

desire not to burden the other justices with extra cases.

Justice Wahl developed a strong work ethic long before she joined the supreme court. She was already the mother of four children upon entering law school at age 38. Justice Wahl had her fifth child during her second year of night classes. Following graduation, she served 6 years in the State public defender's office, then 4 years as a law professor at the William Mitchell College of Law. Her ability to juggle the competing demands of family, academics, and career prepared her well for challenges on the bench.

Rosalie Wahl's tenure as associate justice was important for women, and not just because her appointment ended the all-male history of the Minnesota Supreme Court. One of her most enduring legacies of Justice Wahl's work as chair of a task force on gender fairness in the legal system.

As a coauthor of the Violence Against Women Act, which Congress passed in 1994, I have a special appreciation for Rosalie Wahl's pioneering efforts. Her 1989 task force recommendations provided the basis for the Minnesota law to assist sexual assault and domestic abuse victims. In turn, the Minnesota statute helped shape the Federal law.

Justice Wahl also chaired a racial bias task force, which published recommendations in 1993. Her commitment to equal justice for all Americans is another lasting legacy.

Shortly before her retirement, Justice Wahl remarked, "I think the law should have a human face. Everything we do affects people; it doesn't become a dry bunch of words in books on the shelf."

Rosalie Wahl had a special affinity for the underprivileged and people in need, and she was always mindful of the human impact of court decisions. But Justice Wahl also tried to apply the law as it was written, even when she would have preferred a different result.

It has been said that the best judges have both a heart and a head for justice. The Minnesota Supreme Court was well served by Associate Justice Rosalie Wahl, who used her heart and her head on behalf of those who came seeking justice.

The State of Minnesota will always be grateful for Rosalie Wahl's years of service and sacrifice.

BALANCE THE BUDGET, STUPID

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 17, 1995

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member highly commends to his colleagues this editorial which appeared in the Wayne Herald of Wayne, NE, on November 16, 1995.

[From the Wayne Herald, Nov. 16, 1995]

JUST BALANCE IT

Who should we believe in the current federal budget impasse between the legislative and executive branches of our Government?

On one hand we have a Republican Congressional leadership claiming their plan will put the nation on the road to fiscal solvency within seven years.

On the other hand we have the President telling us the GOP budget plan will ruin the country and millions of Social Security and Medicare recipients in the process.

We tend to be a little skeptical of both sides in this debate.

Congressional leaders of both parties have been trying to convince us for fifty years that they are working hard to balance the federal budget yet they keep approving pet projects and expenditures that mortgage the future of our children's children's children.

The President, when he was known to us as "Slick Willy", campaigned on a promise of bringing us a balanced budget in five years. Now, three years into his presidency, he's saying he still wants a balanced budget, but he can't accept the GOP seven year plan. He thinks it should be nine, or ten or twelve. And to win his argument with Congress he has used the despicable tactic of trying to scare the elderly by telling them their Medicare program will be ruined—a blatant falsehood.

The furlough of nonessential government workers has served to focus national attention on the debate, which is good. It should cause us all to demand an end to the political gamesmanship.

We hope the focus will cause the American public to stand, borrow a phrase from the Clinton campaign and shout with one voice. "Balance the budget, stupid."

FACE DEDICATED TO TRUTH AND FREEDOM

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 17, 1995

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that on next Tuesday, November 21, a very special event will be held by the organization Facts About Cuban Exiles [FACE].

FACE was established in 1982 to foster accuracy and understanding in the portrayal of the Cuban exile population. There are over a million Cubans who have been forced to flee the Castro dictatorship and FACE conducts research and provides information about the history and contributions of the Cuban exile population to the United States and other countries of exile.

The work of FACE is carried on under the leadership of Chairman José Cancela and his fellow officers: Secretary Xiomara Cassado, Vice Secretary Marián Prío-Odio and Treasurer Marilyn Borroto.

Speaking at the luncheon will be the internationally renowned scholar and author, Dr. Mark Falcoff, the author of many influential works on U.S.-Latin American relations, who will be speaking on the subject of "The Hispanic Community in the Lens of the American Media." Dr. Falcoff will be introduced by the former Secretary of Commerce of Florida, Jeb Bush.

FACE also casts light on the nature of the oppression that drove 10 percent of Cuba's population out of their homeland with special emphasis on the plight of Cuban political prisoners as part of the larger tragedy of Castro's oppression.

I wish the Facts About Cuban Exiles success its their larger goal of holding up the light of truth and freedom for the enslaved people of Cuba.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 17, 1995

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 809. After voting "no" on Burton and "yes" on Gingrich, I am positive that I voted "yes" on final passage which was the same as the Gingrich vote. My vote for total gift ban is "yes."

TRIBUTE TO THE EXCELSIOR SPRINGS JOB CORPS CENTER

HON. PAT DANNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 17, 1995

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the outstanding accomplishment of the Excelsior Springs Job Corps Center students, who recently won the national Job Corps Academic Olympic competition in Washington, DC. The Academic Olympics recognize the emphasis on academic training in the Job Corps Program.

The members of the winning team included James Drury of Excelsior Springs; Aaron Baird of St. Joseph; Terry Whitt of Kidder, MO; Kristen Eck of Joplin, MO; and Tracy Ruland of Portland, OR. The team was coached by Tim Smaller and Teresa Underhill, instructors at the Jobs Corps center in Excelsior Springs.

Excelsior Springs Job Corps Director Bernard J. Fennell also deserves much credit for the team's strong performance in a competition that included a broad range of subjects, including language arts, social studies, mathematics, science, and current events.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the State of Missouri are extremely proud of the members of this fine team and their excellent showing in this competition.

BURMA AND THE UNITED NATIONS ASSEMBLY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 17, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing House Resolution 274, a resolution urging the administration to actively support and promote a resolution at the United Nations to call on the Government of Burma to restore civilian, democratic rule.

In July we all learned the good news that after 6 years confinement in her home in Rangoon, Aung Asn Suu Kyi was released. Although her release is supposedly "unconditional," due to the form of government in Rangoon, Suu Kyi and all of us know that she could be just as readily confined again as she was released. The ruling generals in Rangoon should not be rewarded for partially undoing something that they never should have done in the first place. Accordingly, while we are pleased about her new freedom, relations between Rangoon and Washington can not return to normal until there are some fundamental changes in Burma. The change that would

be most significant to us would be that the individuals who were democratically elected in 1990 are released from prison and allowed to run the government.

Aung San Suu Kyi's arrest, detention and release is somewhat similar to the case of Harry Wu. In both instances totalitarian dictatorships under pressure from civilized nations for their egregious human rights abuses took a prominent individual hostage and then expected to be rewarded for their release. This convoluted logic may be acceptable to the inner circles of Rangoon and Beijing, but it is not transparent to democratic leaders around the world.

Our Nation has many important reasons to be concerned about what occurs in Burma. High on our priority is the illicit drug production that has had a devastating impact on our cities, families, and schools. In 1948 when Burma became independent, the annual production of opium was 30 tons. Burma was then a democracy, it exported rice to its neighbors and the world, and it enjoyed a free-market system. It was known as the "rice bowl" of Asia. Today, Burma is one of the poorest nations in the world and its opium production has increased some 8,000 percent to about 2,575 tons [1992-1993]. What is the reason for this massive increase? Bertil Litner, the Burma reporter for the Far East Economic Review, states in his book "Burma in Revolt," that Burmese drug production is—

... The inevitable consequence of the decades-long Burmese tragedy; the inability of successive governments in Rangoon to come to terms with the country's ethnic minorities and the refusal of post-1962 military-dominated regimes to permit an open, pluralistic society.

The clear link between drug production and the military's intolerance for political pluralism became even more obvious when opium production more than doubled after Aung San Suu Kyi's arrest in 1989. This is directly linked to agreements made between the SLORC and the ethnic minorities that grow most of the opium and have been battling the Burmese central government rule for almost 50 years.

Individual Wa and Kokang farmers earn between \$50 to \$75 a year for their harvest. Their leaders, while they are not all angels, are not like Khun Sa who has tennis courts, swimming pools, and concubines. Their motivation to grow opium is that it enables them to continue to fund their armies so that they can keep Rangoon at bay. Unfortunately, they grow even more than does Khun Sa.

The administration has taken the position that there is a human rights problem in Burma but it must not be allowed to blind us to the drug problem. What the administration has failed to recognize is that the human rights problem is directly linked to the drug production. The administration has inadvertently created a false dichotomy between human rights and drug production. They have failed to understand that the drug production problem is a human rights problem. The majority of the opium grown in Burma is grown so that ethnic minorities can protect themselves. The underlying motivation behind much of the production is an economic one. It is very difficult to grow anything else in those regions and they need the money for arms. Until they feel confident that a representative form of government is established in Rangoon, they will continue to

grow just like they have for the past 40 years. It is important that we bear in mind that when the SLORC annulled the results of the 1989 elections the Wa and the Kokang supported Aung San Suu Kyi's winning team.

Recently Aung San Suu Kyi called for a halt in investment in Burma and stated that Burma should not be admitted as a member of ASEAN until it had a democratically elected government. If we want to seriously declare war on Burmese drug production then we need to strongly support her efforts to peacefully bring about positive change. It is both the pragmatic and principled thing to do.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 274.

H. RES. 274

Whereas the military government of Burma, as a member of the United Nations, is obligated to uphold the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and all other international human rights standards and conventions to which it is a signatory;

Whereas the ruling State Law and Order Restoration Council (hereinafter referred to as the "SLORC") in Burma has refused to recognize the results of the May 1990 elections, which the National League for Democracy, led by Aung San Suu Kyi, won by a landslide;

Whereas the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in March 1995 unanimously condemned the SLORC's refusal to "take all necessary steps towards democracy in light of those elections";

Whereas the United Nations Commission on Human Rights also expressed grave concern about violations of fundamental human rights in Burma, including torture, summary and arbitrary executions, massive use of forced labor including forced portering for the military, abuse of women, political arrests and detentions, restrictions on freedom of expression and association, and oppressive measures directed at ethnic and religious minorities;

Whereas the United Nations Commission on Human Rights noted that most of the 1,990 democratically elected representatives have been excluded from the SLORC's "National Convention" and concluded that the convention does not "appear to constitute the necessary step towards the restoration of democracy";

Whereas Burma continues to be one of the world's leading sites of narcotics production and trafficking and, according to the United States State Department, production of heroin nearly tripled in Burma since the SLORC took power in a violent coup in 1988;

Whereas, according to the State Department's International Narcotics Control Strategy Report of March 1995, the SLORC's antinarcotics efforts last year "fell far short of the measures necessary to make serious progress against the drug trade," and in addition, the SLORC's lack of control over heroin-producing areas is due to the SLORC's allowing "wide-ranging, local autonomy (to ethnic armies) in exchange for halting their active insurgencies against Rangoon";

Whereas the peace agreements signed by the SLORC with ethnic insurgencies since 1989 were supposed to lead to both a decrease in opium production and economic development, but according to the State Department's report, "neither development nor a reduction in opium cultivation has occurred";

Whereas in 1948 when Burma became independent, the annual production of opium was 30 tons, Burma was then a democracy, it exported rice to its neighbors and the world, and it enjoyed a free-market system;

Whereas today Burma is one of the poorest nations in the world and its opium production has increased some 8,000 percent to about 2,575 tons (1992-1993);

Whereas the drug production increase is the consequence in large degree of the inability of the successive military governments in Rangoon to come to terms with the country's ethnic minorities and the refusal of post-1962 military-dominated regimes to permit an open pluralistic society;

Whereas it is primarily through a democratically elected civilian government in Burma, supported by the Burmese people including the ethnic minorities, that Burma can make significant progress in controlling narcotics production and trafficking;

Whereas on July 10, 1995, the SLORC responded to international pressure, including 5 resolutions by the United Nations General Assembly, by releasing Aung San Suu Kyi, who had been held under house arrest for 6 years;

Whereas 16 elected Members of Parliament remain in detention in Burma, along with thousands of other political prisoners, according to Human Rights Watch/Asia, Amnesty International, and other human rights monitoring groups;

Whereas in July 1995 the International Committee of the Red Cross (hereinafter referred to as the "ICRC") closed its office in Burma due to the SLORC's refusal to agree to allow the ICRC confidential regular access to prisoners;

Whereas the United States ambassador to the United Nations visited Burma in September 1995, met with Aung San Suu Kyi, and also met with leaders of the SLORC and urged them to "choose the path" of "democracy, rather than continued repression and dictatorial control," and declared that "fundamental change in the United States policy towards Burma would depend on fundamental change in the SLORC's treatment of the Burmese people; and

Whereas the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Burma, Professor Yozo Yokota, visited the country in October 1995 and will deliver a preliminary report of his findings to the current session of the United Nations General Assembly: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives calls on—

(1) the Burmese Government to immediately begin a political dialogue with Aung San Suu Kyi, other democratic leaders, and representatives of the ethnic minorities to release immediately and unconditionally detained Members of Parliament and other political prisoners, to repeal repressive laws which prohibit freedom of association and expression and the right of citizens to participate freely in the political life of their country, to resume negotiations with the International Committee of the Red Cross on access to prisoners, and help control the massive flow of heroin from Burma; and

(2) the President, the Secretary of State, and the United States ambassador to the United Nations to actively support and promote a resolution at the upcoming session of the Third Committee of the United Nations General Assembly reiterating the grave concerns of the international community and calling on the SLORC to take concrete, significant steps to fulfill its obligations to guarantee respect to basic human rights and to restore civilian, democratic rule to the people of Burma.

WHAT'S MOST IMPORTANT—A
TRIBUTE TO LAVONNE CICHOCKI

HON. STEVE C. LATOURETTE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 17, 1995

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress has been grappling, often in a partisan manner, with the task of balancing the Federal budget, I received word yesterday from home that quickly made me remember what's most important in life.

Fifteen years ago, I was a young, enthusiastic, idealistic, and probably obnoxious, public defender. Shortly after my arrival our office was joined by another young attorney, Chuck Cichocki. Chuck and I shared pretty much the same dreams and hopes. We both wanted to do our jobs well; we both wanted to build a family; and we both wanted to give our children the ability to share the American dream.

Both of us were pretty successful in realizing those goals. With his wife, LaVonne, Chuck's family welcomed three beautiful children into the world. Chuck and LaVonne enjoyed a model marriage, a nurturing family, a respect of their community and each other. Sadly, the news from home yesterday was that, after a long and courageous struggle with cancer, LaVonne passed away.

LaVonne Cichocki was a loving wife, a devoted mother and a great friend to all who knew her. Despite her pain, she remained active in her family's activities, her kids' school activities, and her participation in the events that helped shape the community in which they lived.

The world is certainly a better place today because of LaVonne's life, and, sadly the sun shines a little bit dimmer with her passing.

Mr. Speaker, our prayers must be with the Cichocki's today, and my most fervent hope is that we redouble our efforts and focus our attention more on helping families like Chuck and LaVonne's realize their dreams, and less time fighting for political points.

A TAX CREDIT AND BALANCED
BUDGET

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 17, 1995

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member highly commends to his colleagues the following two editorials which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald on November 16, 1995, and November 17, 1995.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Nov. 16, 1995]

HOUSE-SENATE TAX CREDIT PACT HAS GOOD NEWS
FOR MIDDLE CLASS

Republicans in the House and Senate have worked out of sensible compromise on the GOP's proposal for a family tax credit.

The compromise would permit families to reduce their federal income-tax payment by \$500 for each child under age 18, sources said. The credits would be available for single parents with an annual income up to \$75,000 and for two-parent families who earn up to \$110,000 a year.

An earlier version passed by the House set the income-limit at \$200,000. The income has

been capped at a lower level to make the tax cut more palatable to moderate Republicans. Democrats had made it sound as if the majority of families with children were rich.

That, of course, is nonsense. The government already spends billions on welfare, food stamps, subsidized housing and income supplements for children in low-income families. But just above them are middle-class families in which one or two working partners earn a total of \$30,000, \$40,000, or \$50,000, paying taxes, having Social Security contributions withheld and carrying the added responsibility of securing good child care.

Federal tax policy has for years been tinkered with to improve people's lives. But the benefits have not gone to households that looked like a traditional family. Married couples where the wife was not in the labor force saw their median income, in constant dollars, plateau at about \$30,000 from 1967 to 1992. Meanwhile, couples where both partners worked for pay enjoyed a rise in median income from \$38,500 in 1967 to \$50,000 in 1992.

The value of the personal exemption, one of the main tax benefits for families with children, has declined. Sponsors of the 1995 Republican tax credit say the credit is designed to restore fairness.

Other provisions of the compromise tax package would reduce taxes on capital gains. Farmers and small-business owners would be able to pass more of their holdings to their heirs. The "marriage penalty," a tax quirk that discriminates against married couples, would be made less onerous.

The compromise version of the child tax credit was based on a plan approved by the Senate in which families with children would receive about 60 percent of the \$245 billion total over the next seven years. Senate sponsors said this includes 29 million families with about three-fourths of the nation's 69 million children.

For the Democrats to portray this as a tax cut for the rich is to use the irresponsible rhetoric that increasingly makes their party's positions appear irrelevant.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Nov. 17, 1995]

DEMOCRATS IGNORE KERREY'S WISE ADVICE

Congressional Democrats and President Clinton should have taken to heart the advice that a member of their party, Sen. Bob Kerrey of Nebraska, offered recently.

In the midst of rhetoric over emergency spending and borrowing legislation, a statement made Tuesday by Kerrey stood out: "Democrats need to accept the idea that we are going to balance the budget in seven years. Republicans have the majority, and they have won that argument."

Kerrey told an audience of moderate Democrats Monday that their party needs to lead by proving that it can make difficult decisions on spending and taxes. He said the party's leaders need to accept spending cuts, restructure government and decentralize government power.

As the world watches in amazement while a great country embarrasses itself, Clinton has dug in his heels and, as of late yesterday, was refusing to accept the GOP goal of balancing the budget in seven years. As Sen. Charles Grassley of Iowa put it, "everything else" in the Republicans' budget plan was negotiable. But the seven-year goal for reducing the deficit to zero is now the reason for Clinton's refusal to sign a temporary extension of the debt ceiling and spending authority.

Kerrey is chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. He has a major role in next year's elections. Digging in left of center and shouting about Republicans "destroying" Medicare and showering "the rich" with windfall tax breaks at the

expense of the elderly and working class has been the strategy for some party leaders.

That tactic is working, regrettably, in part because the baseless charges are seldom held up to examination by news organizations.

Kerrey has proposed a more honest approach—one that could make the 1996 campaign a genuine referendum on how far the government should go in the way of reform and how fast. Unfortunately, the president and other leading Democrats still are defying the Republican budget plan and behaving with a stubbornness which they hope will pull their poll numbers higher.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICIA MCGARRY
DRAKE

HON. WILLIAM J. MARTINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 17, 1995

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a very special member of the Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey.

Patricia McGarry Drake has recently decided to retire after an outstanding career in public service, where she is recognized State-wide for her expertise in administrative skills. In 1968, Pat began as a typist in the Essex County Clerk's Office, and in 1990, she was elected Essex County Clerk. Currently, she serves as president of the County Officer's Association of the State of New Jersey.

Pat is a life-long resident of Essex County, NJ, where, despite her busy schedule, she found the time to raise four children and two grandchildren. She is also a leading member of several civic and charitable organizations. One such organization, the Patricia McGarry Drake Civic Association, makes charitable donations to needy families.

Furthermore, Pat is very proud of her direct Irish heritage. Her father, Thomas, was born in County Roscommon, Ireland, and her mother, Kathleen, was born in County Sligo, Ireland. In recognition of her achievements, she was honored as Irishwoman of the year by the Friends of Brian Boru in 1986. She has also been honored by many other organizations throughout her career. Most recently, she was selected as Essex County Irish Woman of the Year in 1995.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to help me salute Patricia McGarry Drake for her illustrious performance and sincere dedication as a public official in this county.

SHERIFF HOHERCHAK

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 17, 1995

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my good friend Peter Hoherchak, sheriff of Carbon County, PA. Pete will retire from his post this year and is being honored by friends, colleagues, and family on November 18. I am proud to have been asked to participate in the tribute to him.

There are few public servants who will be missed as much as Pete, who is well-loved and respected by the people of Carbon County. He is the epitome of the ideal sheriff: wise, compassionate, and fair. His enforcement of