

in 1985 was primarily due to higher domestic loan syndication fees, letter of credit fees and credit card merchant fees: "The largest component of domestic fees and commissions was credit card merchant fees, which were \$19.2 million and \$15 million in 1985 and 1984, respectively."

Another factor that contributes to profitability of low-cost banks is their high volume of cardholders, which keeps administrative costs per transaction relatively low. A primary factor in keeping the administrative costs down, is a growing conservatism among the nation's low-cost banks to limit their losses by becoming more selective about who they give cards to, according to an informal survey of several banks.

On the question of profitability of low-cost banks, San Francisco-based attorney Lawrence Appel explained: "There's a wealth of evidence that suggests that financial institutions charging less than 18 percent make a considerable profit. Credit unions, for example, don't charge more than 12 percent. They wouldn't be doing this if it meant shooting themselves in the head. Banks, credit unions and savings & loans outside of California have been charging lower interest for years and not taking a bath in red ink. Documents filed in the Federal Reserve Bank in Washington and San Francisco prove this also."

Despite evidence that profits would be made due to increased volume and good management, the large banks still refuse to lower rates.

According to the New York Times, (August 9, 1986), "Industry sources note that banks make more than 5 cents on every dollar lent through credit card operations, compared with one cent on other types of loans." The article went on to say that big banks resist cutting their rates because credit cards are "highly profitable," and analysts noted that any significant reduction could sharply cut into earnings. Mark Alpert of Bear, Stearns et al. said Citibank, for instance, generates about 20 percent to 25 percent of its earnings from credit card operations, and the New York Times reported BankOne of Columbus, Ohio, about 30 percent.

At the subcommittee markup on March 18, the subcommittee adopted my proposal capping credit card interest rates at 8 percentage points above the yield on 1-year Treasury securities in the constant maturities series. The rate would be adjusted quarterly based on the rate in the second month of the preceding quarter. If my legislation were in effect today, the ceiling would be around 15 percent. When H.R. 515 reaches the floor I will offer my interest rate cap amendment on behalf of the American consumer.

I chose Treasury securities because those rates are truly a free market rate, not one administered by banks themselves, such as the prime rate, or an instrument of monetary policy such as the Federal Reserve discount rate. I chose 1-year yields in an attempt to match the duration of credit card receivables. A quarterly index ensures that the rate would change frequently enough to be responsive to market conditions, but not so frequently as to require frequent monitoring. The Second month of the preceding quarter allows for sufficient lead time to prepare for a new rate. And I chose 8 percentage points to provide ample opportunity to cover costs and make a

profit as well. The interest rate it would allow would be well above the level of many presently profitable banks. Anyone unable to make a profit by borrowing money at 6 percent and lending it at 15 percent should consider another line of work.

VLADIMIR AND MARIA SLEPAK GRANTED THE RIGHT TO EMIGRATE FROM THE SOVIET UNION

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union today announced it is granting to Vladimir and Maria Slepak the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union. I want to congratulate the Soviet Union for that decision. Maria and Vladimir Slepak first applied to emigrate from the Soviet Union 17 years ago, and in 1977 their sons were allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel. One of their sons now lives and studies medicine in my area of Philadelphia.

In 1978, Maria and Vladimir Slepak hung outside of their window a banner asking the Soviet Union to allow them to leave to join their son in Israel. For that their home was raided, the doors were broken down, they were removed forcibly, they were sent to prison. Vladimir Slepak was exiled to Siberia to a place where, as he said to me, Genghis Khan was born. He wife, Maria, joined him there for long years of privation.

Yet they came back with their heads held high and became leaders of the refusenik movement in Moscow. I have met with Vladimir Slepak and Maria Slepak back in 1985 when I first traveled to Moscow and again this past April in Moscow. I was worried because the Slepaks were one of a group of people that the Soviet Union said they would never release because they were the leaders of the refusenik community in Moscow. So it is tremendously heartwarming to hear the news that Vladimir Slepak will again be able to see his children whom he has not seen for 10 long years and to see his grandchildren whom he has never seen. This very courageous and articulate man with a very courageous and not-well wife has continued to lead the refuseniks in the Soviet Union, continued to provide them with support, continued to provide them with belief in their faith, belief in freedom, belief in their future.

The fact that this wonderful man and his wife will be allowed to emigrate to Israel is one that I believe is very important and in which I take very, very deep personal belief and satisfaction.

Now this does not mean that the problem of refuseniks in the Soviet Union is solved, it does not mean the Soviet Union has suddenly reformed. Much remains to be done, much re-

mains to be done for the many thousands of Jewish refuseniks, of Christians, of others who want to leave the Soviet Union, who want to become a part of the world and who believe in freedom and exercise of religion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER].

Mr. RITTER. I would like to commend my colleague in the well for his dogged pursuit of the liberation of Vladimir Slepak. I know that the gentleman from Philadelphia has been actively engaged in this effort for years and I know personally about this effort when we traveled to Moscow in October 1985, 2 weeks before the 1985 summit. And I know how much time and effort he has spent with the Slepak family in Moscow and the kind of effort that he has made once he came back to publicize their plight.

I am familiar with the very excellent video tape that I had the good fortune to witness and how that video tape was used. That video tape incidentally the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] had made. That video tape was used on behalf of the effort, the nationwide effort to free Vladimir Slepak.

I can imagine that it must be a very good feeling for the gentleman tonight to know that that effort has borne fruit and I commend the gentleman.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I thank my colleague. Just let me say that I know over the years of his efforts on behalf of all of those who are persecuted in the Soviet Union, I know that they have been manifold because he indeed lived in the Soviet Union, indeed speaks fluent Russian and indeed knows the plight of people of various persuasions in the Soviet Union and their difficulties.

I know that when I was last in the Soviet Union in April, as we were leaving I said to General Secretary Gorbachev that if he would let Vladimir and Maria take our seats, my wife, Susan, and I would give our seats up so they could come back here.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has done the same kind of thing in a very courageous and heroic effort to help people in the Soviet Union who desperately need our help in times of persecution.

THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

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

Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, on October 7, 1987, Ambassador Patricia M. Byrne, Alternate United States Representative to the 42d Session of the United Nations General Assembly, made a very important statement in the U.N. Third Committee on "The Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination." In that speech, Ambassador Byrne set forth United States policy toward the elimination of South Africa's apartheid system. I believe that the

speech was a significant step in the right direction. It was, perhaps, the strongest, the most forthright statement of opposition to apartheid that the Reagan administration has made to date. I would, therefore, like to share it with my colleagues and ask that it be included in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I must, however, raise two caveats. First, Ambassador Byrne states that "We have, nevertheless, opposed mandatory punitive economic sanctions against South Africa * * *". Instead of "We," I would argue that the Ambassador should have said "the Reagan administration." Certainly, the Congress—and I believe the majority of the American people—are not opposed to sanctions against the apartheid regime.

Second, Ambassador Byrne notes that "the United States will enforce—last year's congressional mandated—sanctions to the letter." I must question the extent to which that assurance is likely to be fulfilled, particularly with respect to the international arena. The Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986 provides that—

The President or, at his direction, the Secretary of State would convene an international conference of the other industrialized democracies in order to reach cooperative agreements to impose sanctions against South Africa to bring about the complete dismantling of apartheid [Sec. 401 (b)(1)].

This provision of the law has simply been ignored: There has been no such international conference. Moreover, the act expresses the—

Sense of the Congress that the President should instruct (our U.N. representative) to propose that the United Nations Security Council . . . impose [anti-apartheid sanctions] against South Africa of the same type as are imposed by this Act [Sec. 401(e)].

Here, if the administration has not violated the letter of the law, it has surely not adhered to the spirit of the law. Indeed, on February 20, 1987, the United States vetoed a U.N. Security Council sanctions resolution modeled after the provisions of our own act.

In its report to the Congress on the effectiveness of the Anti-Apartheid Act, the Reagan administration predictably argued that sanctions had not worked. I would point out—as have others—that had the administration faithfully implemented the international provisions of the act, economic sanctions would have been profoundly more effective.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR PATRICIA M. BYRNE

Mr. Chairman, my delegation wishes to address the agenda item entitled Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

The United Nations Charter makes clear that human rights and fundamental freedoms must be protected for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion. The Universal Declaration upholds the same principle.

The United States is a multiracial nation built by people of every country, race, and religion in the world. The principal reason tens of millions of persons have come to this country is the old one of the search for freedom: political, religious, and economic freedom. We pride ourselves on having built a country based on an ideal: that a person not be judged by his religion, politics, ethnic origin, or race; that everyone has rights which must be protected so that he can participate in the nation's social economic, and political life.

Living up to this ideal is not easy; on many occasions we have failed to do so. Unlike some political systems, we do not claim perfection; we hide nothing; we admit our failings. You can hear and see us debating solutions to our problems in our publications, television programs, election campaigns, and legislatures. One problem with which we have grappled has been that of racism. We have made great progress. Our struggle against racial intolerance has been characterized by some of the worst and some of the most inspiring chapters in our history. That struggle is not over; it is one which will be won.

Our history, our ideals, the nature of our people leave us no option but to oppose ideologies and systems based upon the rule of a self-appointed elite claiming a "revealed truth" justifying oppression. Those factors drive our opposition to Soviet Communism as much as they drive our opposition to the racist apartheid system that rules the people of South Africa.

Mr. Chairman, in case anyone should doubt it, let me state that the United States firmly believes that apartheid cannot be justified. Apartheid must end. The international community has the responsibility to work for the elimination of apartheid. All ideas, attitudes, and economic and political systems that condone slavery, segregation, discrimination, or any other form of subjugation of the individual denigrate victim and perpetrator. Apartheid denigrates all the people of southern Africa.

As we have stated on previous occasions, our opposition to that inhumane system which has brought so much death and misery pushes us to seek ways to dismantle apartheid without increasing the suffering of the people of southern Africa. We must consider carefully the consequences of our actions lest they increase the suffering of the people in whose behalf we act. Calls for violence will bring violence. They serve only to undermine the determined struggle by the majority in South Africa—who, let us not forget, ever more skillfully use their economic clout in the cause of a better life.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the United States has long had a variety of sanctions against South Africa—our arms embargo pre-dates that of the UN by several years. We have, nevertheless, opposed mandatory punitive economic sanctions against South Africa as counterproductive and as hurting precisely those persons less able to resist them. The Congress of the United States, however, passed legislation last year imposing some of the toughest sanctions in the world, including those of the Front Line States. We are a nation of laws, Mr. Chairman, and consequently, the United States will enforce those sanctions to the letter. We will fight any effort to violate or otherwise circumvent those sanctions.

Despite a hardening of South African attitudes since our imposition of sanctions last year, the United States will not disengage from efforts to promote peaceful change in South Africa. The realities there are grim: increased repression, censorship, violence, and fear. But there are also elements of hope: the Natal Indaba, the ANC-Afrikaner talks in Dakar, growing black economic organizational strength, and the conciliatory influence of religious leaders.

Our policies seek to build on those elements of hope. We aim to provide assistance to the victims of apartheid and to prepare them for increased economic and political responsibilities in the future. Our assistance has focused on increasing educational opportunities for the black majority, training in leadership skills, and strengthening community organizations, labor unions, legal resource centers, and black-owned enterprises.

These efforts will continue. We support practical steps to bring a peaceful end to apartheid. Among those are the release of all political prisoners, including Nelson Mandela, and the end to bans on political parties.

Mr. Chairman, on September 29, Secretary of State Shultz spoke before the Business Council on International Understanding and discussed our hope for South Africa's future. We would like to see in South Africa:

A new constitutional order establishing equal political, economic, and social rights for all South Africans without regard to race, language, national origin, or religion;

A democratic electoral system with multi-party participation and universal franchise for all adult South Africans;

Effective constitutional guarantees of basic human rights for all South Africans as provided for in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the canons of democracies everywhere;

The rule of law, safeguarded by an independent judiciary with the power to enforce the rights to be guaranteed by the constitution to all South Africans;

A constitutional allocation of powers between the national government and its constituent regional and local jurisdictions in keeping with South Africa's traditions; and

An economic system that guarantees economic freedom for every South African; allocates government social and economic services fairly; and enables all South Africans to realize the fruits of their labor, acquire and own property, and attain a decent standard of living for themselves and their families.

To quote Secretary Shultz further: "These are ideas that we believe would help South Africans chart their own path to a democratic and prosperous future. We Americans do not claim a monopoly on democratic concepts for another country, but we have every reason to make clear our hopes and visions. I challenge South Africans to rise to the test of building a future which takes these ideas into account."

Mr. Chairman, before concluding these remarks I want to mention another important factor that Secretary Shultz discussed: the powerful force of religion in South Africa. He noted that South Africans are a devoutly religious people. Churches, some of them integrated, represent "institutional channels for dialogue and reconciliation across racial barriers." The Dutch Reformed Church, the largest Afrikaner Church, claimed, until last year, that apartheid was not only allowed but actually required by the teachings of the Bible. Last year, after months of internal debate, the Church announced that its previous teachings were wrong: Apartheid is not justified by the Bible and is not in accordance with Christian principles. Secretary Shultz said: "This simple but powerful truth hit like a thunderbolt among Afrikaners. Suddenly the spurious moral basis for apartheid had been stripped away, revealing if for the unjust and unsanctified system that it is."

In conclusion, we think that the only effective manner to fight apartheid in South Africa is through peaceful change. Violence brings only suffering, and, Mr. Chairman, violence will mean only defeat for the democratic foes of apartheid; it will leave only a devastated landscape and economy incapable of giving life to the dreams so many of us have for South Africa. My country stands ready to assist, as it has done for 200 years, all those who seek to promote democracy and justice.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRES

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to propound primarily a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, is it within the rules of the House for committees to hold hearings where only one side of an issue is presented?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARPER). Under rule 11, the minority party within a committee is entitled to have 1 day's worth of witnesses, although apparently there is no rule relating to witnesses on different sides of the issue.

Mr. WALKER. So if I understand the Chair, if a hearing is held where the minority has had no input into the witnesses, under the rules of the House that committee chairman would have to grant the minority at least 1 day of hearings for the purpose of hearing witnesses from the minority side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair's understanding of the rules is the minority party would be entitled to 1 day's worth of witnesses.

Mr. WALKER. What the Chair is telling me is that the minority party then could get opposition witnesses but there is nothing within the rules that absolutely requires that anybody be heard on a different viewpoint before the committee, is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rules do not speak to that specifically.

Mr. WALKER. A further parliamentary inquiry, is it within the standard practices of the House to have committee hearings where only one side of an issue is heard?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot comment on the types of witnesses that are called by a committee.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair. I raise the issue only because we seem to have a situation arising in one of the committees of the House; namely, the Judiciary Committee where they are about to hold a hearing tomorrow where evidently the only people who have been invited are people opposed to the balanced budget amendment of the Constitution.

Now it seems to me that tells us a great deal about the Democratic leadership of this House. The Democratic chairman of the Judiciary Committee has made a conscious determination that we are going to hold a hearing where only the opponents of the balanced budget amendment of the Constitution are going to be heard and we do not know at the present time of any provision having been made to hear the views of the proponents of that amendment at any particular time. In fact, some of those who have called the committee staff and talked to them about that hearing tomorrow have been told that this hearing is for opponents only, that they would not

be welcome to participate. It seems to me that if it is not outside the rules of the House to do that, it is certainly outside the standard practices of the House. Normally what we do in this body is allow all sides of questions to be heard at least in the committee process. It is very difficult to do out here on the House floor sometimes to get all sides heard under the restrictive rules we sometimes operate under, but generally the committees at least allow full debate.

It appears as though we are going to have at least one hearing tomorrow on the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, one of the most important issues this country wants addressed, that will not include all sides of the issues, where the judgment will be made that only those people who are opposed to the amendment are going to be heard in the House of Representatives in the committee of jurisdiction over that particular amendment.

That is wrong and it is high time that we have people on this floor, hopefully both in the majority and in the minority parties, speak up to this blatant attempt to shut down free discussion of issues in the House of Representatives. We have seen this pattern develop over and over again. We are seeing it with restrictive rules, we are seeing it with the kinds of bills that are often brought out here that do not allow full debate. It seems to me it is high time now when we are starting to shut down the witnesses that are granted before committees that we speak up and say that that has gone much too far.

So I would hope that this is an aberration. I hope that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee will reconsider and that we will be allowed a full discussion of the balanced budget amendment, one of the more important causes that the American people wish to address.

I would be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I very much appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania yielding. I got over here a little late.

The gentleman speaks of issues on which there is genuine disagreement. I appreciate his view on that.

I come to first of all, say to my colleague from Pennsylvania, your colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. COUGHLIN, that his efforts in my opinion, in no small part, are responsible for bringing the message to the Soviet Union on an issue on which there is no disagreement in this House and that is that the Helsinki final act guarantees and other guarantees that give people the very basic human right of having the ability to decide where in this world they want to live, with whom they want to live and when they want to be either in their own country or in some other country, should be observed.

In the particular case, the very poignant case of Vladimir Slepak, the

gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] has been particularly interested, committed and faithful and I want to congratulate him for his efforts and of course all of us join in giving to Vladimir Slepak our very best wishes and hopefully we will be able to give to him a cordial welcome when and if he has the opportunity of visiting the United States.

I want to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman. I too know of my colleague from Pennsylvania's work, having been with him in the Soviet Union in October of 1985 when we too met with this family. It is indeed good news that they are going to be permitted to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

I yield to the gentleman from Delaware who has now assumed his position on the floor rather than at the chair.

Mr. CARPER. We are not playing musical chairs, although it looks that way.

Let me just say as one of the four principal coauthors of the balanced budget amendment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has referenced, I am aware of the hearing scheduled for tomorrow being devoted to the four witnesses in opposition.

□ 1830

My understanding is that we will also be permitted another day of hearings for those proponents, including myself, and presumably the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others will have an opportunity to have their voices heard.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

Do we have any idea when those hearings are going to be held? The word we got when we asked that question was that it could be 3 or 4 months from now when that additional day of hearings comes about. Does that gentleman have any information as to when those hearings are going to be held? I ask that because it certainly appears as though these hearings are going to be held as a way of trying to stop people from signing on to the discharge petition which is at the desk where we are trying to force action on the floor by the end of the session. We are a little bit concerned about that.

Would the gentleman have any information along those lines?

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what point in time the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] has in mind. I would certainly encourage him to hold those hearings within the month.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I appreciate that because we are certainly concerned about what we are hearing coming out of the committee at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

A NEW REIGN OF TERROR IN HAITI

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

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, a new reign of terror has begun in Haiti. The last reign of terror began when the people of Haiti came out and voted 90 percent in favor of a new constitution. That new constitution provided for a series of deadlines to launch an electoral process which would conclude on November 29 with the election of a new president for the Republic of Haiti.

The people in charge at that time, the transitional government head, General Namphy, and his cohorts decided they would take over the election process. They panicked. They never thought the people would approve the constitution, so they decided to take it over, and as a result there were demonstrations throughout Haiti and a number of people lost their lives.

That reign of terror finally ended, partially through the pressure of the U.S. Government to force the Namphy transitional government of Haiti to give up its desire to take over the electoral process. They yielded to the election commission, the electoral process went forward, and the killing stopped for a while. During that period, however, there was one candidate for president who was killed. He was hacked to death in broad daylight by a group of men who walked away and have never been caught.

Yesterday the latest reign of terror was initiated with the killing of another candidate for president. This candidate was shot and killed on Tuesday in front of the police station in Port-au-Prince. He had come to the police station, had called a press conference, and in a speech was demanding the release of another candidate who had been put in jail by the police. While he was speaking and while reporters were gathered around him, plainclothes police came out of the station. They approached him, they beat him, and they shot him. The name of that candidate is Yves Volel. He was killed in front of the police station in Haiti. There were reporters and television cameramen there, and they filmed the entire incident. The police confiscated the cameras and drove the reporters away afterward. The police have now made the statement that he was killed because he had come to the police station with a band of armed men. Everybody knows that he had no armed men with him.

Yves Volel was a citizen of New York. He had lived for a long time in New York City. It is important to take a moment and look at the background of Yves Volel, because one problem we seem to have in America is that there is no empathy with the struggle in Haiti. Haiti is only 90 miles from the

shores of the United States, and yet we do not seem to be concerned at all with their struggle for freedom. We do not seem to be concerned about the fact that the people of Haiti are overwhelmingly in favor of democracy. They have come out and voted for a constitution. They are ready to go forward and rebuild their nation along democratic lines. They want these elections to go through, they want to complete the cycle, and they want to have a president by November 29. But a small band of armed, uniformed thugs, military terrorists, is determined that the process will not go forward.

While this happens, we in the United States sit and watch and do nothing. The Organization of American States sits and watches and does nothing. The United Nations does nothing. But Yves Volel was a human being, a magnificent leader, and he deserved to live. He deserved to participate in the process as a candidate, and now he is gone. He lived for a long time in New York City during exile from Haiti. He has a wife and family right now in Queens, NY, living in the district represented by my colleague, Congressman FLOYD FLAKE. Mr. Volel once attended the military academy with General Namphy who heads the government in Haiti now. He had a reputation generally in this country as a good, decent man who was a civil libertarian.

He was committed to democratic government, and he was willing to fight for what he believed in, but the police say he was an armed bandit and came to the station seeking to cause trouble. In Haiti the comment is that this is a pack of lies.

They are turning the whole world upside down. One of the key drafters of the constitution of Haiti has said that this slaying of Yves Volel was part of a plan to create an insecurity that would make the holding of fair elections in November difficult.

Today it is Volel, tomorrow it will be someone else. I have always contended that the process in Haiti should be assisted by outside forces, not military forces, but peaceful forces. We should make it clear to Haiti that we are watching. We should have groups monitoring the situation. We should have the participation of the Organization of American States. We should finance, if necessary, a team of people who would stay there permanently to monitor the elections until November 29.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of the democratic people of Haiti have spoken. They want a democratic society. They have a constitution, and they should be protected. They should be protected from the uniformed, armed military bandits who are determined to have it their way.

A SALUTE TO MR. PHIL CHEL-NICK—OHIO SENIOR CITIZEN HALL OF FAME

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on October 29, 1987, the Ohio Department of Aging will hold its 11th annual Ohio Senior Citizens Hall of Fame induction ceremony. This year nine individuals will be honored for their vital role in the community. I am pleased to report that Mr. Phil Chelnick, a resident of my congressional district, is among those being honored.

A longtime community activist, I can think of no one more deserving of this special honor. Mr. Chelnick founded the Social Action Committee of the Jewish Community Center Senior Adult Department and has served as its chairman for 14 years. The committee was established to create a vehicle for adult advocacy and involvement in issues of concern. The Social Action Committee has worked in areas such as housing for the elderly and against cuts in Social Security and Medicare. Mr. Chelnick has also served as chairman of the center's house council. However, his interests have not been limited to the problems of the elderly. He has also worked against budget cuts for the needy, and in support of a nuclear freeze.

Mr. Chelnick is the recipient of numerous awards and citations for his efforts, including the Jewish Community Center's Leonard Kronenberg Award for Outstanding Service and the Senior Adult Leadership and Community Service Award of the JCC. He was named as one of six outstanding seniors in Ohio in 1973 and has served as a delegate to the White House Conference on Aging.

In 1986, Mr. Chelnick served as my Congressional Senior Citizen Intern on Capitol Hill. Brimming with enthusiasm and vitality, he did an excellent job of representing the concerns of seniors in the 21st Congressional District and throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Ohio Department of Aging will be recognizing these special individuals for their tireless efforts and significant contributions to our community. It is an honor to salute my friend, Phil Chelnick, on this occasion.

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

[Mr. MILLER of California 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 California [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. LEWIS of California 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 gen-

tlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

CUBAN FOREIGN POLICY—THE FOUNTAINHEAD OF INSURGENCY

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

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California yield briefly?

Mr. LUNGREN. Certainly, I am happy to yield briefly.

AWARDING OF NOBEL PRIZE FOR PHYSICS

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

Mr. Speaker, today there was a significant announcement of the awarding of the Nobel Prize for Physics to Dr. J. Georg Bednorz and Dr. K. Alex Mueller, who received the Nobel Prize for Physics for their discoveries in the field of superconductivity.

We can be very proud of them, although this was a German and a Swiss national. They were working quietly for the IBM Co. in a Zurich research laboratory.

I think this points up the internationalization of science and how international cooperation is so beneficial. I think it also points up great challenges for us as a nation, and I am hoping that with the achievement of the winning of the Nobel Prize in Physics for superconductivity by these researchers, our Government, our industry, and our people will pay attention to this potentially explosive field and seek to do what is right and put forth the appropriate resources so we can have an American effort that will lead the world.

The possibilities of losing out in this spectacular competition are there, and we should try to minimize the problems and we should try to be as competitive as possible with our Japanese and European counterparts.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by saying that it is a great race. It is like the Olympics. We are very much a part of it, and to the victors will go many spoils.

Mr. LUNGREN, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, in August, a new wave of optimism splashed across the nations of Central America. President Arias of Costa Rica negotiated a peace plan with four other Central American governments. Admirers of the accord proclaimed a new era of tranquility and independence in Central America. Unfortunately, a close examination of the Caribbean basin's strategic realities reveals little basis for such hopes.

To put it bluntly, Mr. Speaker, the nature and implementation of Cuban foreign policy has thrust that radical

dictatorship into the stature of a superpower. The essential role which the destruction of the Latin American status quo plays in Cuban policy means that every pro-Western country in the Western Hemisphere must worry about Fidel Castro. And the extraordinary boldness of Cuban support for insurgencies means that many of these democracies must regard Castro as a threat to their survival. In short, the present character of Cuban foreign policy has become incompatible with stability in the Americas.

Prior to the success of his insurrection against the Batista regime, Fidel Castro composed an ominous message to his confidante, Celia Sanchez:

I swore to myself that the Americans were going to pay dearly for what they were doing. When this war is over, a much wider and bigger war will begin for me: the war I'm going to launch against them.

FORMULATING CUBAN FOREIGN POLICY

In 1986, a violent crusade against imperialism remains as central to the objectives of the Cuban Government as it did to the world view of Fidel Castro in 1958. Raymond Duncan, a political science professor at the State University of New York at Brockport, has observed that the essence of Cuban foreign policy arises from the interplay between nationalism, domestic Communist ideology, and Castro's Leninism. Writing in "Historical Antecedents of Cuban Foreign Policy," an essay contained in the sixth edition of the authoritative "Cuban Communism," Duncan argues that government ideology underpins the Havana regime. Castro's vision of a society in "total revolution" theoretically unites the people with their leaders. Revolutionary ideology, Duncan says, "helped to build a Cuban national conscience after 1959, serving as a basic communication system through which to mobilize Cubans for new national commitments. Fidel Castro, Ernesto Che Guevara, and other members of the revolutionary elite have linked the themes of anti-imperialism, class struggle, socialist unity and economic determinism to the creation of a 'new man' possessed of the technical and cultural skills required to forge a new Cuba." This ongoing construction of a completely new society legitimizes the leadership's decisions, and it gives Cubans a justification for hope when those decisions prove unwise. The sustenance of a living ideology has thus become imperative for Havana policymakers.

Foreign policy obligations stem from this requirement. As a Leninist, Castro believes that international relations rest on a dialectical fault in which socialism and international capitalism struggle implacably against one another. Professor Duncan notes:

According to the script, the Western enemies, led by the United States, will seek to maximize power at all costs.

The forces of "imperialism" will never acquiesce in the creation of a "new man," Cuban or otherwise, be-

cause such an acceptance would jeopardize the capitalist status quo. It would also interrupt the dialectical cycle of which Leninist historiography consists. The maintenance of ideology for purposes of internal mobilization embroils Cuba in an unceasing conflict with America and her friends in the Western Hemisphere.

Havana, it should be added, expects nations friendly to Cuba to share this perspective. Juan Valdes Paz, a senior Cuban intelligence official, universalized the dialectic of revolution in a 1985 essay for Contemporary Marxism. In "Cuba and the Crisis in Central America," Paz even identifies neutrality in Central America with opposition to the West. Paz states that:

Nonalignment is a historical result of the Central American peoples' struggles for full national independence and of their opposition to the global and regional strategic interests of imperialism, principally U.S. imperialism.

The Cuban Government cannot accept democracy in its sphere of influence because its leaders hold, as a matter of dogma, that democracy will never tolerate the Havana regime.

Castro began the implementation of his international objectives even before he came to power. According to Luis Aguilar, a professor of history at Georgetown University, Castro enlisted with the radical Caribbean Legion in its scheme to remove the Dominican dictator Trujillo from power. In addition, Castro may have participated in political riots in Bogota in 1948.

Castro's insurgent proclivities continued after his victory in 1959. Professor Aguilar notes:

Once in power, and even before his Marxist proclamation, he sent expeditions to Panama and the Dominican Republic. By 1961, he was bitterly denouncing his former protector, Venezuelan president Romulo Betancourt and all Latin American oligarchies.

On January 31, 1962, the Organization of American States ejected Cuba for its sponsorship of guerrillas in Venezuela.

In response, Castro announced the Second Declaration of Havana. He asked Latin Americans to "follow Cuba's example" and initiate guerrilla warfare. Writing in the second 1987 issue of Terrorism: An International Journal, R.A. Hudson of the Library of Congress observes that Castro went much farther than mere declarations. Hudson states:

To provide support mechanisms, Castro and Guevara formed three Liberation Committees—organized regional for the Caribbean, Central America, and South America—that became known as the Liberation Directorate. The committees were designed to plan guerrilla and other subversive acts and to provide logistical arrangements for sending agents to the different regions.

Hudson adds:

Evidence emerged that American Department chief Manuel Pineiro was directing guerrilla groups in the early 1960s when the Colombian Army found a letter written by him to a group of Colombian rebels, whom he told to carry out Cuban instructions ex-