

The Redress Monitor

The National Newsletter of the Japanese American Citizens League—Legislative Education Committee

Volume 3, Number 1

Washington, D.C.

March 1990

States' Treatment of Redress Payments

The Civil Liberties Act of 1988 provides for exemption of redress payments from Federal income tax and from determination of eligibility for certain public benefit programs. Former JACL-LEC Acting Executive Director, Rita Takahashi, initiated a survey of all the States, asking if they would be following the guidelines of the federal government for State taxes and assistance programs.

All states that responded to the letters from our office, except for Mississippi, have stated that redress payments will

be exempt from state income tax.

Especially critical for the first group of redress recipients — many of whom are likely to be beneficiaries of social services or assistance programs for the elderly — is the matter of whether redress payments will be counted as income or resources in determining eligibility for those programs, or the amounts of the benefits. If redress payments are counted either as income or resources, some individuals may lose their eligibility for these benefits, or

continued on page 8

Toll Free Help-Line for ORA

ORA has recently installed a bilingual toll-free Help-Line at 1-800-395-4672. There will also be a toll-free TDD number for the hearing impaired in operation by the end of March. If you have questions for ORA, it is helpful if you know the Social Security number as well as name and birthdate, of the person you're calling about.

ORA is presently sending out identity verification packets to living eligible persons who are age 75 and older. Over 10,300 letters have been sent out so far. Those who are easiest to identify as eligible will be receiving packets from ORA sooner than those cases where more research is necessary to determine eligibility. A special verification unit is in operation to do the extra research on "hard" cases, where the paper trail is not as clear cut or complete.

Message From the Chair:

LEC Plans Phase-Out

by Jerry Enomoto

Following the Board's decision at its January meeting in San Francisco, the phasing-out of JACL-LEC operations in its Washington, DC office is proceeding as planned. The office will operate at its present staff level until the end of June when the Executive Director will leave. The Board hopes to continue at a reduced level with one staff person until the end of the year.

It was the Board's judgment that the remaining work on redress does not justify additional fundraising, and so we are planning to finish up our activity using the funds that we presently have available.

Because we recognize that no one will feel that the job on redress is really complete until the payment process is under way, we want to assure you that JACL-LEC plans to continue working with ORA so that things will go smoothly. The next issue of the Redress Monitor will have more information about ORA.

Editor's Message

by JoAnne H. Kagiwada

When the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 was signed into law on 10 August by President Reagan, there was a great celebration. Finally, "the fundamental injustice of the evacuation, relocation, and internment of United States citizens and permanent resident aliens of Japanese ancestry during World War II" had been officially acknowledged. Congress apologized on behalf of the nation and promised a symbolic payment of \$20,000 to redress that wrong to each eligible person surviving on the date the law was enacted.

However, we found out that passage of the law formally authorizing the redress payments and apology was not the end of the story. Getting redress fund-

ing in the last session of Congress was a roller coaster sequence of events. The hope for funding went from a high of \$500 million to a low of absolutely no funds at all, and Congress admitted that redress was not going to survive the competition for appropriations in these fiscally rocky times.

And then Senator Inouye played his "entitlement" card, thus ensuring the funding for redress beginning in fiscal 1991.

For that bold move, there is much rejoicing. From this experience, we know that the alternative would have been a yearly struggle for funds that could have stretched out to ten years, with no guarantee even then, that all payments would be made.

Much has happened this past year. Our high school civics classes never prepared us for all this. Together we learned to negotiate the technical maze of the appropriations process. And most important, we did not give up.

What Does It Mean for Redress to be an "Entitlement"?

The United States Congress incorporated as a part of its 1990 appropriations a provision to make redress an "entitlement." The question has been asked, "What does this mean?" The answer, in terms of its results, is simple: the provision making redress an entitlement ensures that the federal government will make the entire \$1.25 billion for redress available for payment by 30 September 1993.

In the language of the federal government, an "entitlement" is a legally binding commitment that the money will actually be paid. In other words, the government is obligated to make these

payments. Entitlements almost always define who will be paid by using eligibility criteria. The definition of "eligible individual" ("any individual of Japanese ancestry who is living on the date of the enactment of this Act..." etc.) is in section 108 of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988.

The 1990 appropriations Act made an advance commitment to fund redress beginning in fiscal year 1991. It will be funded at the maximum level of \$500 million per year beginning 1 October 1990 until all funds are paid out: All monies should therefore be available within the three years after that date.

The **Redress Monitor**

JoAnne H. Kagiwada
Editor-in-Chief

Rochelle Wandzura
Production Manager

Typesetting and Layout by



Stacy
Kagiwada

Senate Decides Redress Should be Entitlement

On 29 September 1989, the Senate, by an overwhelming vote of 74- 22, added a provision to one of its 1990 appropriations bills which would make redress payments into an entitlement program beginning in fiscal 1991. When Senator Dan Inouye (D-HI) said, "I believe the time has come for me to tell my colleagues what has been in my heart for all these many years," it set the tone for the debate which followed. Fellow Senators rose to support his entitlement proposal, agreeing with Senator Rudman's statement that, "there comes a time when something is the right thing to do, and this is one of those times."

Floor debate was over an objection raised by Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC), that a new entitlement could not be created for a fiscal year for which a budget resolution has not yet been passed. In other words, the FY 1991 budget would have to be adopted before the entitlement could be considered. Helms also voiced his concern about adding to the federal deficit in fiscal 1991. He recalled the debate in April of 1988 when the Senate considered S. 1009, clearly stating that redress payments would be subject to the availability of annual appropriations.

But Senator Hollings (D-SC) reminded Helms of the current budget dilemma which forced the subcommittee to make this difficult choice so that "we would not continue to delay the acknowledged act of the U.S. Government itself in making these reparations payments with the families waiting and diminishing each day and some will never see it."

Members arrived in the Senate chamber to hear Senator Inouye speak of his "awe and disbelief" when he learned about the experiences of his mainland buddies in the 442nd who had volunteered to serve in the

military service from behind barbed wire. The Senator confessed that he had often asked himself whether he would have volunteered under such circumstances. "In all honesty, I cannot give you a forthright answer," he said.

Obviously moved by Inouye's comments, his colleagues rose to speak in tribute to him, referring to his heroism during World War II as well as his achievements in the Senate. Speaking from their own experiences, each senator emphasized his strong conviction that the budget waiver was necessary.

continued page 9

Responses to President's Signature

On Tuesday, 21 November 1989, President Bush signed into law the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill. This large bill, appropriating funds for several major departments, also contained a provision making payments under the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 into an entitlement program with mandatory funding.

Senator Dan Inouye (D-HI):
"We are now at the end of a long

and most painful process. While we, individually and as a nation, must put the pain and bitter memories behind us, we must not forget them. Rather, this chapter must remain in our collective conscience as a grave reminder of what we are capable of in a time of crisis, and what we must not allow to happen again to any group, regardless of race, religion or national origin."

continued next page

Responses continued from previous page

Senator Spark Matsunaga (D-HI): "Over my 27 years of service in the Congress, I have fought long and hard to have the United States Government extend an official apology to, those Americans wrongly deprived of their liberties and to compensate them for their loss and suffering. Now redress has been attained as the law of the Land and a historic blot on our Constitution will begin to fade."

Representative Norman Mineta (D-CA): "For 47 years, Americans of Japanese ancestry have sought to right the wrongs of the internment. We did so not out of any rancor or bitterness, but from our deep faith in the United States, in our Constitution, and in the American people. We now hope, and pray, that the tragedies of the interment will never again occur".

Representative Robert Matsui (D-CA): "President Bush's signature on the entitlement legislation marks the appropriate end to a regrettable chapter in American history. Happily, this chapter ends constructively with a reaffirmation of the values this country was built on. This is the end of a long ordeal — an arduous national march toward redemption."

Representative Daniel K. Akaka (D-HI), a member of the House Appropriations Committee: "I hope the legacy of this

continued page 9

Entitlement Chronology

1 August 1989: House of Representatives approves the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill which includes \$50 million for the compensation program authorized under the Civil Liberties Act of 1988.

29 September 1989: The Senate approves a proposal from Senator Daniel K. Inouye that makes possible a three-year completion schedule for redress payments. The payments would begin in fiscal 1991.

Under this provision, the \$20,000 payments for each eligible person would be made a federal entitlement program. But, no funds are appropriated for fiscal 1990. Any funding for fiscal 1990 will have to be negotiated in the House/Senate Conference Committee.

19 October 1989: The Conference Committee approves the Senate proposal to make redress a federal entitlement program, beginning in fiscal 1991. However, the \$50 million which was in the House bill for the current fiscal year is not included in the conference report.

26 October 1989: The House approves the Conference Committee Report.

1 November 1989: The Senate accepts the Conference Report. However, the Senate adds an amendment to another section of the report which the House has not approved, thus delaying final action on the report.

7 November 1989: The House gives unanimous consent to the new language negotiated by the Conference Committee on the matter unrelated to redress.

8 November 1989: The Senate gives final approval to the Conference Report.

21 November 1989: President George Bush signs the H.R. 2991, the 1990 appropriations bill for Commerce, Justice, State, which contains the provision which makes redress payments into an entitlement program beginning in October 1990.

Entitlement will take redress out of the annual appropriations funding battle. Beginning in fiscal 1991, it mandates \$500 million per year for redress payments until all eligible individuals are paid. The Civil Liberties Act provides for a total of \$1.25 billion for payments, but puts a cap on annual expenditures at \$500 million. All monies should therefore be made available within three years.

Summary of States' Treatment of Redress Payments

March 1990

People are advised to check with their state authorities to make sure this information is current. All states periodically revise their laws and regulations on tax and benefit programs.

YES means payments are exempt; NO, payments included as income.

ALABAMA

TAXES: No response

BENEFITS: No response

ALASKA (106)

TAXES: Yes: no personal income tax.

BENEFITS: Yes for federally funded programs. For State programs, the Department of Health and Social Services is currently researching the need for changes in statutes or regulations — "presently supportive" of excluding payments. *Contact the Director of Division of Public Assistance*

ARIZONA (457)

TAXES: Yes: based on federal adjusted gross income

BENEFITS: No response to this question.

ARKANSAS

TAXES: Yes, follows federal law, exempts damages for human suffering.

BENEFITS: Yes for federally funded programs; excluded from gross income for state tax programs for senior citizens (property tax) and low income households (sales tax exemptions on electricity).

CALIFORNIA (55,853)

TAXES: Yes: State law exempts damages for human suffering.

BENEFITS: Yes for federally funded programs; excluded as income or resources for determining eligibility to receive Medi-Cal or public assistance, or the amount of those benefits.

COLORADO (1,358)

TAXES: Yes: based on Federal Adjusted Gross income

BENEFITS: No response to this question

CONNECTICUT

TAXES: Yes: no state personal income tax except on capital gains, dividends, and interest income.

BENEFITS: Yes for federally

funded programs (food stamps, public assistance); no exclusion for State programs.

DELAWARE

TAXES: Yes: based federal adjusted gross income.

BENEFITS: Yes for AFDC based on federal eligibility regulations. No standards established for other programs because "no claims for Delaware General Assistance have been made by recipients" of redress payments.

FLORIDA (230)

TAXES: Yes: no state income tax.

BENEFITS: Yes for federal programs; AFDC, food stamps, medicaid

GEORGIA

TAXES: Yes: based on Federal adjusted gross income.

BENEFITS: Yes for federally funded programs.

HAWAII (2,044)

TAXES: Yes: by State law.

BENEFITS: Yes for federally funded AFDC, food stamps, general assistance, & social service programs; yes for State social and economic programs, including agricultural and natural disaster loan programs.

IDAHO (378)

TAXES: Yes: follows federal law.

BENEFITS: Yes, not consid-

ered as income for programs administered by State Tax Commission; e.g., property tax reduction program. *Contact Idaho Department of Health and Welfare about programs under their administration.*

ILLINOIS (3,082)

TAXES: Yes: not considered income under State law.

BENEFITS: Payments may affect "entitlement privileges," making redress recipients ineligible for services which they are now receiving.

INDIANA

TAXES: Yes: follows federal law: exempts damages for human suffering.

BENEFITS: *Contact Welfare Department as to impact on eligibility for benefits and services.*

IOWA

TAXES: Yes: excluded as satisfaction of a claim against the US for deprivation of liberty or property.

BENEFITS: Yes: excluded as income or assets in determining eligibility for state or local government benefits or entitlement programs. Liens, except liens for child support, are not enforceable against these payments.

KANSAS

TAXES: No response

BENEFITS: No response

KENTUCKY

TAXES: Yes: follows federal law by exempting damages for human suffering.

BENEFITS: No response to this question.

LOUISIANA

TAXES: Yes: based on federal adjusted gross income

BENEFITS: *Contact the Department of Social Services.*

MAINE

TAXES: Yes: based on federal adjusted gross income.

BENEFITS: No response to this question.

MARYLAND (255)

TAXES: Yes: based on federal adjusted gross income.

BENEFITS: *Contact each state agency which provides the particular services and/or benefits.*

MASSACHUSETTS

TAXES: Probably yes: based on federal adjusted gross income, but advised to request Letter Ruling to verify. *Contact the Department of Revenue, Rulings and Regulations Bureau.*

BENEFITS: Yes for food stamps, but as of 17 July 1989, hadn't been advised as to other federal programs. Generally, all income is included, unless explicitly excluded. *Contact Department of Public Welfare.*

MICHIGAN (451)

TAXES: Yes: based on federal adjusted gross income.

BENEFITS: Yes, generally follows federal guidelines for eligibility for services and benefits provided by the State.

MINNESOTA (285)

TAXES: Yes: follows federal law: damages for personal injury are not taxed.

BENEFITS: Yes: excluded as income and resources for food stamps, AFDC, SSI, and State programs for Family MA, GA and GAMC; also MSA, MA for aged, blind and disabled and GMAC for single adults and married couples without dependent children; and GA/WR programs.

MISSISSIPPI

TAXES: NO: individuals are taxed on all income unless specifically excluded. LEC sent a follow-up letter on 23 February 1990 requesting review of this position.

BENEFITS: Yes, follows federal guidelines for eligibility for AFDC and food assistance.

MISSOURI (142)

TAXES: Yes: based on federal adjusted gross income, but individuals are advised to review regularly.

BENEFITS: Yes for food stamps; other programs don't have regulations written yet.

MONTANA

TAXES: Yes: follows federal law: damages are not taxed.

BENEFITS: Yes: payments are not included in determining eligibility for any "tax incentives or credits presently in place in Montana."

NEBRASKA

TAXES: Yes: based on federal adjusted gross income.

BENEFITS: Yes for federally funded assistance, medical, or service benefits.

NEVADA (310)

TAXES: Yes: no state income tax.

BENEFITS: Yes for federally funded programs; "benefits paid by [State agencies] would be unaffected by the payments as well."

NEW HAMPSHIRE

TAXES: Yes: no state personal income tax, except on dividends and interest.

BENEFITS: Yes for federally funded programs and State programs: Aid to the Disabled, Aid to the Needy Blind, and Old Age Assistance.

NEW JERSEY (505)

TAXES: Yes: not included in categories of taxable income.

BENEFITS: Yes for federally funded programs, legislation has been passed in the State Senate and is pending in the State Assembly to cover the State's PAAD program.

NEW MEXICO

TAXES: Yes: based on federal adjusted gross income.

BENEFITS: NO for State programs: included in calculating modified gross income for purposes of Low Income Food and Medical Tax Rebate, Comprehensive Tax Rebate, and Property Tax Rebate. *Contact Human Services Department, about AFDC, Medicare/Medicaid, etc.*

NEW YORK (718)

TAXES: Yes: based on federal adjusted gross income.

BENEFITS: Yes for Public Assistance and food stamps. For State social services, a bill is in the State Assembly, but no action has been taken. There is no sponsor in the N.Y. State Senate. *Needs strong lobbying campaign before the close of 1990 session in May.*

NORTH CAROLINA

TAXES: Yes, by State law.

BENEFITS: Yes for AFDC, food stamps.

NORTH DAKOTA

TAXES: Yes: based on federal adjusted gross income.

BENEFITS: Yes for AFDC, food stamps, Medicaid, Energy assistance.

OHIO (571)

TAXES: Yes: based on federal adjusted gross income; damages not taxed.

BENEFITS: No response to this question.

OKLAHOMA

TAXES: Yes: based on federal adjusted gross income.

BENEFITS: *Contact Department of Human Services.*

OREGON (1,584)

TAXES: Yes: state law exempts damages for human suffering.

BENEFITS: Yes for federally funded programs, NO for state General Assistance Programs. Except for certain nursing facility residents, recipients would lose eligibility until "lump-sum" income is exhausted.

PENNSYLVANIA (229)

TAXES: Yes, not within the eight taxable classes of income.

BENEFITS: Yes for federally funded programs including AFDC, Social Security, Medicaid, food stamps, and housing assistance. But redress is included as income in "determining forgiveness under special state tax provisions for poverty."

RHODE ISLAND

TAXES: Yes: based on federal adjusted gross income.

BENEFITS: No response to this question.

SOUTH CAROLINA

TAXES: No response

BENEFITS: No response

SOUTH DAKOTA

TAXES: Yes: no state income tax; "not taxable under our present tax structure."

BENEFITS: Yes for all "social services" programs.

TENNESSEE

TAXES: Yes: state taxes only on interest and dividends.

BENEFITS: No response to this question.

TEXAS (314)

TAXES: No response to this question.

BENEFITS: Yes for all benefits available through the Department of Human Services.

UTAH (897)

TAXES: Yes: by State law.

BENEFITS: Yes: not counted as "resources" for eligibility determination by Department of Social Services.

VERMONT

TAXES: Yes: based on federal adjusted gross income.

BENEFITS: Yes, not counted as resources by agency of Human Services.

VIRGINIA (217)

TAXES: Yes: based on federal adjusted gross income.

BENEFITS: Yes for federally funded programs such as Medicaid, food stamps, WIC, AFDC, school lunches.

WASHINGTON (5,285)

TAXES: Yes: no state personal income tax.

BENEFITS: Yes: for public assistance and nursing home care, payments are exempt, "including all income and resources derived therefrom."

WEST VIRGINIA

TAXES: Yes: based on federal adjusted gross income.

BENEFITS: Yes for federally funded programs.

WISCONSIN (146)

TAXES: Yes: based on federally adjusted gross income.

BENEFITS: Yes for federally funded programs and property tax relief programs.

WYOMING

TAXES: Yes: no state income tax.

BENEFITS: Yes: follows federal guidelines.

NOT INCLUDED IN PREVIOUS STUDY:

American Samoa

District of Columbia

Guam

Puerto Rico

Virgin Islands

For those States where ORA has more than 100 contacts, the number of contacts is given in parentheses following the State's name. As of 28 February, the total number of contacts is

78,282. The number of contacts will probably not be exactly the same as the number of eligible individuals for any given State.

Treatment continued from front page

have reduced benefits, until the redress payment is completely gone. For elderly recipients, this could be a devastating loss.

Federally funded programs should follow federal guidelines and exempt redress payments from determination of eligibility or benefit level. However, this needs to be confirmed, because some states indicated they were waiting for additional federal regulations. There is a wide variation in the number and types of state programs available. Please try to organize and work to follow up on these questions in your state. We have included the office or agency to contact for those states that gave us that information. Contact our office also for other information we have in our files.

A summary of the responses which we have received is printed in this newsletter. In reporting the position of the states, we have tried, as much as possible, to use the language in the letters which we have received from the State offices. In some instances, this has meant using alphabetical abbreviations for some of the benefit programs. If you have questions, please contact your local officials.

Senate continued from page 3

Senator Warren Rudman (R-NH) said that "there is a time when one whose name is part of the Deficit Control Act of 1985 believes the Budget Act ought to be waived, and this is one of those times." He asked his colleagues to give "overwhelming support to waive the Budget Act to redress finally for the now elderly Americans, the injustice that money will never recompense."

His remarks were supported by Senator Arlen Specter (R-PA), who said "this is not a close question at all. There is no bigger black mark in American history, at least in this century, than that which was perpetrated on American citizens of Japanese extraction..."

Senator Bumpers (D-AR) noted that the Jerome and Rohwer camps were located in Arkansas. Recalling the "unspeakable conditions" under which families lived, he said, "It is one of the most shameful episodes in the history of our country." He added regretfully that it is an issue that is still widely misunderstood even by people who remember it, but that he intends to respond to his constituents by sending them copies of Senator Inouye's speech, saying, "Enclosed is the reason I voted as I did."

When Senator Joe Biden (D-DE) prefaced his remarks by saying, "I did not intend to speak on this issue," he expressed the

need of other colleagues as well to share their feelings on this matter. He emphasized that it was most important to acknowledge the injustice that was done, "if we fail to acknowledge it now, if we fail to rectify it now, what record are we leaving for history?"

Recalling that Italian Americans had some problems during World War II, Sen. Pete V. Domenici (R-NM), ranking member of the Budget Committee, remembered how upset his family was when his mother was arrested because of a misunderstanding about her citizenship. But, he said, that mistake was a very small mistake compared to what happened to Japanese Americans, adding the redress law passed last year embodied the government's intent "to try in a small way to recompense for a very bad mistake." Noting that it had become clear that these payments were not going to be made in a timely way through discretionary appropriations as originally anticipated, he stated strongly, "To be for the bill that created the right and not be for the waiver today borders close to hypocrisy."

Senator Bill Bradley (D-NJ) stressed the importance of letting people know that "we do not want to do the normal political thing — to make a big speech and then do nothing — but that we want to back up our statements with a little bit, to compensate for the pain, suffering,

continued next page

Responses continued from page 4

legislation will be that loyal Americans will never again be denied their rights simply because of the color of their skin or shape of their eyes."

Representative Patricia Saiki (R-HI): "This measure has finally brought redress to reality after years of effort and decades of anticipation But today President Bush has sealed our government's commitment that they will be repaid."

Representative Barney Frank (D-MA), who chaired the Judiciary Subcommittee responsible for getting the Civil Liberties Act out onto the House floor in 1987: "By adopting the redress bill, America gave the world an example of how to gain strength by confronting and correcting past mistakes. The redress bill showed the democratic process at its best."

Angus Macbeth, Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians: "Six years ago the CWRIC... recommended that an apology be offered to those that had been excluded and detained; and that a payment of \$20,000 be made to each survivor.... With passage of this bill, we know that the country has acted forthrightly and unambiguously to repair the damage of the past."

Joe Rauh, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, former member of the JACL-LEC Board: "I will never forget the

continued next page

Responses continued from previous page

picture of a tiny Japanese American boy waving a small American flag out the window of the railroad car carrying him and his family to a concentration camp. Full redress for the years of imprisonment is not possible, but we can at least venture the hope that a nation willing to atone for its violations of civil freedom is less likely to repeat them ever again."

Ed Snyder, Friends Committee on National Legislation:

"After the war, FCNL worked closely with the JACL to support the establishment of the 'Evacuation Claims Commission.' Ultimately, to the great disappointment of FCNL and JACL, the attorney general was permitted to offer very low settlements to former internees. We now celebrate with the JACL that Congress will recognize an entitlement to the restitution that has been promised to those who suffered from this never-to-be-forgotten error in our nation's history."

American Civil Liberties Union Washington Representative, Wade Henderson: "Led by JACL-LEC, with the strong support of the civil liberties community, the struggle itself was a testament to the deep commitment of the American people to simple justice and the healing of the nation."

continued back page

Senate continued from previous page

indignity, and infringement on individual liberty that they endured."

Senator Paul Simon (D-IL), who grew up in Oregon, recalled his boyhood embarrassment when his father, a Lutheran minister, made an unpopular statement on a local radio program that what was happening to Japanese Americans was wrong. But he now looks back on that as one of things for which he is proudest of his father. He continued, "I think it is important that we do the right thing here; not just for Japanese Americans, but to signal the future generations that this can never happen again."

Senator Brock Adams (D-WA) recalled that one third of his classmates were moved out of his Seattle high school one day because they were of Japanese American descent. Many of those classmates did not come back, having died in Italy fighting for the United States. Stressing the implications for the future, Adams added, "We need to be certain that this stain on our honor is cleansed. This entitlement language does that."

And in the end, the Senate acted overwhelmingly to waive the Budget Act. The vote of 74-22 was greater than the Senate vote on passage of S. 1009 last year. The Senate thus took one more step to bring about the long sought goal of Redress.

Matsunaga Battling Cancer

Sen. Senator Matsunaga, (D-HI) said he is "overwhelmed" by the number of people who have expressed their support in his fight with cancer.

According to his office, Matsunaga has received hundreds of cards, letters, and telephone calls—many recounting personal experiences with cancer—since his announcement in January.

"I am overwhelmed by the amount of concern and well wishes, some in the form of remedies in addition to letters and phone calls, received from constituents, colleagues, and people in all walks of life at home and abroad," the Hawaii lawmaker said.

"Although the cancer which began in my prostate has spread to my bones and I am confined to a wheelchair, I am continuing my work on my legislative agenda," which includes the Retired Veterans Disability Equity Bill and global warming legislation.

Readers of the *Redress Monitor* can send cards and messages to Sen. Spark Matsunaga, 109 Hart Senate Office Building, US Senate, Washington DC 20510.