

The year 1950 was begun in glorious style, as Reverend Hill was elected pastor of the Second Mount Sinai Church, thereby relieving his father of his vast pastoral duties. He looked with pleasure upon the fact that he served exactly 1 year as the church's assistant pastor, and had the opportunity to work with the junior church.

Within the Mount Sinai Baptist Church, Reverend Hill was the catalyst for the creation of the church's credit union and other support programs to serve the congregation and the community. The church also moved to its present location at 7510 Woodland Avenue. A Job Skills Bank and Hunger Center proved successful additions to the church.

Reverend Hill has also devoted many hours to various community organizations. His memberships include: the Baptist Ministers Conference of Cleveland, the Baptist Pastors Council, the Cleveland Council of Churches, the Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance, the NAACP, Eureka Lodge No. 52 of Free and Accepted Masons, Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, and the Regional Transit Authority. Reverend Hill is also the recipient of an honorary doctor of divinity degree from the Institute of African Methodist Episcopal Church in Monrovia, Liberia. In June 1987, Reverend Hill enriched his life by marrying the former Girlie Andrews.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Hill has been an asset to the church, those of us who know him and to the entire Cleveland metropolitan area. He has made an indelible mark on the hearts and minds of countless people.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Reverend Hill and wishing him Godspeed during his retirement.

### CITIZENS' TRAIN

SPEECH OF

### HON. MARTY RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1988

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great enthusiasm this afternoon that I, along with Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, hail the timely arrival of the Citizens' Train and all those passengers aboard who have journeyed by rail from coast to coast in an historic move to present their ideas for a responsible citizens' budget to the Congress of the United States of America. I would like to send a special welcome to my neighbors from the Greater Chicago area and salute all involved for the active interest and involvement they have taken in the future of their Government—for themselves as well as for their families and friends.

Aboard this train rode passengers from all walks of life, and from all regions of the United States with one unifying goal linking them: To communicate to their leaders in Washington their belief that the true security of our Nation lies not in the number of missile silos or nuclear arms we possess but, on the contrary, our Nation's real security lies in the well-being and prosperity of our citizenry. How appropriate is the arrival of the Citizens' Train on a day when Congress is considering President Reagan's proposed budget for fiscal year 1989 which again allocates exorbitant sums to defense spending while vital domestic pro-

grams, uncertain of continued survival, go begging for funds.

The goal of the Citizens' Train is one which I applaud. I share their conviction that we, as congressional leaders, hold the responsibility to develop a budget reflecting the reality that our true national defense begins at home. The citizens' budget calls for a reprioritization of our budgetary goals. Should we continue to follow the pattern which has persisted in Congress for far too long of building our military while our neglected domestic problems continue to grow? Or should we, as policymakers and leaders of our country, follow the lead of the Citizens' Train and make a dramatic and much-needed departure in policy by reexamining our priorities as a nation and developing a budget reflective of the peoples' values.

The idea of a Citizen's Train is long overdue, but now its day has come and our time has come to welcome its arrival. My hope is that these citizens' efforts in their bold "March on Washington" will prove successful in laying the groundwork for long-term change in achieving our national goals through our Federal budget—goals that will reflect a government based on equal opportunity, compassion, and the welfare of its people.

### EASTER IN SOUTH AFRICA

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1988

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind each of us that we must continue to promote the end of the oppressive system of apartheid in South Africa.

As Federal legislators, we must realize that while we can be proud of the stand for justice that we took by passing the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986, it was only a first step in dismantling the system of legally sanctioned racism that exists in that nation. During the last session of Congress, we also signed into law a bill, that I introduced, repealing the foreign tax credit to companies that do business in South Africa. This was an important step in strengthening our policy of opposing the pernicious system of apartheid in which children are incarcerated for asserting their basic human rights and families are dispossessed from their homes and resettled in poverty ridden areas. Obviously, much more has to be done.

Recent events are proof that the South African Government still maintains its campaign of repression and terror against the majority of that nation's citizens. This Easter, Anglican Arch Bishop Desmond Tutu and the Reverend Dr. Allan Boesak of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches have called for a nationwide celebration of liberation in South Africa. In the Christian faith, Easter is symbol of liberation and salvation for all humans.

By contrast, the white South African Government has again chosen to oppose the causes of freedom, justice, and brotherhood. In line with its continued detention of Nelson Mandela, Walter Sisulu, and scores of black and colored children, its refusal to allow all citizens equal political participation and its segregation of schools, hospitals, and housing, this government also intends to prevent this Easter Sunday celebration.

I ask that all members of our Nation rededicate themselves to the struggle for peace and freedom in South Africa. I, therefore, hope that the following article from the Civil Rights Journal on Easter in South Africa will be of particular interest to each of us.

#### EASTER IN SOUTH AFRICA

(By Benjamin F. Chavis, Jr.)

Easter is the season of crucifixion and resurrection. It is the time in the Christian faith for spiritual rejuvenation when we celebrate the liberation and salvation of human kind through Jesus Christ. Nowhere in the world today is there a greater affront to the meaning of Easter than the racist apartheid regime of South Africa.

The oppressive government of P.W. Botha has embarked on its last, desperate attempt to remain in power. Not only have all of the anti-apartheid organizations in South Africa now been banned, but this brutal regime has also announced its intention to severely limit the activities of the church as a voice of protest against the continuing holocaust.

Anglican Archbishop Desmond Tutu and the Rev. Dr. Allan Boesak, President of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, together with other church leaders in South Africa, have called for a massive, nationwide celebration of liberation on Easter Sunday this year. The government of South Africa intends to prevent the services.

The church is the last nonviolent voice that has not yet been extinguished by South Africa's repression. Bishop Tutu emphasizes, "Does the Government of South Africa really think it can dictate to the people of God in our quest for justice and freedom? We will not bow down and worship Botha. The idolatry and sin of apartheid must be ended now!" Rev. Boesak agreed, warning, "With these latest acts of repression against the church and the freedom movement, the Government of South Africa has signed its own death warrant."

As our sisters and brothers in South Africa continue to wage a valiant struggle for freedom, the glaring absence of sustained voices and actions on the part of America's church leaders becomes more obvious. Here in the United States, it is our prayer that during this Easter season church leaders and church members will resurrect their active solidarity with the struggle to bring new life and freedom to South Africa. On a broader scale, the governments to the United States, Great Britain and Israel, in particular, have a great deal for which to repent. They have maintained their unholy support of the evil of apartheid in South Africa and Namibia, which South Africa illegally occupies.

Rather than millions of people spending millions of dollars on new Easter outfits this year, it would be far better to help purchase medical supplies and outfits for the freedom fighters of the Africa National Congress and the South West Africa Peoples' Organization. The Ministers for Racial and Social Justice, an organization of African American clergy of the United Church of Christ, has established a special African Freedom Fighters Fund for this purpose.

One thing is certain: a victory for the sake of righteousness and justice will be won in South Africa. Our responsibility is to not let the joy of Easter be just a momentary celebration. We must let all of our lights so shine in struggle that God's justice will continue to unfold in South Africa and everywhere in the world where the evils of racism and oppression lurk.

**PRESIDENT'S VETO OF S. 557,  
THE CIVIL RIGHTS RESTORA-  
TION ACT OF 1987**

SPEECH OF

**HON. JACK FIELDS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 22, 1988*

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the President's veto of S. 557, the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987. Of the hundreds of letters that I have received regarding this bill, 99.9 percent have been in opposition to S. 557.

I think that we all agree that discrimination has no place in our society. If S. 557 did what its title says it does, restore civil rights enforcement to pre-Grove City law, I believe it would have passed the House and Senate unanimously. But, in fact, what the broad, loosely structured language does is to deny rights to some while restoring rights to others.

I have already spoken out against the shortcomings of this legislation. The bill would go far beyond pre-Grove City law and unjustifiably expand the power of the Federal Government over the decisions and affairs of private organizations such as churches and synagogues, farms, businesses, and State and local governments. The President has forwarded to us a responsible legislative package which contains important changes from S. 557 designed to avoid unnecessary Federal intrusion into the lives and businesses of Americans, while ensuring that Federal aid is properly monitored under the civil rights statutes it amends.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to sustain the President's veto of S. 557 and give the President's proposal the careful consideration that it deserves.

**REARMING THE WAR ON DRUGS**

SPEECH OF

**HON. GEORGE J. HOCHBRUECKNER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 30, 1988*

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, as the American public is increasingly aware, drugs are having devastating effects on our children and on the safety of our streets. I advocate attacking the drug problem using a two-pronged strategy. No. 1, we must strengthen our border drug interdiction system by promoting the use of early warning radar aircraft, such as the E2C Hawkeye, to help enforcement officers locate and stop drug smugglers using boats and aircraft before they enter the United States. If the U.S. Coast Guard had six to eight E2C's (the agency currently has two), I believe it might well shut down drug smuggling on the east coast.

The second part of a sensible strategy for rearming the war on drugs is to impose sanctions on nations which export drugs to the United States. We can accomplish this by acting to reduce the annual aid sent by the U.S. State Department to drug producing and trafficking nations, and by imposing trade sanctions against those nations.

Ronald Reagan has failed to use the authority he was provided by Congress in the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 to take action against foreign nations involved in the drug

trade. This act authorizes the President of the United States to reduce foreign aid to countries which are not cooperating fully in the international war on drugs. On December 10, 1987, I wrote to President Reagan to urge that he personally review statistics on drug smuggling before deciding which countries may receive U.S. aid during the 1988 funding cycle. The President, responding to mounting international concerns about Panamanian General Manuel Noriega, has since declared Panama to be noncooperative with the war on drugs. As a result, the United States is withholding aid and imposing other sanctions against that country. The Congress should support this action.

However on March 1, 1988, President Reagan certified as fully cooperative five nations—the Bahamas, Mexico, Bolivia, Peru, and Paraguay—which are in fact failing to cooperate with United States efforts to stop illegal drugs. As experts will attest, these countries should not be certified by the President as cooperative. Each is intimately involved in the international drug trade.

Under the terms of the 1986 Anti-Drug Abuse Act, Congress has 45 days after March 1 in which it may "decertify" any nation it believes, contrary to the President's finding, is not fully cooperating in the war on drugs. I have joined with four other Members of the House from both political parties in sponsoring five bills which would decertify each of the five aforementioned countries. This legislation would require President Reagan to reduce 1988 foreign aid to these nations by half and impose trade sanctions. Decertification, if enacted, would not affect food aid, military training assistance, or law enforcement support. Furthermore, Congress should consider allocating any recaptured foreign aid money to the U.S. Coast Guard to restore their lost funding and enhance that agency's drug interdiction capabilities.

In principle, we certainly should not be rearming nations which send drugs to our streets by giving them U.S. taxpayer dollars. I strongly believe we should use our foreign aid as leverage to discourage foreign drugs production and encourage Third World farmers to grow food crops rather than drug crops. Decertification legislation sends a strong message from Congress to foreign drug producers, smugglers, money launderers and others involved in the ugly business of drug trafficking. It signals that we will not stand by while foreign drug producers destroy American children's lives, cause murder on our streets, and contribute to the overcrowding of our Nation's jails. The legislation also sends an important message to the White House that Members of Congress continue to be truly serious about the war on drugs.

**A TRIBUTE TO SI KENEN**

**HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 31, 1988*

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of a dear friend of many of us in the Congress, and one of our Nation's most respected statesmen. I.L. (Si) Kenen passed away last week at the age of 83 after a lifetime of devotion to the precious cause of Israel and United States-Israel relations.

More than any other individual, Si was responsible for transforming the United States-Israel relationship from the iciness that marked it during the Eisenhower years to the close friendship of today. He was the founder of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee [AIPAC] and the first editor of the Near East Report. Si's excellent command of the subject matter, his gentle yet persuasive manner and his magnificent knack for making friends made him one of the most influential lobbyists Washington has ever seen. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues a touching tribute to Si Kenen written by M.J. Rosenberg, who is currently special assistant to Senator CARL LEVIN. M.J. was the longtime editor of the Near East Report and one of Si's proteges.

[From the Washington Jewish Week, Mar. 31, 1988]

AN APPRECIATION—REMEMBERING I.L. "SI" KENEN

(By M.J. Rosenberg)

An era ended with the death of I.L. Kenen on March 23. Si's death was no shock to those of us who knew him. He had been in failing health for the last few years. But he looked good, far younger than 83, and there was always the hope that he would rally and, once again, be as he was in his prime.

Si was lucky. His prime lasted a long time. He was already in his late sixties when I first came to work at AIPAC in 1973. I came in as a volunteer, anxious to do anything. I could to help Israel during the Yom Kippur War.

The AIPAC of 1973 was not the operation we know today. I doubt that there were more than ten people working in the office on 13th and G. The "Jewish lobby" was run on a shoestring. Si's secretary would parcel out postage stamps like they were gold. And she would want to see the letter you were mailing to make sure you didn't swipe a stamp for your mother's birthday card.

Si ran a tight ship. He made all the key decisions. In those days, only Si's treasured long-time aide, Esher Chesney, and legislative liaison Ken Woliack, dared to question a Kenen decision. But he rarely budged. He knew how to run AIPAC. After all, he had invented the place.

In his old age, newcomers to AIPAC would think of Si (who dropped in once a week, or so) as a "sweet old man." But his demeanor deceived. Si may have been sweet (sometimes) but he was not benign.

He was a tough boss. In late 1973 I wrote my first article for Near East Report. He made me rewrite it a half dozen times and didn't compliment me on the final product. (Not then anyway. Over the next 15 years Si repeatedly told me—with great exaggeration—how "brilliant" that first story was).

It wasn't much fun arguing with him, about the Mideast or about his determination to reduce the size of every item in Near East Report by about 60 percent. Trained as a lawyer, he was a skilled debater.

His demeanor was disarmingly gentle. Si rarely raised his voice. He would express anger by lowering it, forcing you to lean in close to hear him. That manner was an asset on Capitol Hill. He was liked on both sides of the aisle and by Senators and House members of every stripe. Si didn't have an enemies list. On the contrary, he believed that every member of Congress was either a friend or a potential friend. And he treated them accordingly.

He was effective. When he began his work in Washington, Israel was receiving not one