

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, July 10, 1992.

Hon. ALBERT V. CASEY,
President and CEO, Resolution Trust Corporation, Washington, DC.

DEAR AL: Thank you for your July 7, letter in which you urge the Oversight Board to authorize the Resolution Trust Corporation (RTC) to borrow loss funds from the Federal Financing Bank (FFB). This proposal would allow the RTC to use FFB borrowing to exceed the amount specifically appropriated by Congress to pay for permanent losses incurred in resolving failed thrifts. As the two enclosed letters show, the Oversight Board has consistently stated, and Congress has repeatedly confirmed, that borrowing from the FFB should not be used to expand the amount available for losses.

I appreciate your efforts to consider every possible alternative that will allow the thrift cleanup to continue. However, I continue to believe that the best way to do this is to continue to urge Congress to provide adequate funds to the RTC so that the cost to the tax-payers can be held to a minimum.

I would be happy to discuss this matter further with you, either upon my return or at the Oversight Board meeting on August 5.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS F. BRADY.

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1993**

SPEECH OF

HON. RON MARLENEE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1992

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5503) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes:

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, once again our cherished right of hunting is at risk. The antihunter extremists are again attempting to stop lawful hunts on Federal lands.

My colleague from suburban Virginia thinks his beliefs are vastly superior to all of those in the Department of the Interior. He even wants to overturn a decision of a Federal judge, who ruled in favor of hunting on this very subject just over a year ago. He wants to legislate a hunting ban in defiance of all the experts from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service who contend that hunting is a necessary and critical conservation technique.

I have always been a strong supporter of the National Wildlife Refuge System. Within this appropriation bill there is a ban on hunting by law-abiding citizens on the Mason Neck Wildlife Refuge in northern Virginia.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I have to remind this body that hunting is the most balanced way to maintain and conserve wildlife habitats. At the turn of the century, there were approximately 500,000 white-tailed deer in North America. Now there are as many as 17 million.

In Virginia alone there are 800,000 deer—more than there was in George Washington's time.

My colleague from suburban Virginia says that only Government officials should hunt on this refuge. I ask him, is it the responsibility of

the Federal Government to micromanage the great Commonwealth of Virginia?

He tells us that hunting by law-abiding citizens has failed. However, the refuge management states that the 137 deer harvested from Mason Neck last year was a success.

My colleague from suburban Virginia states that loud noises hurt the bald eagles ears but he advocates the use of professional Government marksmen to thin the herd. Does my colleague from northern Virginia believe that the eagles will not hear the Government rifles?

He states that the hunt is not good for the eagles. But deer have stripped almost all foliage off the trees less than 5 years old. In 20 or 30 years there would not be any of these trees to replace the older, dying trees the eagles currently nest in.

Mr. Chairman, if my colleague wants to leave the hunt to the professionals, he should listen to the professionals. Let law-abiding hunters harvest the surplus deer population according to proven refuge management policies.

Mr. Chairman, the Moran provision in the Interior appropriations bill is just another blatant attack by animal rights extremists trying to tie the hands of wildlife conservationists. I can only guess that it is the likes of PETA, the fund for animals, the National Wildlife Refuge Reform Coalition and other antihunting groups, who are pushing the House to stop this hunt again.

Conservation groups such as the Wildlife Legislative Fund of America, the National Rifle Association, Safari Club International, the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service support the hunt on the Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge.

Vote for conservation. Vote for practicality. Vote for the Brewster amendment to keep our hunting heritage alive on this and other wildlife refuges.

**VOTING RIGHTS LANGUAGE
ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1992**

SPEECH OF

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4312), to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 with respect to bilingual election requirements:

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Chairman, as an original cosponsor of this important legislation, I rise in strong support of the Voting Rights Language Assistance Act.

When my colleagues and I in Congress passed the Voting Rights Act in 1975, we included section 203 to require counties that have large numbers of minority language citizens to provide bilingual voting assistance.

Since then, millions of Americans—Hispanics, Asian Americans, native Americans, and others throughout the United States who would otherwise have been disenfranchised—have benefited from this support and have exercised their most precious right: the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, the American people still need this legislation. The Voting Rights Language

Assistance Act would reauthorize and refine the bilingual provisions of the Voting Rights Act, which are due to expire this year.

The bill extends bilingual voting assistance for 15 years, through 2007, while tightening current law to ensure that minority language communities are covered by the bilingual provisions of the Voting Rights Act.

To date, counties are only required to provide support if 5 percent of voting age citizens do not speak English well enough to cast a ballot. In densely populated cities like New York, however, huge limited-English proficient populations may still comprise less than the required 5 percent. The Voting Rights Language Assistance Act would require that a county provide assistance if it meets the 5 percent minimum or if it has more than 10,000 voters who speak English poorly.

Most importantly, bilingual voting assistance helps to guarantee a fundamental American right: the right to vote.

Our democracy, Mr. Speaker, will succeed only if its citizens are able to choose their leaders and thereby influence the operation of their Government. When a community is disenfranchised because it has not yet become proficient in English, everyone loses the benefit of its contribution to our valued democratic process.

Bilingual voting assistance helps to bring diverse American communities closer together. No one, Mr. Speaker, can deny that a deepening divide separates Americans of different races. This bill will strengthen the American democracy by enhancing the quality of the political process.

Moreover, providing written assistance averaged 7.6 percent of total election costs, according to the General Accounting Office, which predicted that costs would only decrease as election materials were recycled and election officials gain experience in providing bilingual assistance.

Section 203 clearly works. In New York alone, hundreds of thousands of Latino voters use bilingual voting assistance, and four out of five Asian American voters would be more inclined to vote if ballots were also written in their native language.

For generations, Mr. Speaker, good and honorable people have come to the shores of the United States from every continent, from every country on Earth.

They bring with them their desire to succeed, their love of freedom, and their own culture and language.

From the beginning, the United States has benefited and been enriched by these immigrants, different as they look and sound.

The music of many languages flows through the streets of New York; it is a rich heritage that should be nurtured, cherished and promoted.

When someone comes to America, they do not leave their language, history, and culture at the door. And we should not insist that they do.

I strongly urge my colleagues to pass the Voting Rights Language Assistance Act without any weakening amendments. Millions of Americans depend on this legislation. We must not let them down.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. MARGARET WONG LIM

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1992

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Mrs. Margaret Wong Lim, an outstanding citizen who has dedicated over 40 years of her life to public service. On August 14, 1992, the Sacramento Chinese Community Center will be honoring Mrs. Lim for her many achievements.

Margaret Wong Lim, known to many as "Peggy," is a fourth generation native of Sacramento. She attended Sacramento's public schools of Washington Elementary, Sutter Junior High and Sacramento Senior High prior to graduating from Sacramento City College. She continued her higher education at Stanford University and the University of California at Berkeley.

Mrs. Lim is a career life underwriter with the Franklin Life Insurance Co. since 1947. October of 1992 will mark her 45th anniversary and during her affiliation she has been awarded with membership recognizing outstanding achievement, such as the Key Club, Diplomat Club, \$100 Million Club, and is life member of the Franklin Million Dollar Conference. For the past 27 years her participation with the National Life Underwriters Association earned her the National Quality Award and the National Sales Achievement Award each year.

Throughout her life, Mrs. Lim has also demonstrated her tireless dedication to the Asian Community. She is an active member of the Chinese Community Church, serving in the past as a deacon of the Consistory and has currently been appointed member of the Greater Consistory. During 1981 through 1986, Mrs. Lim was the secretary, treasurer and board member for the Asian Job Resource project. But her proudest moment came 5 years ago with the opening of Sacramento's unique 99-bed Asian Community Nursing Home. Long hours were dedicated serving and actively working on the finance committee to raise funds for the construction of their skilled nursing home.

Mr. Speaker, Margaret Wong Lim has served as an exemplary community leader and I commend her for her many contributions to the Sacramento area. It is with great pleasure that I rise to recognize Mrs. Lim, her achievements and dedication are truly worthy of praise and I invite my colleagues to join me in commending her.

PASS THE MILITARY FREEDOM ACT OF 1992

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday July 27, 1992

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, Col. Margarethe Cammermeyer joined the Army as a nurse in 1961. She spent 14 months in Vietnam during the height of the war there, administering aid to wounded and dying soldiers. For her valiant efforts, she received the Bronze Star. In the 1970's, she joined the Army Reserve, later transferring to the Na-

tional Guard. Over the next two decades, she rose to the rank of chief nurse in the Washington State Army National Guard and was in line to become chief nurse for the U.S. National Guard. Along the way, she was named "Veterans Administration Nurse of the Year" in 1985, earned her doctorate in nursing at the University of Washington, and received the highest awards for clinical expertise and professionalism from the Surgeon General.

On June 11, the Army expelled Colonel Cammermeyer. Why? Because she acknowledged that she is a lesbian. She refused to lie. Thus, due solely to her sexual orientation, Colonel Cammermeyer's exemplary military career has been destroyed.

Colonel Cammermeyer is not alone. The Pentagon's policy of banning gays and lesbians in the U.S. military continues to ruin the professional lives of hundreds of dedicated public servants each year.

The military has abandoned its most often cited historical reason for excluding homosexuals from serving. Its claims that gays and lesbians are a security risk, susceptible to blackmail, have been soundly debunked by at least three studies conducted by the Defense Department itself.

In fact, Defense Secretary Dick Cheney has even spoken of gay soldiers "who have served notably, served well." Furthermore, Secretary Cheney finds no problems whatsoever with gay civilians serving in the Defense Department, many of whom work at the highest and most sensitive levels. The Secretary himself labeled the blackmail argument "an old chestnut."

Oddly enough, the Pentagon's policy seems only to apply in times of peace. In the months leading up to the war in the Persian Gulf, the Defense Department suspended most investigations of suspected homosexuals because they were needed overseas. Hundreds of admitted gay and lesbian soldiers and reservists were shipped overseas to serve during the conflict. They served with honor and distinction.

The Pentagon's only remaining rationale for excluding gay soldiers is its claim that their presence in the Armed Forces makes it difficult "to maintain good discipline, good order, and morale."

No one suggested such absolute idiocy when gay and lesbian soldiers were dying on the field of battle. Actually, according to Department of Defense studies and records released in 1989, gays and lesbians in the military have the highest performance records on the average of any single subgroup, consistently in the top 5 percent.

If the "good discipline, good order, and morale" contention sounds familiar, it should. It is the same argument that was used to exclude blacks from the armed services for so many years. In fact, conservatives during the 1940's argued that integrating the Armed Forces would destroy our Armed Forces because whites would not serve alongside blacks. This contention turned out to be a red herring; indeed, after President Truman issued his Executive order in 1948 calling for the integration of the Armed Forces, the military took the lead in American society in welcoming minorities and in promoting equal opportunity for people of all races.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the military to do the same with gay and lesbian soldiers. It is,

in fact, long past time for the Government to reverse this policy.

Polls indicate that the public agrees: A 1991 poll showed that 80 percent of Americans believe that homosexuals should be admitted to the military. In addition, major editorial boards of leading newspapers support overturning the ban—the New York Times, the Washington Post, USA Today, the Philadelphia Inquirer, and many other publications have urged the Pentagon to overturn its policy of discrimination.

In addition to the enormous human cost that the policy entails, there is a staggering financial expense as well. In fact, if the public knew the financial costs of enforcing the Pentagon's discriminatory and absurd policy, the percentage of people who support overturning the ban on gays and lesbians in the Armed Forces would certainly be higher.

A recently released Government Accounting Office [GAO] study shows how costly and wasteful this policy has been. Examining Defense Department data from 1980 to 1990, the report found that the various service branches discharge an average of 1,500 persons each year simply for being gay. Over the period studied, 16,919 service members were discharged due to their sexuality.

The Defense Department did not provide the GAO with a breakdown of the money it spends to investigate and remove lesbians and gay men from the military. However, GAO calculated the cost to the Government of recruiting and training replacements for the lesbians and gay men discharged in 1990 at \$27 million. Because 1990 was the year with the fewest discharges of any year studied, costs for other years were presumably much higher.

In 1990, the Pentagon spent \$28,226 to recruit and train each enlisted person and \$120,772 per officer. Between 1980 and 1990 a total of 16,692 enlisted men and women and 227 officers either resigned or were discharged because of their homosexuality. In 1990 dollars, that works out to \$498 million of wasted taxpayers' money. Keep in mind that this total represents only the cost to replace dismissed service members; it does not include the money that the military spends on investigating, prosecuting, and ultimately discharging gay service members. In today's fiscal climate, this is an unconscionable waste of the taxpayer's money to sustain an unconscionable policy.

In addition to documenting the financial costs that the Defense Department's policy involves, the GAO also states:

Many experts believe that the military's policy is unsupported, unfair, and counterproductive; has no validity according to current scientific research and opinions; and appears to be based on the same type of prejudicial suppositions that were used to discriminate against blacks and women before these policies were changed.

The GAO report also found that other NATO countries which do not bar gays from the military have suffered no ill effects. Finally, the GAO reported that, within the United States, the eight municipal police and fire departments with openly gay and lesbian personnel have experienced only "a positive impact on management personnel relations."

The President of the United States, with a stroke of the pen, could overturn this mean-spirited and hateful policy today. I implore him to do so, now. Failing that, the Congress must