

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN LESS THAN TRUSTWORTHY IN SOCIAL SECURITY FUNDS

(Mr. PENNY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, every pay period, working Americans faithfully make their contributions through the payroll tax to finance Social Security benefits. They pay now, trusting that the U.S. Government will guarantee that money will be there when it is their turn to retire. As we know, the Federal Government has been less than trustworthy in its caretaking of the surplus funds now building in the Social Security system. Instead of saving these funds, the Government is spending them. In this year alone, \$65 billion in extra Social Security receipts will pay for nonsocial security spending. Next year, that will grow to \$75 billion, and the year after, it will be \$86 billion.

Congress' resident scholar, Senator MOYNIHAN, calls that practice thievery. Others have called it embezzlement, looting, or safecracking. By any definition, it is wrong and an abuse of the public trust.

The payroll tax burden on working families has grown more dramatically in the Reagan-Bush years than at any time since its creation in the mid-1930's. The Social Security tax rate has been raised seven times—five times in the last 6 years alone—while the income level subject to the payroll tax also doubled. From 1980-88, Social Security tax revenues as a percentage of total Federal revenues rose by 23 percent. By comparison, corporate income tax revenue as a percentage of total Federal revenues declined by 23 percent.

That means the Federal Government is becoming more and more reliant on a regressive tax—paid at the same rate by the rich and the poor alike—to finance its operations. That's not fair. If we are collecting the tax for Social Security, then let us use it for Social Security. If not, then let us cut the tax and return the system to pay-as-you go.

PRESIDENT REAGAN AND THE BERLIN WALL

(Mr. ROHRABACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, it was 1,000 days ago today that Ronald Reagan was in Berlin challenging Mr. Gorbachev to tear down this wall.

I worked in the White House at the time and I remember well the controversy of that speech in the days before President Reagan delivered it. The entire foreign policy establishment of the United States descended upon the White House to try to pressure Presi-

dent Reagan into not saying, "Tear down the Wall." They suggested it was too confrontational, too belligerent.

President Reagan's own advisers tried to pressure him into deleting that from his speech, but President Reagan stood firm. Not only did he stand firm and say, "Tear down the Wall," but he stood firm in developing the SDI, rebuilding America's military strength and in supporting those people who were fighting for freedom around the world.

Now, today we hear the voices of those who opposed Ronald Reagan suggesting that all the progress we have had toward peace and freedom is nothing more than a cycle of history. I say it was the result of strong leadership and right ideas.

MAJORITY LEADER'S SPEECH SHOWED UP PRESIDENT'S LACK OF LEADERSHIP ON FOREIGN POLICY

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the majority leader of the House came out with a program to aid the Soviet Union. Whatever one thinks of that program, and there were many opinions on one side or the other, everyone agreed about one thing. It showed up the President's decisive lack of leadership on foreign policy.

Today as the President announces his transportation policy, again we see a total lack of leadership. With our infrastructure crumbling, with the need to build the Nation's roads and highways so that we can compete against Germany and Japan, what does the President do? He says, "Localities, you pay for it."

Well, the President could have saved 108 pages. He simply could have written a letter to the Governors and Mayors and said, "Dear Local Communities, from now on you pay for the Nation's highways, and by the way, that money we collected for fixing roads, we are using it to hide the deficit."

Under the President's plan, toll booths will be as common as arches across the Nation's highways. Under the President's plan, poor communities that cannot fix their own highways will suffer.

Mr. Speaker, is this leadership?

DEMOCRACY DAY IN VERMONT

(Mr. SMITH of Vermont asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was town meeting day in my home State of Vermont. Some call it "Democracy Day," because it remains one of the last exercises in pure democracy in this democratic nation.

Through these once-a-year meetings we get the rare opportunity to really know what the people think. Not from polls or interviews, but from the actual source. What they said yesterday should interest us all.

One of the things they said in near unison was that we need to take a close look at our defense budget this year. Almost 90 percent of the towns voted to call for a 5-percent cut in defense spending, with the money redirected toward new priorities: education, environment, housing, drug abuse, farming, and many others.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, we should listen to the people of Vermont, because they represent the leading edge of a vast wave of public opinion coming from across the Nation. There are many problems that need our attention and the Federal Government's money. People see that every day. What they do not see is the continued need for defense budgets which claim such a huge share of our limited National Treasury.

This year, let us get serious about streamlining our defense needs, eliminating waste, fraud, and coverups, reevaluating our force structure and our burden-sharing commitments and our weapons systems. Let us listen to the people of Vermont and send the American people's money where they want it to go: people programs and deficit reduction.

IN SUPPORT OF SANCTIONS

(Mr. DYMALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, the recent release of Mr. Mandela and certain moves by Mr. de Klerk have inspired some, like Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, to call for lifting of sanctions against South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the time to lift sanctions against South Africa. Sanctions have proven to be quite effective in gaining the release of Mr. Mandela, and in pointing the South African regime in the direction of negotiations. If anything we should support the South Africa Financial Sanctions Act (H.R. 3458) sponsored by our colleague Mr. FAUNTROY and coauthored by me. I call on my colleagues to join me and the rest of the Congressional Black Caucus in cosponsoring H.R. 21, the Anti-Apartheid Act Amendments of 1989, introduced by Representative DELLUMS, and House Concurrent Resolution 270, introduced by our colleague Representative CONYERS. This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that the United States sanctions against South Africa should not be lifted until all conditions under the Anti-Apartheid Act are met.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this distinguished body to join me in expressing their support of sanctions against South Africa in order to expedite the dismantling of apartheid and bring in majority rule, a value we hold dear in our democratic system.

PERMISSION FOR 18-YEAR REFUSENIK RAIZ FAMILY EXPECTED

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I inform my colleagues of the expected exit permission being granted to the Raiz family of Vilna, Lithuania. Informed sources have indicated that the permission, granted by Soviet leader Gorbachev, via Lithuanian official Algirdis Brezauskas came after lengthy private negotiations on the Raiz family's behalf.

Vladimir and Carmella Raiz have been refused exit visas since 1972 on the grounds of security due to Vladimir's work as a molecular biologist. He was fired after the application was filed in 1972, and his wife, Carmella, was demoted from her position as the first violinist of the Vilna Philharmonic Orchestra. A religious family, the Raizs are leaders of the Jewish community in Vilnius, and organized religious, cultural, and language seminars. They were continually harassed by the KGB and smeared in local press reports.

Mrs. Raiz is presently in the United States on a tourist visa, working to publicize her family's plight. It is anticipated that an exit visa for her husband, Vladimir, will be issued early next week, and that businessman Albert Reichmann, of Toronto, Canada, long involved in the family's case, will transport Mr. Raiz to Israel from Lithuania, where the Raiz family will be reunited.

KENTUCKY COCAINE DEALER PAROLED, OUT OF PRISON

(Mr. HUBBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, convicted cocaine dealers such as Rayful Edmond III, of Washington, DC, recently have been sentenced to prison for life without parole.

I'm saddened to admit there is at least one area of the United States where you can be a persistent felon, where police can seize from you \$350,000 in cocaine and, after pleading guilty, you only spend less than 2 years in confinement, notwithstanding a circuit judge's sentence of 23 years in prison.

Yes, it's in my own congressional district that one Hiram Curtis Smith, age 33, is free now. On February 29,

1988, Mr. Smith pleaded guilty in Paducah, KY, to narcotics crimes, as well as to the specific charges of possession with intent to sell cocaine, possession of a handgun by a felon and a second degree persistent felony offender count, citing Smith's previous felonies.

Early parole was the good fortune of Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith is the first cousin of Kentucky State Representative Rex Smith and a nephew of multimillionaire Jim Smith, probably the wealthiest man in my congressional district and a man who is very active in Kentucky politics.

Early parole in Kentucky is extremely rare.

Not until today when the Paducah Sun newspaper revealed it did we realize Mr. Smith was released from the Kentucky State Penitentiary on February 14.

The Kentucky Parole Board's routine policy is to require a nonviolent offender to serve at least 20 percent of his sentence before being eligible for parole. In Curtis Smith's case that would have been in mid-1992, more than 2 years from today.

But Mr. Smith was granted a parole hearing. There were only 28 such hearings last year out of the 5,564 inmate cases reviewed by the Kentucky Parole Board.

Before his early parole Mr. Smith was also privileged to be 1 of only 10 men who lived in the minimum security complex next to the penitentiary at Eddyville.

The people of Kentucky should be outraged by the early parole of a big-time cocaine dealer.

This is a live, March 8, 1990, example for a textbook which could be entitled "A Dual Justice System," featuring Rayful Edmond III and Hiram Curtis Smith.

PRaise FOR THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S HONESTY ON CHINA

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the new State Department report on human rights deserves praise for exposing the dismal story of human freedom in China. The report states that virtually all internationally recognized human rights are restricted in China, many severely.

Mr. Speaker, the report speaks the truth. Despite lifting martial law, thousands remain in detention. Torture and execution are common. Students suffer a year's hard labor indoctrination before entering universities. Freedom of speech, press, religion, and assembly are virtually nonexistent.

In Tibet, martial law imposed a year ago remains in effect. Tibetan student, Lobsang Tenzin, is threatened with execution prior to the anniversary of

demonstrations against Chinese repression.

The Chinese Government's predictable response to the report is to reject the concept of universal human rights and instead promote the concept of nation's rights whereby each nation determines its own human rights standards. As a party newspaper stated, no abstract human right overrides national boundaries.

We reject and condemn this ridiculous notion. Human rights know no political or national boundaries. The denial of the rights of one human being anywhere is the denial of the rights of us all.

INVITATION TO DISCUSS AID TO THE SOVIET UNION

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to let my colleagues know that when it is appropriate later on today, I hope to take a 1-hour special order to continue discussing the Democratic majority leader's proposal for aid to the Soviet Union.

I will emphasize today the amount of Soviet transfers of military and other aid to Cuba, Angola, Afghanistan, Vietnam, Nicaragua, Ethiopia, North Korea, Cambodia, Iraq, and other countries, and raise the question: Is it really smart to talk about aid to the Soviet Union when the Soviet Union is sending military aid to so many dictatorships?

I look forward to any colleagues on either side of the aisle who would like to discuss this.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4096

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from H.R. 4096. My name was placed on this legislation as a result of staff error.

Although I am removing my name, I remain strongly supportive of efforts to enact legislation which protects the rights of artists and writers from the threat posed by digital audio tape technology.

I look forward to full hearings on this issue in the near future.

It is my hope that the remaining disputes between supporters and opponents of this legislation can be resolved so that legislation on this subject may go forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.