

laws have been applied to this body. Now Congress is required to play by the same rules as everyone else.

But there is still at least one special exception the Congressional Accountability Act did not eliminate: Congress gets paid during Federal shutdowns while other Federal employees do not.

We can clear up this matter by passing H.R. 2658, a bill I introduced which would suspend Member's salaries during Federal shutdowns and furloughs. It is only fair that Congress be treated like every other Federal employee. If we are serious about playing by the same rules that govern everyone else, we need to pass this now.

On January 3, 1996, Carol Ann Rinzler and Perry Luntz wrote an excellent and eloquent article for the New York Times which accurately describes this problem. I have enclosed it below so all of my colleagues can better understand the magnitude of this issue:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 3, 1996]

OUR 2 CENTS' WORTH

(By Carol Ann Rinzler and Perry Luntz)

Almost exactly a year ago, Congress passed the Congressional Accountability Act, a much ballyhooed measure that requires the House and Senate to abide by the workplace and civil rights laws they enact for the rest of us. Alas, like so many things in life, this long-overdue legislation turns out to be less than meets the eye.

In an effort to minimize the effects of the Government shutdown on their constituents, Republicans in the House proposed last week that furloughed Federal employees go back to work without being paid, surely a new idea in free-market, conservative economics.

Afterward, someone asked Representative Tom DeLay of Texas, the House majority whip, whether he would consider giving up his own salary during the crisis. No way, said Mr. DeLay, explaining that, like every other member of Congress, he isn't a Federal employee—he is a "constitutional officer."

Well, we've reread our copy of the Constitution, and frankly the distinction seems a bit arcane to us.

True, members of Congress are specifically mentioned in the Constitution, Article I, Section 6 says that "Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law and paid out of the Treasury of the United States." Cabinet members and Federal judges also get a mention, later on, but other workers—curators at the Smithsonian, say—do not.

But every Federal paycheck originates in an appropriation requiring money from the Treasury, whose funds come, in large part, from income taxes. That should give everyone of us the inalienable right to put in our 2 cents. Or to take it out.

Members of the House and Senate earn a base salary of \$133,600 a year (those in leadership positions get more.) And don't forget the generous benefit package: life insurance, health insurance, per diem travel and a nifty pension. Mr. DeLay's base salary alone costs each of America's more than 115 million individual taxpayers 1.2 cents a year.

As conscientious citizens, we have always paid our taxes, regardless of our political gripes. Even though one of us was tear-gassed in 1971 by an overzealous guard at the Nixon White House, protecting it from throngs of balding, middle-aged Vietnam War protesters and their children, the Internal Revenue Service got paid the following year anyway.

This time, however, we plan to draw a line in the sand. Having voted to obey its own

laws, members of Congress should be man (or woman) enough to live up to that requirement. Before Tom DeLay votes for trimming Medicare, he should whittle down his own Government-financed health insurance. If he expects Federal workers to show up for free, so should he.

Until then, he can forget our helping to pay his salary. Come April 15, our joint tax return will be 2 cents short. That ought to send a message: keeping Congress in line is a hard job, but somebody has to do it.

COMMENDATION FOR THE  
HONORABLE EDWARD J. BLAKE

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Honorable Edward J. Blake, who is retiring from the Court of Common Pleas on January 31, 1996.

Judge Blake was born in Philadelphia on May 18, 1926, to Philip and Agnes Blake, and he was graduated from Saint Joseph's Preparatory High School in June 1944. From August 1944, to January 1946, he attended the Pennsylvania Maritime Academy, and was thereafter commissioned as an Ensign in the U.S. Naval Reserve. In September 1946, Judge Blake entered the prestigious Saint Joseph's College and earned a bachelor of science degree upon his graduation in May 1950.

Following his graduation, Judge Blake volunteered for active military service during the Korean war. As a damage control officer on the U.S.S. *Sutherland*, he participated in the Inchon invasion in September 1950. Judge Blake was honorably discharged from active duty in 1951, but he remained a member of the Reserve fleet and eventually attained the high rank of lieutenant commander before his discharge from the reserves in 1972.

Judge Blake's legal career was just as distinguished as his military achievements. Judge Blake attended the University of Pennsylvania Law School where he was to become class president. After graduating with honors, Judge Blake was appointed chief law clerk to the Court of Common Pleas No. 2, a position he held until 1962. From 1962 until 1964, he served as chief deputy court administrator of the court, and court administrator from 1964 until 1974.

In 1966, during his tenure as court administrator, the Court of Common Pleas entered the electronic age with the implementation of a computer system. As a direct consequence of his efforts, the court's ability to manage its caseload substantially improved, and the results were published in Computer Streamlines Caseload at Philadelphia Common Pleas Court, which Judge Blake coauthored.

Gov. Milton J. Schapp appointed Judge Blake to the bench of the Common Pleas in 1971, and he was elected in full term on November 6, 1973. In 1983 and 1993, Judge Blake was retained by the voters of Pennsylvania for succeeding terms in office.

The Pennsylvania Supreme Court appointed Judge Blake as administrative judge of the trial division of the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County on April 11, 1986, and during his tenure, the disposition of cases im-

proved even though the filing rate for civil cases increased dramatically.

On December 18, 1990, Judge Blake was elected as president judge. During his term of office as president judge, the criminal section of the trial division of the Court of Common Pleas was finally relocated to the newly completed Criminal Justice Center. This was a long-term project which was conceived, and nurtured due primarily to the efforts of Judge Blake.

Judge Blake's accomplishments, as a dedicated officer in the Army and a distinguished judge in the courtroom, has earned him respect and praise from his peers. I join his family and friends in wishing him an enjoyable retirement.

HONORING THE 85TH BIRTHDAY OF  
WILLARD MUNGER

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, today I want to honor Minnesota State Representative, Willard Munger, who is 85 years young and marking his 40th year as a member of the Minnesota Legislature. Willard is a Minnesota original—a Minnesota natural resource—whose work honors his family, the State of Minnesota, and our Nation.

Willard Munger represents the best of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party's tradition of service to the State of Minnesota. He is currently tied with former Representative Day as the longest-serving member of the House and he has no intention of retiring now. The Munger vision and tenacity have shaped our State and generations of lawmakers. I'm proud of the 6 years I served in the Minnesota House of Representatives with Willard Munger. Willard Munger, as a sage and chairman, introduced me to the task and role of environmental lawmaker. What a teacher and what a friend Willard Munger was to me and past, present, and future generations of lawmakers.

Willard Munger reminds us again and again of our stewardship responsibilities. He established a pragmatic proactive progressive public service tradition and standard of public interest decisions that are sustained by sound science—both political and natural science. Willard first was the conscience speaking out courageously against powerful interests and finally a fiery new chairman. Today his advocacy remains constant. He is not complacent, but is rightfully viewed as mainstream but the careful work on law and policy that he has written and helped enact and will continue to advance.

Willard was one of the first people to raise questions about the use of pesticides, PCBs, and mercury. He began addressing issues like recycling, energy conservation, nuclear power, wetlands, soil erosion, environmentally safe mining practices, and hazardous waste long before these policy matters became politically popular.

Willard Munger's environmental vision has helped make Minnesota a natural leader in the areas of natural resource conservation and protection. Among his achievements are the enactment of the Minnesota Environmental

Policy Act, the Resource Recovery Act, the Critical Areas Act, the Power Plant Siting Act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, the Waste Management Act, Reinvest in Minnesota, the Solid Waste Reduction and Recycling Act, and the 1991 Wetlands Conservation Act. I was very privileged to work on some of these very measures in Gov. Wendell Anderson's "Minnesota Golden Years," 1971-1976. Willard was also instrumental in establishing the Western Lake Superior Sanitary District in the 1960's, which provided wastewater treatment along the St. Louis River and ended a major source of pollution in Lake Superior.

The tireless efforts of Willard Munger on natural resource policy over the past 40 years have rightfully earned him the title "the environmental conscience of the Minnesota Legislature." I was pleased to participate in a joint Minnesota House of Representatives and Senate program organized by former Minnesota Gov. Elmer L. Anderson, January 18, 1996. It is fitting that Minnesota has declared January 18 "Willard Munger Day." He has made and continues to make a difference. On behalf of today's and tomorrow's generations I thank Willard for standing up for what is right and wish him the best in the coming years.

TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR S.S.  
RAY OF INDIA

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 24, 1996*

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to pay tribute to a superb diplomat who has done a great deal to improve relations between the world's two largest democracies, the United States and India. Ambassador Siddhartha Shankar Ray, India's envoy to the United States since 1992, will be leaving Washington on February 20 and returning to domestic politics in his country. While many of our colleagues are sad to see Ambassador Ray finish his tour in Washington, we all gratefully acknowledge his many contributions to the improved climate in Indo-U.S. relations.

Ambassador Ray's appointment to Washington with the status of a Federal Cabinet Minister is indicative of the great confidence his Government has in his abilities. That confidence was well-placed. During Ambassador Ray's years in Washington, he was tireless in his promotion of India, not only as the world's largest secular democratic nation, but as a major emerging market for United States consumer products and business investment.

The last 4 years have been trying times in South Asia. Sharing a long border with China and facing an insurgency in Kashmir supported by outside forces, India has had its share of challenges. Throughout these years, my colleagues and I could always rely on Ambassador Ray to articulate India's concerns with eloquence and precision.

But, Mr. Speaker, these past 4 years have also been extremely exciting times. India, under the leadership of Prime Minister P.V. Narosimha Rao, has embarked upon a historic economic reform policy that has opened up unprecedented opportunities for United States companies, large and small, as well as for Indian entrepreneurs. At the same time, the end

of the cold war has forced all nations to rethink their security arrangements. Both of these historic developments are leading the United States and India to seek greater cooperation and partnership on many fronts. Many Members of this body were greatly impressed by the Prime Minister's address to this Chamber in 1994 in which he addressed many of these same points. The appointment of a statesman with the stature and experience of S.S. Ray—with his years of service as an attorney, Member of Parliament, Cabinet Minister, and top posts at the state level—shows the degree of importance that the Government of India attaches to its relations with the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we will also miss the Ambassador's extraordinary wife, Mrs. Maya Ray. Prior to their service in Washington, both Mr. and Mrs. Ray enjoyed distinguished legal careers as barristers, as well as Members of Parliament. Mrs. Ray's contributions to her husband's work in Washington will indeed be remembered with fondness and appreciation.

In my capacity as cochairman of the bipartisan Congressional Caucus on India and Indian-Americans, I look forward to working with Ambassador Ray's successor during this period of strengthened partnership between our two great nations, building on Ambassador Ray's excellent work.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my good wishes and those of my colleagues to Siddhartha and Maya Ray as they enter the next phase of their careers back home in India. Their many friends in the Congress and throughout our Nation hope they will return to visit frequently.

AMERICA NEEDS A NEW RUSSIAN  
POLICY

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 24, 1996*

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the departures of Andrei Kozyrev, Anatoly Chubais, and Sergei Filatov from the Yeltsin administration and the appointment of a Brezhnev-era hard-liner to be foreign minister should be the final wake-up call for the Clinton administration.

These reformers have been all but powerless for a long time, but their presence has allowed the administration to claim that Russia is on the right track and that any criticism of Russian policy would embolden the hard-liners. We see now that the hard-liners were emboldened long ago and are now in complete control.

For over 2 years, Russia has been engaged in a myriad of activities that range from the legal to the illegal to the morally repugnant, but all of which are contrary to United States national interests. These include Chechnya, nuclear dealings with Iran and Cuba, intimidation and subversion of nearly every former Soviet State, violations of numerous arms-control agreements, and strategic nuclear modernization, among many others.

All of this has been met by the Clinton administration with silence, arms control concessions, and a steady flow of U.S. taxpayer dollars. In other words, appeasement. True to its unvarnished record in history, appeasement has failed again. It is time for a new approach.

A more realistic policy toward Russia would involve several things: First, we must stop the mindless policy of giving foreign aid to Russia, especially its government. At this very moment, the Clinton administration and the IMF are preparing a \$9 billion infusion into the Russian treasury. In addition to fostering complacency among economic policymakers in Russia, our aid, especially multilateral loans and Nunn-Lugar, has been subsidizing the dangerous activities listed above.

Second, we should give immediate and concrete assurances to qualifying countries in central Europe that they will become full members of NATO in the nearest possible future. With Primakov as Foreign Minister, there can be no doubt that Russia will attempt at least to "Finlandize" the former Warsaw Pact countries. It is silly to oppose NATO expansion with talk of drawing lines in Europe. There already is a line, and because of it, stability has been fostered in those countries west of it. Quite frankly, the farther east that line is, the better. Furthermore, the virtual military reabsorption of Belarus by Russia has resulted in the stationing of Russian border troops on the Polish border. They have already moved the line—to the west.

Third, it is high time we start to resist Russian policy in the near abroad and the Third World. For over 2 years, Russia has been methodically sapping the sovereignty of its neighbors, and is clearly moving toward reestablishing some sort of Russian-dominated union. Using classic Soviet-style divide and rule tactics, Russia has helped topple the democratic government of Azerbaijan, brought Georgia to heel, and pushed Armenia to allow Russian bases on its soil. Russia continues its illegal occupation of Moldova, routinely violates Lithuanian territory, and has threatened annexation of the Baltic States. This uncivilized behavior is not only outrageous, it is potentially highly destabilizing to Europe. The same can be said about Russia's renewed affinity for some of the world's worst rogue regimes, such as Iran, Cuba, Syria, and Iraq. We must make it plain to the Russians that their membership in Western organizations is directly linked to their international behavior. Right now, they don't make the grade.

Fourth, we must extricate ourselves from our slavish devotion to arms control. To the Clinton administration, what this means is that any agreement is a good agreement, Russian violations of existing agreements are to be hushed up, and protecting American citizens from ballistic missiles is bad. Thus, recent and clear Russian violations of the Biological Weapons Convention, CFE and START I and many others, have been excused. The administration's only response has been a rash drive to ratify the flawed START II and a stubborn insistence on unilateral adherence to the ridiculous ABM treaty, from which we can walk away legally anytime.

Mr. Speaker, the key issue is not whether Russia has 3,500 or 10,000 nuclear warheads. What is in our interest and what will ensure the security of our European friends is a Russia that behaves in civilized fashion internationally. So far, not a thing the Clinton administration has done has goaded Russia in this direction. Indeed, the administration has tolerated and even condoned, as in Chechnya, uncivilized and dangerous Russian behavior.

The past 3 years of behaving as though we feel guilty that we won the cold war have