

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 taxpayers 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.

