

credit limit. That is essentially what the administration wants this Congress to do. It wants Congress to raise its credit limit or the debt ceiling without any strategy for paying off its debt.

Balancing the budget is a step in the right direction; it diminishes the continuing need for having the debt or borrowing level raised. The Federal debt or credit card bill is now about \$5 trillion, and that does not include the interest. The fiscal year 1996 budget estimates that the U.S. Government will spend about \$256 billion in 1996, or about 16 percent of the budget, just to pay the interest on this debt.

H.R. 2621 is a bill to enforce the public debt limit and to protect the Social Security and other Federal trust funds. It ends the debt-ceiling smoke and mirrors. With the \$21 billion in the G-fund, \$365 billion in the Social Security Retirement Fund, \$143 billion in the Medicare Trust Fund, and \$483 billion in the Social Security Trust Fund, there is money for the administration to disinvest and build up more and more debt with more and more interest payments thereby sidestepping the Constitution. This bill ensures what the Constitution says about the authority to issue debt—Congress is vested with the "Power . . . To borrow Money on the Credit of the United States."

The reason we are having this current confrontation in Washington is not simply over how the Government keeps its books, or when we reach a balanced budget. The true confrontation is changing the way Government operates. We are in the midst of a revolution as dramatic as Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal and its expansion of Government into every aspect of our lives. The question is whether we will have more Governmental control over our lives, higher taxes, more borrowing, and more interest payments, or whether we will go back to what made this country great—a frugal Government and individual responsibility. I agree with the views Thomas Jefferson expressed in his letter to Elbridge Gerry nearly 200 years ago—"I am for a government rigorously frugal and simple, applying all the possible savings of the public revenue to the discharge of the national debt; and not for a multiplication of officers and salaries merely to make partisans, and for increasing, by every device, the public debt, on the principle of its being a public blessing."

H.R. 2621 not only protects our retirement funds from senseless and expensive manipulation, it sends the President a clear message that the American public and this Congress is serious about balancing the budget.

DEDICATED, PROFESSIONAL, AND
CARING

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the greatest need that all of us have throughout our lives is for food. And contrary to some accepted myths, it doesn't just magically appear on the grocery store shelves overnight. Food gets from farm to table through the professional and skillful efforts of many people who have spent their careers in agribusiness. Ronald W. Stebbins is one of these committed professionals who after having been involved in agri-

business for the past 40 years is about to retire.

Born and raised on a dairy and potato farm in Kalkaska County, MI, and having attended Michigan State University, over his career Ron Stebbins has worked for private industry, for cooperatives, and for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. He has worked throughout Michigan, and has developed a very impressive international marketing capability. He is well respected as a leader in agribusiness, and has served as an officer of several different professional agricultural associations, including the Michigan Bean Shippers Association, the Michigan Grain and Agri-Dealers Association, St. Paul Bank for Cooperatives, the Bank of Alma, and Valley Marketing, Inc.

In his capacity as president, secretary, and treasurer of the Michigan Agri-Business Association, Ron has helped to increase the professionalism and capability of Michigan's men and women in agribusiness. Educational events, informative meetings, legislative activities, insurance and other services have all been provided by this association, and Ron Stebbins has helped develop and improve many of these efforts.

Ron is very well known to many farmers in Michigan agriculture. Certainly his work as a grain trader has brought him in contact with many farmers, as did his work as supervisor for USDA's grain storage program many farm bills ago. His work over the years specifically with dry beans has made him a world leader in one of the most vital commodities for the economic well-being of our area's agriculture. His work with advisory committees has helped him to maintain a close eye on the moods and needs of our producers. Many farmers and traders alike know that when they speak with Rob Stebbins, they are getting an informed and dependable assessment on important agribusiness conditions.

This gentleman has also maintained significant involvement with his community over the years, including his service as a member of several area groups in Ithaca and Gratiot County, as well as having served as a councilman for the city of Ithaca and a director of the Gratiot County Hospital Board. Together with his wife of 38 years, Mary Kay, his three children and five grandchildren, Ron continues to offer the kind of role model that all of our children should see. Commitment to family, dedication to professionalism, concern about his community, all of these factors of which Ron can be proud, and examples for the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of 40 years of devoted expertise and consistent professionalism, I urge you and all of our colleagues to join me in wishing Ron and his family the very best on his retirement.

IN MEMORY OF TOBY FARMER

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during this holiday season our thoughts naturally turn to children—our own children and grandchildren, children of our friends, children in our community, children in need. I would like to tell my colleagues about a special child, Andrew Michael "Toby" Farmer, a child who died of cancer on December 2.

Words are inadequate to convey our sense of grief and compassion in the loss of a child. Andrew was 10 years old, the son of David and Janet Farmer of Stafford County and brother to Allison Marie Farmer. He was a fifth-grade student at Garrisonville Elementary School. And he was a fighter. His mother wrote to me, "Andrew had a tough time, but he never, ever complained. He was and is the strongest person I have ever known."

Such courage in the face of death—particularly such courage in a young boy—humbles and saddens us, Mr. Speaker, but also should inspire us to work harder to find the elusive cure for a disease that prematurely ends too many lives each year. We must be sure that programs vital to biomedical research are protected and strengthened where needed. One of those programs, Mr. Speaker, is the international space station, and I commend this body for supporting funding of the space station earlier this year. The weightless environment of the space station has enormous potential for medical research—research that could lead to cures or better treatments for cancer and other diseases—and I urge my colleagues to continue support for such programs in the years to come.

Our hearts go out to Andrew's parents, sister, grandparents, and his many friends, and I ask my colleagues also to join me today in paying our last respects to this brave young man. Andrew "Toby" Farmer lived the remaining days of what should have been the normal life of a 10-year-old boy by displaying extraordinary strength and courage. Mr. Speaker, he is an inspiration to all those who knew him and loved him—and he will be missed.

BRINGING THE TERRORISM BILL
TO THE FLOOR

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Republican leadership reversed itself again on the terrorism bill. Repeatedly, the leadership had promised to bring this legislation to the floor. First they said they would do it by Memorial Day. Then they said it would come up before August recess. Finally, they pledged a vote by the end of the year.

Yesterday afternoon, however, the bill was abruptly yanked from this week's floor schedule.

Yesterday, I also received a letter from Ms. Victoria Cummock of Coral Gables, FL. Ms. Cummock's husband was killed 7 years ago when Pan Am Flight 103 exploded over Lockerbie, Scotland. As a victim of this random, senseless terrorist attack, she had dearly hoped that the House would finally move toward passage of the terrorism bill. Once again, her hopes have been dashed by the leadership's pandering to the far right.

I would like to enter Ms. Cummock's statement in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate to all of my colleagues how important this legislation really is. I share her hope that Congress will move urgently to pass the anti-terrorism bill right away, rather than waiting for another tragedy to spur action.

I ask unanimous consent that her letter appear directly following these remarks:

FAMILIES OF PAN-AM 103 LOCKERBIE,
Coral Gables, FL, December 13, 1995.
 Re H.R. 1710/sub/H.R. 2703 counter-terrorism
 legislation.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,
House Judiciary Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHUMER: I am the widow of John Binning Cummock, a 38 yr. old American father of three, who was killed by terrorist, abroad Pan Am 103 over Lockerbie Scotland. Additionally, I am the Vice President of the Pan Am 103 Families group representing over 180 next-of-kin. I am writing in support of HR 2703 substitute for HR 1710. I feel that this current legislation is the most comprehensive and proactive approach to protect Americans from terrorism that I have seen come out of Congress in the last seven years.

After the bombing of the Murrah building in Oklahoma City, Congress vowed to get tough and pass this legislation by Memorial Day '95. Quick progress was made on the Senate side but sadly the House seems to have come to a screeching halt on debating this bill. Now that the media focus has faded from the Oklahoma City bombing, my fear is that Congress will recess before enacting this badly needed legislation. It is imperative that Congress does not forget its responsibility, not only to protect the American people, but to support the law enforcement agencies who are trying to respond to the escalating and changing threats.

In less than seven years, I have looked into the faces of hundreds of American families that have been devastated by terrorism, after the bombing of Pan Am 103, the World Trade Center and most recently after spending 11 days in Oklahoma City under the sponsorship of the American Red Cross. I know all to well what they have been sentenced to live with under the current system. We owe it to our children and to future generations to be able to live in a safe and secure America. American children must now grow up feeling like they are walking targets to potential terrorist attacks, both domestically and internationally. Unfortunately, the children of the victims of terrorism remember all too well the questions of who is protecting them and where is justice? Let us not afford more consideration and rights to illegal aliens, felons or potential terrorists, than we do to our children who daily pledge allegiance to the American flag.

Specifically, for the Pan Am 103 families the FSIA Amendment within Section 804 is of particular importance. This will provide victims of terrorism an avenue to pursue terrorist sponsoring Nations, where none existed before, by waiving Sovereign Immunity for specific acts of terrorism against American. Clearly, history has shown that the current system, of diplomacy takes decades and only serves to re-victimize the victims' families by providing little or no remedy. In our case, as the KAL 007 flight which occurred over 12 years ago, no progress is in sight. A failure to achieve swift and adequate resolution only to continues the emotional pain, and anguish of the families especially the children. Victims' families are not entitled to access the mental health and other areas of support currently available to other American victims of violent crimes. Hence, America turns its back on the families of those who made the ultimate sacrifice for being Americans. To potentially receive compensation after 40 years can not buy back my children's childhood, especially if they have been too traumatized to be able to learn how to read or sleep through the night.

I hope that we can count on your full support when this bill is placed for a vote. I can be reached at (305) 667-7218 or Skypage 1 (800)

592-8770. My hope is that it will not take another incident to refocus Washington's priorities on counter-terrorism, and other Americans can be spared our fate. Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

M. VICTORIA CUMMOCK,
V.P. Pam Am 103 Lockerbie,
Widow of John B. Cummock.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996
 *****§1x—ContinuedE 2417

SPEECH OF

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1995

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I want to make clear that I see many good facets to this bill. However, I call attention to a portion of it, on the consequences of an HIV-positive test result, that was not debated in the House, primarily because many of us believed that it would be removed by the Senate. The President has suggested that he will veto this bill. If he does and this chamber has another opportunity to consider it, it is essential that we directly address and debate the issue of HIV testing and test results in the military.

We should be aware that section 561 of this bill—section 567 of the Conference Report—provides that any member of the military who is determined through testing to be HIV-positive be automatically dismissed. Specifically, this section requires the Secretary of Defense to separate or retire service members who test HIV-positive within 6 months of their positive test. This requirement represents a serious public policy and public health problem that should not become law in this country.

The issue is not simply testing for HIV because I believe there are appropriate public health reasons and goals for such testing. For example, I have worked very closely with other Members, both Republicans and Democrats, including the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN], and others, on the issue of mandatory testing of infants as part of the reauthorization of the Ryan White CARE Act. Many advances in the treatment of HIV disease have been developed and are becoming increasingly available; this is a positive situation that did not exist previously. HIV testing, if done appropriately and sensitively, should lead individuals who test positive to seek treatment and care. Effective treatments ultimately may lead to a cure for HIV disease. If testing leads to treatment and to a cure, then all of us ought to support it. Under these circumstances, we should encourage testing for every element of American society. Testing is currently one of the most important means of HIV prevention that exists.

But, when mandatory testing leads to mandatory job discrimination, we send a signal to everyone in American society not to get tested. That is, we send precisely the opposite message than we really want to send. The mandatory discharge specified in this bill occurs regardless of the HIV-positive individual's health and fitness and despite the fact that people continue to work productively for several years after being infected with HIV. We should not presume that a positive HIV test automatically means an inability to effectively

carry out duties or to engage in productive work. Yet, this presumption seems to underlie the mandatory discharge provision in this bill.

The mandatory discharge specified in this bill also singles out HIV disease from other medical conditions. It treats military personnel who test HIV-positive differently than personnel with other diseases or conditions. In this sense, then, section 561 is blatantly discriminatory. The issue becomes one of HIV status rather than health status and the ability to carry out duties.

If we allow this provision to remain, furthermore, we likely set ourselves on a slippery slope to continuing and increasing discrimination. Today it is the military, tomorrow it will be military contractors, and the next day it will be all of the independent private sector. We have to change this provision before this bill becomes law. We should not encourage, and certainly not legislate, discrimination against any American citizen.

The provision for mandatory discharge of members of the armed forces who test HIV-positive should not be in this bill. Instead, we should encourage HIV testing in a context in which individuals can and will seek out effective treatments. These treatments may extend their lives, allow them to continue to work productively, and one day, produce a cure for HIV disease. Individuals who seek or are tested for HIV should not be punished for their test results. The positive elements of this bill aside, therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose this Department of Defense authorization bill conference report.

ENGLISH: LANGUAGE OF OPPORTUNITY I

*****§1x—ContinuedE 2417

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to share with the Members of this distinguished body and the good people of this country an account which reveals a great deal about legislation which I have introduced to establish English as the official language of the Federal Government. I have my good friend Mr. Tommy Macchiaroli to thank for passing along this story to me, and I am pleased to now present it to you.

As you know, I have been a principal sponsor of legislation to establish English as the official language of the Federal Government since the 101st Congress. I have studied the official English issue at length and have explored its tremendous potential to contribute to the well-being and prosperity of this country. However, even though I have become very familiar with the comprehensive reports, the historical lessons, and the compelling logic which confirm the need for this kind of legislation, I am still struck by the experiences and straightforward wisdom of folks who have visited the question of a common language on the most personal of levels. Anthony Macchiaroli, an immigrant from Italy, is one of these individuals, and it is his inspiring story that I would like to relate to you today.

It is my hope that we will learn from the dedication, the workmanlike approach, and the ultimate success of this proud American. His example tells us quite a bit about the economics of official English legislation, demonstrating