- Thomas Sutherland of the American University of Beirut;
- Frank Herbert Judd of the Lebanon International School;
- Joseph James Cicippio of the American University of Beirut;
- Edward Austin Tracy, author;
- Jesse Turner of Beirut University College;
- Alann Steen of Beirut University College; and
- Robert Pohll of Beirut University College.

Furthermore, I would also like to take this moment to honor Lt. Col. William Higgins who was executed by his captors last summer.

In a resolution petitioning Congress, we must also remember all of the Western hostages who have passed hundreds of days and nights in the custody of hostile captors. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to consider the hostage crisis in Lebanon will be found so our fellow Americans and friends will again be free.

ABNER W. SIBAL ENDORSES CONGRESSIONAL TERM LIMITATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Members who disagree that congressional term limitation is a concept whose time has come may have lost touch with the folks back home. One need only look to the States and our constituents to affirm the desire this year showed 70 percent of the American public in favor of term limitation. Last year, the State of South Dakota passed a resolution petitioning Congress to adopt, and send to the States to ratify, a constitutional amendment to limit terms. This year, similar resolutions have been introduced in almost every State. In February, the legislatures in the State of Utah passed a resolution, and in March, the legislature of my own State, New Hampshire, passed one. I would like to share with my colleagues a letter from Mr. Abner W. Sibal, who represented the Sixth District of Connecticut from 1961 to 1965, Mr. President, I ask that Mr. Sibal's letter appear in the Record immediately following my remarks, and I again urge my colleagues to consider this important reform.

The letter is as follows:

HARTFORD, CT. February 27, 1990

HON. GORDON J. HUMPHREY, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: In response to your letter of February 20 you may certainly cite me as supporting Senate Joint Resolution 235, and I congratulate you and Sena­tor De Concini for sponsoring it.

The changes which have led to abuse in fund-raising practices over the relatively short period past, coupled with the frankness with which the frankness of the public has almost eliminated issues, ability and integrity as the important factors in con­gressional elections, it's regrettable that steps such as yours must be taken since many members with longer service than 12 years have served with distinction, but Congress must regain the confidence and re­spect it once enjoyed as a coequal branch of government and it appears that Senate Joint resolutions 235 is a way to move toward that goal.

Sincerely,

ABNER W. SIBAL, Attorney at Law.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN CUBA

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I would like to submit for the attention of the Senate a resolution passed by the Governor and cabinet of the State of Florida on the human rights situation in Cuba. The resolution salutes the release of three long-term political prisoners: Mario Chanes de Armas, Ernesto Diaz Rodriguez, and Alfredo Mustelier Neuvo. All three have suffered over 20 years in Cuban prisons. Mario Chanes has been held in prison longer than any other known political prisoner in the world today—28 years.

In a letter to the United Nations Secretary General, Peres de Cueliar, Florida Governor Bob Martinez said the resolution "celebrates the spirit of freedom that burns in the hearts" of Cubans who have worked to attain freedom and democracy for the people of Cuba.

As we celebrate the wave of freedom that has swept Eastern Europe, Panama, and now Nicaragua, we must not forget the people of Cuba. As Fidel Castro becomes increasingly isolated, he has also become more desperate. Now is the time for all free peoples to stand with the people of Cuba, and let them know we will not forget them.

I commend Governor Martinez for this resolution and, as a cochairman of the Senate Cuba Freedom Caucus, ask that the State of Florida resolution of March 5, 1990, be included at this point in the Record.

The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, January 28, 1990, marked the 37th anniversary of the birth of Jose Marti, the Apostle of Cuba's independence from Spain; and

Whereas, Jose Marti denounced the oppressive Spanish regime, proclaimed freedom and preached the revolution for independence initially by giving lectures, writing articles, delivering speeches, uniting his countrymen and attracting support and resources throughout the United States and especially in Tampa and Key West; and

Whereas, February 24, 1990, marked the 95th anniversary of the outbreak of the Revolution for Independence from Spain which Jose Marti proclaimed and preached and for which he ultimately gave his life on the battlefield on behalf of the freedom of his beloved country, Cuba; and

Whereas, recent events in Eastern Europe have brought international attention to the popular wave of uprisings, peaceful or other­wise, that have been sweeping from Poland and Czechoslovakia, Germany, Bulgaria and Romania; and

Whereas, freedom-loving people through­out the civilized world are becoming increas­ingly aware of the perverse, oppressive nature of the Communist regimes that have been ruling through repression, terror and bloodshed not only in Eastern Europe but also in
set reasonable goals is worth recognition and in my book, I congratulate him on being a national figure, and Malhe’s 1990 Teacher of the Year.

THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

HON. TED WEISS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1990

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues, Garrison Keillor’s article entitled “Thanks for Attacking the N.E.A.” It appeared in the New York Times today, April 4, 1990. I believe that: "Thanks for Attacking the N.E.A." poignantly and elegantly conveys an important perspective on the significant of the National Endowment for the Arts—three—of an artist.

As Congress considers legislation to reauthorize the Endowment, and the possibility of restricting the agency’s ability to function as it was intended to, we must keep this agency's manifold and consequential contributions in mind. Congress subjects the N.E.A. to content restrictions based on political, rather than peer review, but, we will be faced ultimately with the question of whether it is worth funding the agency at all. What price in freedom of expression and creativity will we be willing to pay to have the government continue to fund the Arts?

I urge my colleagues to look closely at Garrison Keillor’s argument in support of a National Endowment for the Arts unrestricted by statutory content provisions.

The article follows:

THANKS FOR ATTACKING THE N.E.A. (By Garrison Keillor)

WASHINGTON—It’s a pleasure to come down to Washington and speak in support of the National Endowment for the Arts, one of the wisest and happiest pieces of legislation ever to come through Congress. I’m grateful to those who have so ably attacked the Endowment over the past year or so, for making it necessary to defend it. I enjoy controversy and I recognize the adversary: they are us.

My ancestors were Puritans from England. They arrived here in 1648 in the hope of finding a greater freedom than was permissible under English law at that time. But over the years, we Puritans have learned something about repression, and it’s as true today as when my people arrived: man’s interest in the forbidden is sharp and constant.

If Congress doesn’t do something about obscenity, we’re going to have to build a garrison twice as big to hold the people who want to see it. And if Congress does do something about obscenity art, the galleries will need to be even bigger than that. We’ve heard three or four times this morning that, of 85,000 works funded by the N.E.A., only 20 were controversial. I don’t know why anyone would cite that as something to be proud of.

All governments have given medals to artists when they are old and salubriously successful and almost 26 years ago, Congress decided to boldly support the creators of art—support the act of creation itself—to encourage artists who are young and vital and out of the wave and therefore dangerous. This courageous legislation has changed American life.

Today, in every city and state, when Americans talk up their home town invariance, they mention their museums, theaters, or theater or museum will fall. It wouldn’t be this way. Forty years ago, an American man was to have an aesthetic today, you can be a violinist in New York, a painter in Iowa, a painter in Kansas.

This is an event—small and lovely—that the Endowment helped to bring about. The Endowment has fostered thousands of art works—many of which will outlive you and me—but the most important thing the Endowment has changed the way we think about the arts. Today, no American family can be secure against the danger that one of its children may decide to become an artist.

Twice in my life, at crucial times, grants from the Endowment made it possible for me to be a writer. The first, in 1969, arrived when I was young, broke, married with baby, living on very little cash and a big vegetable garden. I was writing for the New Yorker at the time but they weren’t aware of it.

I wrote every morning and every night. I often had fantasies of finding a patron. A bearded would appear at my door one day; I’d give him an egg salad sandwich, and suddenly he’d turn into a fat, quiet, Prince Bob from the Guggenheim Foundation. But instead of him, I got a letter offering me a job for one month in the Poets on the Schools program in Minneapolis, funded by the N.E.A., directed by Molly LaBerge, which sent young writers into the schools to read and teach. In 1969, there were three such programs: New York, California and Minnesota. Today, there’s at least one in every state.

It was the first time anybody paid me to be a writer. It was the sort of experience a person looks back at and wonders what would have happened if it hadn’t.

In 1974, a grant from the N.E.A. enabled me and my colleagues at Minnesota Public Radio to start a "Prairie Home Companion." The help of the Endowment was crucial because the show wasn’t that great to begin with.

Our first broadcast, we had a crowd of 12 persons, and then we made the mistake of having an international and we lost half of them. The show wasn’t obscure, just obscure: it took me a few years to figure out how to do a live radio show with folk music and comedy and stories about my hometown of Lake Wobegon. By the time the show became popular and Lake Wobegon became so well-known that people thought it was real, the Endowment was gone, and I was on my own.

When you walk into someplace like that in the arts world in politics, it seems like everybody wants to give you your own money, or, you have to be rich or powerful or friend of the emperor to have enough. If you ever want to do enough for other people, people can do enough for you.

When I graduated from college, the debt was $8,900. I worked from 1971-73, so I got mine early and had a chance to watch the others. I remember the last graduate, the most humiliated graduate, a hall boy who walked up like a platform and en route stepped on the hem of his own gown and walked right up the aisle. I needn’t dwell on that.

Like him, the Endowment has succeeded in embarrassing itself from time to time; to the considerable entertainment of us all, and like him the Endowment keeps going. It has contributed mightily to the creative genius of America: architecture, sculpture, theater, and dance. I believe the Endowment has fostered the arts.

I hope it lives another 25 years; I hope we continue to argue about it.

WESTOVER AIR FORCE BASE: 50 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1990

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for many years Westover Air Force Base in Chicopee, MA, has been an important national asset and a highly-visible public reminder of the challenges facing the United States of America. In the occasion, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the men and women who have served with distinction at Westover in the past, and to wish the existing personnel all the best in the future.

Just days after the German invasion of Poland sparked World War II, the massive Northairbase authorized by Congress in 1939 was officially cited between Chicopee and Ludlow, MA. On April 6, 1940, the airbase was dedicated as Westover Field to honor Maj. Gen. Oscar Westover, the former Army Air Corps chief who advocated strategic airpower.

Mr. Speaker, Westover Field was designated as an attack base because the War Department feared the loss of Great Britain and the possible German invasion of Greenland and Canada. Westover’s neighbors endured black-out conditions and were trained as aircraft spotters. After the Battle of Britain, the Westover mission was changed to training. From the bases around the near shops, bomber navigators, and aerial gunners came to Westover to be molded into aircrews for the Eighth Air Force operating out of England.

At the dawn of East-West confrontations, Westover became one of the Eastern Division of the Military Air Transport Service. The base reflected America’s concern and became the U.S. hub for the Berlin airlift. As relief supplies were loaded aboard MATS airlift, local citizens assembled handkerchief parachutes to deliver candy to children in the Allied sector of Berlin. Thus the “Little Vittles” nickname was born. As the Cold war intensified in the mid-1950’s, Westover Air Force Base became the new home to the Eighth Air Force, and the main runway was widened and lengthened to accommodate Strategic Air Command B-52’s and KC-135’s. Local residents became accustomed to the constant roar of SAC bombers and tankers as the Nation faced a series of crises in Berlin, Cuba, and around the globe. But even as Westover crews were assigned to bombing missions in Southeast Asia and politicians picked Westover’s gates, neighbors of the base treated military personnel with kindness and hospitality.

When conscription ended and the total-force concept was initiated, Westover again reflected the needs of the Nation and, consequently
A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO FLOYD CLAY IN HONOR OF HIS SELECTION AS THE ``1990 MAN OF THE YEAR''

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1990

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen and a person I hold in the highest regard, Floyd Clay. Mr. Clay, in recognition of his distinguished career and all that he has achieved as a Los Angeles, Harbor Commissioner, has been named the ``1990 Man of the Year'' by the Maritime Trades Department Southern California Port Council AFL-CIO. It is an honor to bring Floyd Clay to your attention.

As a member of the Harbor Commission, Mr. Clay oversees the maritime service activity and development of Worldport LA, the leading container port in the United States. Floyd Clay was nominated to the Port by Los Angeles Mayor Van Nuys, like many others, recognized his tremendous experience and expertise in labor relations. He also serves as a business representative and executive board member for the Los Angeles County and Vicinity District Council of Carpenters. He joined the United Brotherhood of Carpenters in 1952, followed by his appointment in 1984 as financial secretary/business representative of local 1437.

Floyd Clay was also recently appointed to serve as a Worldport LA representative to the governing board of the Joint Powers Authority (JPA) for the Consolidated Transportation Corridor (CTC) because of his lifelong involvement with efficient, state-of-the-art cargo transportation systems that benefit people and the environment alike. As a result of Floyd Clay's efforts, the CTC has become an innovative project comprising railroad, street, and other related construction improvements aimed at facilitating the movement of international and domestic cargo and to from the port of Los Angeles. The CTC is also expected to reduce traffic congestion through extensive use of rail cars, resulting in improved air quality.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in recognizing Mr. Clay for all his vast achievements and activities in the community. He has done a great deal to make living and working in southern California a little better. I salute Floyd Clay on being named the 1990 Man of the Year, and wish his wife, Laura, and his children, Larry and Laura, all the best for the future.

HON. CHESTER G. ATKINS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1990

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the occasion of National Police Week to pay tribute to the Bedford Police Department for their dedicated and outstanding service to the people of Bedford, MA, in the protection of life, liberty, and property.

Each day the newspapers are full of stories of violence and lawbreaking which others have to resolve. These "others" are the brave officers of the Bedford Police Department—the public servants on the front line who enforce the laws that we create. These men and women ensure that a nation rich by law and order; that our neighborhoods are not held hostage to the threats of criminals; and that justice is served.

Our country is a better place for the professionalism of these police officers who have offered their lives to serve the common belief that justice is an inherent right. How many of us can answer so courageously the question, "Are you prepared to offer your life in service to your community?"

Too often we wait until it is too late, until some brave officer is struck down, to say thanks for a job well done. Let us take this time to recognize the contributions of Chief Donald Eunson and those who serve in the Bedford Police Department:


The Bedford Police Department is known as the first police department in the country to receive both radio and television vehicles and thousands of dollars in grants. In 1988, the Bedford Police Department was the first recipient of a $189,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Arts. The Bedford Police Department was the first police department in the country to receive a $15,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Arts. The Bedford Police Department was the first police department in the country to receive a $3,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to heed "America's Art, Smear." It is critical that we in Congress support the N.E.A. which has benefited thousands of artists—and millions of Americans.

From the New York Times, May 17, 1990:

"The N.E.A. has been criticized for being an obstructionist, and for its support of controversial art.

The National Endowment for the Arts (N.E.A.) was created by Congress in 1965 to provide federal funding for the arts in the United States. The N.E.A. is a private, non-profit organization that supports the arts through grants to individuals, organizations, and projects that promote the arts. The N.E.A. has been criticized for its support of controversial art, and for its funding of projects that some people believe are not appropriate for public funding.

The N.E.A. has been the target of attacks and criticism from those who believe that the arts should be free from government interference. The N.E.A. has also been criticized for its support of controversial art, and for its funding of projects that some people believe are not appropriate for public funding.

The N.E.A. has been criticized for its support of controversial art, and for its funding of projects that some people believe are not appropriate for public funding. The N.E.A. has been criticized for its support of controversial art, and for its funding of projects that some people believe are not appropriate for public funding.

The N.E.A. has been criticized for its support of controversial art, and for its funding of projects that some people believe are not appropriate for public funding.