EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ENLARGING DEMOCRACY

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT
OF MISSOURI
HON. NEWT GINGRICH
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, we would like to encourage all of our colleagues to read the following address by Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Anthony Lake. We believe that Mr. Lake's speech provides a basis for an active U.S. foreign policy by enlarging democracy and free markets throughout the post-cold war world.

FROM CONTAINMENT TO ENLARGEMENT

(By Anthony Lake)

I have come to speak with you today because I believe our nation's policies toward the world stand at an historic crossroads. For half a century America's engagement in the world revolved around containment of a hostile Soviet Union. Our efforts helped block Soviet expansionism, topple Communist repression and secure a great victory for human freedom.

Clearly, the Soviet Union's collapse enhances our security. But it also requires us to think anew because the world is new.

In particular, with the end of the Cold War, there is no longer a consensus among the American people around why, and even whether our nation should remain actively engaged in the world. Geography and history always have made Americans wary of foreign entanglements. Now economic anxiety fans that wariness. Calls from the left and right to stay at home rather than engage abroad are re-enforced by the rhetoric of Neo-Know-Nothings.

Those of us who believe in the imperative of our international engagement must push back. For that reason, as President Clinton sought the Presidency, he not only pledged a domestic renaissance, but also vowed to engage actively in the world in order to increase our prosperity, update our security arrangements and promote democracy abroad.

PURSUING AMERICAN INTERESTS ABROAD

In the eight months since he took office, President Clinton has pursued those goals vigorously. We have completed a sweeping review of our military strategy and forces. We have led a global effort to support the historic reforms in Russia and the other new states. We have helped defend democracy in Haiti and Guatemala and secured important side agreements that pave the way for enactment of the North American Free Trade Agreement. We have facilitated major advances in the Mideast peace process, working with our Arab partners while strengthening our bonds with Israel. We have pursued steps with our G-7 partners to stimulate world economic growth. We have placed our relations with Japan on a new foundation and set a vision of a New Pacific Community. We are putting in place practical policies to preserve the environment and to limit the spread of weapons of mass destruction. We have proceeded with sweeping reductions in nuclear arms and declared a moratorium on testing as we move toward a comprehensive test ban. We have struggled with the complex tragedy in Bosnia. And we have worked to complete our mission of ensuring lasting relief from starvation in Somalia.

But engagement itself is not enough. We also need to communicate anew why that engagement is essential. If we do not, our government's reactions to foreign events can seem disconnected; individual setbacks may appear to define the whole; pubic support for our engagement likely would wane; and America could be harmed by a rise in protectionism, unwise cuts to our military force structure or readiness, a loss of the resources necessary for our diplomacy and thus the erosion of US influence abroad.

Stating our purpose is neither academic nor rhetorical. What we do outside our borders has immediate and lasting consequences for all Americans. As the President often notes, the line between foreign and domestic policy has evaporated. Our choices about America's foreign policy will help determine:

Whether Americans' real incomes double every 26 years, as they did in the 1960s, and every 36 years, as they did during the late '70s and '80s. Whether the 25 nations with weapons of mass destruction grow in number or decline.

Whether the next quarter century will see terrorism, which injured or killed more than 2000 Americans during the last quarter century, expand or recede as a threat.

Whether the nations of the world will be more able or less able to address regional disputes, humanitarian needs and the threat of environmental degradation.

I do not presume today to define the Administration's entire foreign policy vision. But following on Secretary Christopher's speech yesterday, and anticipating the address the President will make to the United National General Assembly on Monday, I want to suggest some broad principles, as a contribution to an essential national dialogue about our purpose in the world.

AMERICA'S CORE CONCEPTS: DEMOCRACY AND MARKET ECONOMICS

Let us begin by taking stock of our new era. Four facts are salient. First, America's core concepts—democracy and market economics—are more broadly accepted than ever. Over the past ten years the number of democracies has nearly doubled. Since 1970, the number of significant command economies dropped from 10 to 3.

This victory of freedom is practical, not ideological: billions of people on every continent are simply concluding, based on decades of their own hard experience, that democracy and markets are the most productive and liberating ways to organize their lives.

Their conclusion resonates with America's core values. We see individuals as equally created with a God-given right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. So we trust in the equal wisdom of free individuals to protect those rights: through democracy, as the process for best meeting shared needs in the face of competing desires; and through markets as the process for best meeting private needs in a way that expands opportunity.

Both processes strengthen each other: democracy alone can produce justice, but not the material goods necessary for individuals to thrive; markets alone can expand wealth, but not that sense of justice without which civilized societies perish.

Democracy and market economics are ascendant in this new era, but they are not everywhere triumphant. There remain vast areas in Asia, Africa, the Middle East and elsewhere where democracy and market economics are at best new arrivals—most likely unfamiliar, sometimes vilified, often fragile.

But it is wrong to assume these ideas will be embraced only by the West and rejected by the rest. Culture does shape politics and economics. But the idea of freedom has universal appeal. Thus, we have arrived at neither the end of history nor a clash of civilizations, but a moment of immense democratic and entrepreneurial opportunity. We must not waste it.

The second feature of this era is that we are its dominant power. Those who say otherwise sell America short. The fact is, we have the world's strongest military, its largest economy and its most dynamic, multiethnic society. We are setting a global example in our efforts to reinvent our democratic and market institutions. Our leadership is sought and respected in every corner of the world. As Secretary Christopher noted yesterday, that is why the parties to last week's dramatic events chose to shake hands in Washington. Around the world, America's power, authority and example provide unparalleled opportunities to lead.

Moreover, absent a reversal in Russia, there is now no credible near-term threat to America's existence. Serious threats remain: terrorism, proliferating weapons of mass destruction, ethnic conflicts and the degradation of our global environment. Above all, we are threatened by sluggish economic growth, which undermines the security of our people as well as that of allies and friends abroad. Yet none of these threats holds the same immediate dangers for us as did Nazi conquest or Soviet expansionism.

America's challenge today is to lead on the basis of opportunity more than fear.

The third notable aspect of this area is an explosion of ethnic conflicts. As Senator Moynihan and others have noted, the end of the Cold War and the collapse of various repressive regimes has removed the lid from numerous caldrons of ethnic, religious or factional hatreds. In many states of the former Soviet Union and elsewhere, there is a tension between the desire for ethnic separatism and the creation of liberal democracy, which alone can safely accommodate and even celebrate differences among citizens. A major challenge to our thinking, our policies and our international institutions in this era is the fact that most conflicts are taking place within rather than among nations.

These conflicts are typically highly complex; at the same time, their brutality will tug at our consciences. We need a

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

healthywariness about our ability to shape solutions for such disputes, yet at times our interests or humanitarian concerns will impel our unilateral or multilateral engagement.

The fourth feature of this new era is that the pulse of the planet has accelerated dramatically and with it the pace of change in human events. Computers, faxes, fiber optic cables and satellites all speed the flow of information. The measurement of wealth, and increasingly wealth itself, consists in bytes of data that move at the speed of light.

The accelerated pace of events is neither bad nor good. Its sharp consequences can cut either way. It means both doctors and terrorists can more quickly share their technical secrets. Both prodemocracy activists and skinhead anarchists can more broadly spread their views. Ultimately, the world's acceleration creates new and diverse ways for us to exert our influence, if we choose to do so—but increases the likelihood that, if we do not, rapid events, instantly reported may overwhelm us. As the President has suggested, we must decide whether to make change our ally or allow ourselves to become its victims.

FROM CONTAINMENT TO ENLARGEMENT

In such a world, our interests and ideals compel us not only to be engaged, but to lead. And in a real-time world of change and information, it is all the more important that our leadership be steadied around our central purpose.

That purpose can be found in the underlying rationale for our engagement throughout this century. As we fought aggressors and contained communism, our engagement abroad was animated both by calculations of power and by this belief: to the extent democracy and market economics hold sway in other nations, our own nation will be more secure, prosperous and influential, while the broader world will be more human and peaceful.

The expansion of market-based economics abroad helps expand our exports and create American jobs, while it also improves living conditions and fuels demands for political liberalization abroad. The addition of new democracies makes us more secure because democracies tend not to wage war on each other or sponsor terrorism. They are more trustworthy in diplomacy and do a better job of respecting the human rights of their people.

These dynamics lay at the heart of Woodrow Wilson's most profound insights; although his moralism sometimes weakened his argument, he understood that our own security is shaped by the character of foreign regimes. Indeed, most Presidents who followed, Republicans and Democrats alike, understood we must promote democracy and market economics in the world—because it protects our interests and security; and because it reflects values that are both American and universal.

Throughout the Cold War, we contained a global threat to market democracies; now we should seek to enlarge their reach, particularly in places of special significance to us.

The successor to a doctrine of containment must be a strategy of enlargement—enlargement of the world's free community of market democracies.

During the Cold War, even children understood America's security mission; as they looked at those maps on their schoolroom walls, they knew we were trying to contain the creeping expansion of that big, red blob. Today, at great risk of oversimplification, we might visualize our security mission as promoting the enlargement of the "blue areas" of market democracies. The difference, of course, is that we do not seek to expand the reach of our institutions by force, subversion or repression.

We must not allow this overarching goal to drive us into overreaching actions. To be successful, a strategy of enlargement must provide distinctions and set priorities. It must combine our broad goals of fostering democracy and markets with our more traditional geostrategic interests. And it must suggest how best to expend our large but nonetheless limited national security resources: financial, diplomatic and military.

In recent years, discussions about when to use force have turned on a set of vital questions, such as whether our forces match our objectives; whether; we can fight and win in the time that is acceptable; whether we have a reasonable exit if we do not, whether there is public and congressional support. But we have overlooked a prior, strategic question—the question of "where"—which sets the context for such military judgments.

I see four components to a strategy of enlargement.

First, we should strengthen the community of major market democracies—including our own—which constitutes the core from which enlargement is proceeding.

Second, we should help foster and consolidate new democracies and market economies, where possible, especially in states of special significance and opportunity.

Third, we must counter the aggression—and support the liberalization—of states hostile to democracy and markets.

Fourth, we need to pursue our humanitarian agenda not only by providing aid, but also by working to help democracy and market economics take root in regions of greatest humanitarian concern.

A host of caveats must accompany a strategy of enlargement. For one, we must be patient. As scholars observe, waves of democratic advance are often followed by reverse waves of democratic setback. We must be ready for uneven progress, even outright reversals.

Our strategy must be pragmatic. Our interests in democracy and markets do not stand alone. Other American interests at times will require us to befriend and even defend non-democratic states for mutually beneficial reasons.

Our strategy must view democracy broadly—it must envision a system that includes not only elections but also such features as an independent judiciary and protections of human rights.

Our strategy must also respect diversity. Democracy and markets can come in many legitimate variants. Freedom has many faces.

STRENGTHENING THE COMMUNITY OF MAJOR MARKET DEMOCRACIES

Let me review each of the four components of this straegy in greater detail.

It is axiomatic in electoral campaigns that you start by firming up your political base. The same is true in international politics. Thus, the highest priority in a strategy of enlargement must be to strengthen the core of major market democracies, the bonds among them and their sense of common interest.

That renewal starts at home. Our efforts to empower our people, revive our economy, reduce our deficit and re-invent our government have profound implications for our global strength and the attractiveness of democracy and markets around the world. Our domestic revival will also influence how much of their hard-earned money Americans will commit to our engagement abroad.

The imperative of strengthening the democratic core also underscores the importance of renewing the bonds among our key democratic allies. Today our relations with Europe, Canada and Japan are basically sound. But they suffer from an economic problem and a military problem.

The economic problem is shared sluggish growth and the political cost it exacts on democratic governments. For example, over the past decade, many western European nations have not created a single net job. Partly as a result, most of our key allies are now sitting atop thin treasuries and thin political majorities. Economic stagnation and its political consequences undermine the ability of the major democratic powers to act decisively on our many common challenges, from the GATT to Bosnia.

Fortunately, many of our democratic allies are undertaking searching re-examinations of government processes and domestic policies, just as we are. These efforts should proceed boldly—not only for the sake of justice and prosperity in each of our nations, but also so that our democratic community once again can act with vigor and resolve.

That is why we are leading the effort to secure a successful GATT agreement by year's end. And it is why enactment of NAFTA is one of the President's top priorities. But while these specific agreements are of enormous importance, this need for economic renewalgoes even further. We are in the early stages of as great a change in the global economy as we faced at the end of World War II. And with hard times in all our nations, we face the possibility of creating vicious rather than virtuous circles of international economic action. Unless the major market democracies act together—updating international economic institutions, coordinating macroeconomic policies and striking hard but fair bargains on the ground rules of open trade—the fierce competition of the new global economy, coupled with the end of our common purpose from the Cold War, could drive us into prolonged stagnation or even economic disaster.

The military problem involves NATO. For half a century, NATO has proved itself the most effective military alliance in human history. If NATO is to remain an anchor for European and Atlantic stability, as the President believes it must, its members must commit themselves to updating NATO's role in this new era. Unless NATO is willing over time to assume a broader role then it will lose public support, and all our nations will lose a vital bond of transatlantic and European security. That is why, at the NATO summit that the President has called for this January, we will seek to update NATO, so that there continues behind the enlargement of market democracies an essential collective security.

FOSTERING NEW DEMOCRACIES AND MARKET ECONOMIC

Beyond seeing to our base, the second imperative for our strategy must be to help democracy and markets expand and survive in other places where we have the strongest security concerns and where we can make the greatest difference. This is not a democratic crusade; it is a pragmatic commitment to see freedom take hold where that will help us most. Thus, we must target our effort to assist states that affect our strategic interests, such as those with large economies, critical locations, nuclear weapons or the potential to generate refugee flows into our own nation or into key friends and allies. We

must focus our efforts where we have the most leverage. And our efforts must be demand-driven—they must focus on nations whose people are pushing for reform or have already secured it.

The most important example is the former Soviet Union and it fits the criteria just noted. If we can support and help consolidate democratic and market reforms in Russia and the other newly independent states, we can help turn a former threat into a region of valued diplomatic and economic partners. In addition, our efforts in Russia, Ukraine and the other states raise the likelihood of continued reductions in nuclear arms and compliance with international non-proliferation accords.

The new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe are another clear example, given their proximity to the great democratic powers of Western Europe.

And since our ties across the Pacific are no less important than those across the Atlantic, pursuing enlargement in the Asian Pacific is a third example. In July, the President underscored that point in Japan and Korea with his descriptions of a New Pacific Community.

Continuing the great strides toward democracy and markets in our emerging Western Hemispheric Community of Democracies also must be a key concern. And we should be on the lookout for states whose entry into the camp of market democracies may influence the future direction of an entire region; South Africa and Nigeria now hold that potential with regard to sub-Saharan Africa.

How should the United States help consolidate and enlarge democracy and markets in these states? The answers are as varied as the nations involved, but there are common elements. We must continue to help lead the effort to mobilize international resources, as we have with Russia and the other new states. We must be willing to take immediate public positions to help staunch democratic reversals, as we have in Haiti, Guatemala and Nigeria. We must give democratic nations the fullest benefits of integration into foreign markets, which is part of why NAFTA and the GATT rank so high on our security agenda. We must link wider access to technology markets with commitments to abide by nonproliferation norms. And we must help these nations strengthen the pillars of civil society, improve their market institutions, and fight corruption and political discontent through practices of good governance.

In all these efforts, a policy of enlargement should take on a second meaning; we should pursue our goals through an enlarged circle not only of government officials but also of private and non-governmental groups. Private firms are natural allies in our efforts to strengthen market economies. Similarly, our goal of strengthening democracy and civil society has a natural ally in labor unions, human rights groups, environmental advocates, chambers of commerce, and election monitors. Just as we rely on force multipliers in defense, we should welcome these "diplomacy multipliers," such as the National Endowment for Democracy.

THE "BACKLASH" STATES

The third element of our strategy of enlargement should be to minimize the ability of states outside the circle of democracy and markets to threaten it.

Democracy and market economics have always been subversive ideas to those who rule without consent. These ideas remain subversive today. Every dictator, theocrat, kleptocrat or central planner in an unelected regime has reason to fear their subjects will suddenly demand the freedom to make their own decisions.

We should expect the advance of democracy and markets to trigger forceful reactions from those whose power is not popularly derived. The rise of Burma's democracy movement led to the jailing of its most vocal proponent, Aung San Suu Kyi. Russia's reforms have aroused the resistance of the nomenklatura.

Centralized power defends itself. It not only wields tools of state power such as military force, political imprisonment and torture, but also exploits the intolerant energies of racism, ethnic prejudice, religious persecution, xenophobia, and irredentism. Those whose power is threatened by the spread of democracy and markets willalways have a personal stake in resisting those practices with passionate intensity.

When such leaders sit atop regional powers, such as Iran and Iraq, they may engage in violence and lawlessness that threatens the United States and other democracies. Such reactionary, "backlash" states are more likely to sponsor terrorism and traffic in weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missile technologies. They are more likely to suppress their own people, foment ethnic rivalries and threaten their neighbors.

In this world of multiplying democracies, expanding markets and accelerating commerce, the rulers of backlash states face an unpleasant choice. They can seek to isolate their people from these liberating forces. If they do, however, they cut themselves off from the very forces that create wealth and social dynamism. Such states tend to rot from within, both economically and spiritually. But as they grow weaker, they also may become more desperate and dangerous.

Our policy toward such states, so long as they act as they do, must seek to isolate them diplomatically, militarily, economically and technologically. It must stress intelligence, counterterrorism, and multilateral export controls. It also must apply global norms regarding weapons of mass destruction and ensure their enforcement. While some of these efforts will be unilateral, international rules are necessary and may be particularly effective in enforcing sanctions, transparency and export controls, as the work of the IAEA in Iraq demonstrates.

When the actions of such states directly threaten our people, our forces, or our vital interests, we clearly must be prepared to strike back decisively and unilaterally, as we did when Iraq tried to assassinate former President Bush. We must always maintain the military power necessary to deter, or if necessary defeat, aggression by these regimes. Because the source of such threats will be diverse and unpredictable, we must seek to ensure that our forces are increasingly ready, mobile, flexible and smart, as the President and Secretary Aspin have stressed.

Let me take a moment to illustrate what America's armed forces are doing, right now as we meet: In South Korea, some 37,000 U.S. troops are on guard against aggression from the North. In the Persian Gulf, the "Abraham Lincoln" carrier battle group and other forces remain stationed as a follow up to Operation Desert Storm. And as we move toward new Middle East peace agreements, some 1000 US soldiers continue to help keep the peace in the Sinai Peninsula. Such forces cost money. Some people may regret our "Bottom Up Review" did not suggest a substantially smaller or cheaper force. But the fact is: these forces, the world's very best, are part of the necessary price of security and leadership in the world.

While some backlash states may seek to wall themselves off from outside influence, other anti-democratic states will opt to pursue greater wealth by liberalizing their economic rules. Sooner or later, however, these states confront the need to liberalize the flow of information into and within their nation, and to tolerate the rise of an entrepreneurial middle-class. Both developments weaken despotic rule and lead over time to rising demands for democracy. Chile's experience under General Pinochet proves market economies can thrive for a time without democracy. But both our instinct and recent history in Chile, South Korea and elsewhere tell us they cannot do so forever.

We cannot impose democracy on regimes that appear to be opting for liberalization, but we may be able to help steer some of them down that path, while providing penalties that raise the costs of repression and aggressive behavior. These efforts have special meaning for our relations with China. That relationship is one of the most important in the world, for China will increasingly be a major world power, and along with our ties to Japan and Korea, our relationship with China will strongly shape both our security and economic interests in Asia. It is in the interest of both our nations for China to continue its economic liberalization while respecting the human rights of its people and international norms regarding weapons sales. That is why we conditionally extended China's trading advantages, sanctioned its missile exports and proposed creation of a new Radio Free Asia. We seek a stronger relationship with China that reflects both our values and our interests.

Our policies toward the Islamic world provide another example. Let me emphasize this point: our nation respects the many contributions Islam has made to the world over the past 1300 years, and we appreciate the close bonds of values and history between Islam and the Judeo-Christian beliefs of most Americans. We will extend every expression of friendship to those of the Islamic faith who abide in peace and tolerance. But we will provide every resistance to militants who distort Islamic doctrines and seek to expand their influence by force.

THE HUMANITARIAN AGENDA

The fourth part of a strategy of enlargement involves our humanitarian goals, which play an important supporting role in our efforts to expand democracy and markets. Our humanitarian actions nurture the American public's support for our engagement abroad. Our humanitarian efforts also can stimulate democratic and market development in many areas of the world. Ultimately, the world trusts our leadership in that broader effort in part because it witnesses our humanitarian deeds: it knows that our responses to hunger and suffering, from Bangladesh to Somalia to Chernobyl, are an expression of who we are as a nation. Our humanitarian efforts must continue to include a broad array of programs—economic and military assistance, disaster relief, and projects to assist education, nutrition and health. Over the coming months we plan to work with Congress to reform this array of aid programs—to focus them more strategically and efficiently on the promotion of democracy and markets, environmentally sustainable development and early responses to social and economic chaos.

We face great challenges to our humanitarian instincts in this era, and far fewer barriers to action than there were during the

period of superpower competition. Public pressures for our humanitarian engagement increasingly may be driven by televisedimages, which can depend in turn on such considerations as where CNN sends its camera crews. But we must bring other considerations to bear as well: cost; feasibility; the permanence of the improvement our assistance will bring; the willingness of regional and international bodies to do their part; and the likelihood that our actions will generate broader security benefits for the people and the region in question.

While there will be increasing calls on us to help stem bloodshed and suffering in ethnic conflicts, and while we will always bring our diplomacy to bear, these criteria suggest there will be relatively few intra-national ethnic conflicts that justify our military intervention. Ultimately, on these and other humanitarian needs, we will have to pick and choose.

Where we can make a difference, as in Somalia and Northern Iraq, we should not oppose using our military forces for humanitarian purposes simply because these missions do not resemble major wars for control of territory. Such missions will never be without risk, but as in all other aspects of our security policy, our military leadership is willing to accept reasonable risks in the service of our national objectives.

Ultimately, it is through our support for democracy and sustainable development that we best enhance the dramatic new winds of change that are stirring much of the developing world. In Africa, for example, we recently have seen the birth of democracy in Namibia and multiparty elections in over a dozen African countries. These developments, combined with new efforts at regional conflict resolution and a shift away from planned economies, provide real hope that sub-Saharan Africa can at long last begin to realize her vast potential. One key to that progress will be South Africa, which has now begun its historic countdown toward a full non-racial democracy. Just as our strategy of enlargement focuses on key points of leverage, so our strategy toward Africa must focus on providing international leadership to help South Africa's transition succeed.

CURRENT FOREIGN POLICY DEBATES IN PERSPECTIVE

What does a strategy of enlargement tell us about the major foreign policy debates we hear today? Above all, it suggests many of those debates are overdrawn. The headlines are dominated by Bosnia, Somalia, and "multilateralism." A strategy of enlargement suggests our principal concerns should be strengthening our democratic core in North America, Europe and Japan; consolidating and enlarging democracy and markets in key places; and addressing backlash states such as Iran and Iraq. Our efforts in Somalia and Bosnia are important expressions of our overall engagement; but they do not by themselves define our broader strategy in the world.

The conflict in Bosnia deserves American engagement: it is a vast humanitarian tragedy; it is driven by ethnic barbarism; it stemmed from aggression against an independent state; it lies alongside the established and emerging market democracies of Europe and can all too easily explode into a wider Balkan conflict.

That is why this Administration supported lifting the arms embargo against Bosnia, led a successful effort to enforce the no-fly zone, initiated a large-scale humanitarian airlift, and pushed NATO's pledge of air strikes to stop the strangulation of Sarajevo and other Bosnian cities. It is why we remain committed to helping implement an acceptable and enforceable peace accord, and through that commitment, encourage its achievement. But while we have clear reasons to engage and persist, they do not obliterate other American interests involving Europe and Russia, and they do not justify the extreme costs of taking unilateral responsibility for imposing a solution.

In Somalia, President Bush engaged our forces to help end a murderous famine. He correctly concluded we could create a secure military environment for humanitarian relief at a reasonable cost and risk. As a result our nation helped save hundreds of thousands of lives and restored order throughout most of Somalia. As we have approached our goals, we have reduced our military presence by 80 percent and transferred lead responsibility for peacekeeping and reconstruction to the UN. The withdrawal of our remaining combat troops is only a matter of time, but it must not come in a way that undermines all the gains made in the areas beyond Mogadishu and leads, almost inexorably, to the chaos which caused the human tragedy in the first place.

Unfortunately, debates over both Bosnia and Somalia have been cast as doctrinal matters involving the role of multilateralism. This focus is misplaced. Certainly, in each case—as in Cambodia and elsewhere—our actions are making multilateral case law for the future. But we should not let the particular define the doctrinal. So let me say a word about the current doctrinal debate on multilateralism—a subject Ambassador Albright will address more fully on Thursday.

I believe strongly that our foreign policies must marry principle and pragmatism. We should be principled about our purposes but pragmatic about our means.

Today some suggest that multilateralism should be our presumptive mode of engagement. Others suggest that it is inherently flawed—dragging us into minor conflicts where we have no interest and blocking us from acting decisively where we do have an interest.

This debate is important but dangerous in the rigidity of the doctrines that are asserted. Few who bemoan multilateralism today object to NATO, the IMF, or the GATT. And it is beyond debate that multilateral action has certain advantages: it can spread the costs of action, as in our efforts to support Russian reform; it can foster global support, as with our coalition in the Gulf War; it can ensure comprehensiveness, as in our export control regimes; and it can succeed where no nation, acting alone, could have done so, as in Cambodia. I would go further and state my personal hope that the habits of multilateralism may one day enable the rule of law to play a far more civilizing role in the conduct of nations, as envisioned by the founders of the United Nations.

But for any official with responsibilities for our security policies, only one overriding factor can determine whether the USshould act multilaterally or unilaterally, and that is America's interests. We should act multilaterally where doing so advances our interests—And we should act unilaterally when that will serve our purpose. The simple question in each instance is this: what works best?

THE CASE FOR ENGAGEMENT

I believe there is a more fundamental foreign policy challenge brewing for the United States. It is a challenge over whether we will be significantly engaged abroad at all. As I suggested at the outset, in many ways, we are returning to the divisions and debates about our role in the world that are as old as our Republic. On one side is protectionism and limited foreign engagement; on the other is active American engagement abroad on behalf of democracy and expanded trade.

The last time our nation saw that classic division was just after World War II. It pitted those Democrats and Republicans whose creativity produced the architectures of post-war prosperity and security against those in both parties who would have had us retreat within the isolated shell we occupied in the 1920s and 1930s. The internationalists won those debates, in part because they could point to a unitary threat to America's interests and because the nation was entering a period of economic security.

Today's supporters of engagement abroad have neither of those advantages. The threats and opportunities are diffuse, and our people are deeply anxious about their economic fate. Rallying Americans to bear the costs and burdens of international engagement is no less important. But it is much more difficult.

For this reason, those who recognize the value of our leadership in the world should devote far more energy to making the case for sustained engagement abroad and less energy to debates over tactics. To be sure, there will be disagreements over tactics: we expect to be held accountable for our policy decisions, and our critics can expect us to respond where we disagree. But all of us who support engagement should be careful to debate tactics in a way that does not prevent us from coming together in common cause around the fundamental importance of that goal.

All of us have come out of the Cold War years having learned distinct lessons about what not to do—don't go to war without a way to win; don't underestimate the role of ideas; don't minimize the power of nationalism. Yet we have come into the new era with relatively few ways to convince a skeptical public that engagement abroad is a worthwhile investment. That is why a national dialogue over our fundamental purposes is so important.

In a world of extraordinary complexity, it would be too easy for us in the internationalist camp to become "neo-Marxists"—not after Karl, but after Groucho, who once sang, "Whatever it is, I'm against it."

It is time for those who see the value of American engagement to steady our ranks; to define our purpose; and to rally the American people. In particular, at a time of high deficits and pressing domestic needs, we need to make a convincing case for our engagement or else see drastic reductions in our military, intelligence, peacekeeping and other foreign policy accounts.

In his farewell address in January, 1953, Harry Truman predicted the collapse of Communism. "I have a deep and abiding faith in the destiny of free men," he said. "With patience and courage, we shall some day move on into a new era."

Now that era is upon us. It is a moment of unparalleled opportunity. We have the blessing of living in the world's most powerful and respected nation at a time when the world is embracing our ideals as never before. We can let this moment slip away. Or we can mobilize our nation in order to enlarge democracy, enlarge markets, and enlarge our future. I am confident that we will choose the road best travelled.

TRIBUTE TO LT. COL. JOHN P. MOORE

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lt. Col. John P. Moore, a man of unparalleled professionalism from my 17th District on Ohio.

Mr. Speaker Lieutenant Colonel Moore is the Logistics Group Commander for the 910 Airlift Group at Youngstown Air Reserve Base. He is an air reserve technician [AFT]. But to our chagrin, he will be leaving the base to take assignment at HQ Air Force Reserve at Robins Air Force Base [AFB] GA.

Mr. Speaker Lieutenant Colonel Moore's career is peppered with awards, honors, and accomplishments. While earning his bachelor of science and master of education degrees, he complemented his learning with a military education. He attended squadron officers school, Air Command and Staff College and the Air War College at the Air University at the Maxwell AFB, AL. The Colonel received his commission through the Air Force Officers Training School at Lackland AFB. TX.

While serving on active duty Colonel Moore held numerous positions, including maintenance control officer and wing maintenance control officer at Hill AFB, UT. He then left active duty and joined the Air Force Reserve in Youngstown. By 1985, he became the deputy commander for maintenance and Commander, 910 consolidated Aircraft Maintenance Squadron. In 1992, the position was reclassified as logistice group commander. His contributions to the surrounding community have been outstanding as well. He is a member of the base-community council and has helped spearhead the drive to obtain new aircraft for the base.

Lieutenant Colonel Moore's decorations and awards are many: Air Force Meritorious Service Medal, Air Force Commendation Medal (with one Oak Leaf Cluster), Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, National Defense Service Medal (with device), Air Force Longevity Service Ribbon (with four Oak Leaf Clusters), Small Arms Expert Marksmanship Ribbon and the Air Force Training Ribbon.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the citizens of my district in thanking Lieutenant Colonel Moore, his wife Mary Frances and their children John David and Patricia Anne for their service to our community. I wish the Colonel well at his new assignment.

SLOVAKIA: ON ESTABLISHING DEMOCRACY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this week the Helsinki Commission will release a report on the human rights situation in Slovakia—a newly independent country and a new participant in the CSCE process. It constitutes one of a series of reports prepared by the Commission staff on the implementation of human rights commitments in Eastern Europe and the transition to democracy in this region. Other reports have been prepared on Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Germany, and Latvia.

The Commission's first report on developments specifically in Slovakia, issued in April last year, examined the political situation in that republic as its leaders stood poised to assume both power and responsibility. Today, independent Slovakia presents a mixed picture.

On the plus side of the ledger, the worst abuses of the former Communist regime have ceased: political prisoners have been released, travel restrictions curtailing freedom of movement have ended, and religious freedom is generally respected. In addition, free and fair elections were held in Slovakia in June 1992 and a workable constitution was passed shortly after that.

Nevertheless, the transition to democracy is hardly complete and other essential elements for the rule of law have yet to be established: the independence of the judiciary remains uncertain; an accounting with former leaders of the Communist regime awaits its victims; and questions relating to the legacy of war and totalitarianism, such as property restitution, are still outstanding. In some areas of the human dimension, such as freedom of the press, a distinct hostility on the part of the ruling party has been evidenced. In addition, the government has pursued policies that suggest at best indifference toward and at worst intolerance of the rights of those belonging to minorities groups.

Regrettably, even as this report was being sent to the printer, additional human rights problems have emerged. Prime Minister Meciar has sought to bring criminal charges against a journalist for reporting on Meciar's own poorly worded speech about Roma, Gypsies. The parliament has just passed new legislation reaffirming its restrictions on the rights of individuals to names of their own choosing. Although perhaps not as restrictive as the previous regulations, the new law still discriminates on the basis of both sex and ethnicity, requiring Hungarian women to use a slavic name ending—whether they want to or not. Bilingual road signs remain banned, contrary to assurances made by Prime Minister Meciar to Congressmen TOM LANTOS this past spring regarding the fair treatment of minority communities. And just a few days ago, the Commission received information from a nongovernmental organization regarding proposed plans for administrative redistricting in Slovakia. As described, these plans appear to be specifically designed to limit the effective participation of Hungarian Slovaks in public affairs, contrary to commitments in the CSCE Copenhagen Document.

The human rights implications of these developments are, I believe, all too clear. But equally important, these issues have significance for Slovakia's transition to a free-market economy. One can only wonder how much money is spent by the central government in Bratislava to maintain a bureaucracy to ensure that peoples' names meet state-defined limitations. How much money is spent painting over the Hungarian versions of city and road names? To me, Bratislava's heavyhanded tactics not only sound shortsighted, they sound expensive.

I do not want to paint too black a picture; as I said at the outset, after all, the situation in Slovakia is mixed. I was heartened, for example, to learn that high-level Slovak officials, including President Michal Kovac, publicly denounced a recent assault on an American rabbi in Bratislava. The open condemnation of intolerance by those in positions of leadership may help curb acts of violence and foster a climate of mutual trust. I was also gratified to learn that the nongovernmental Slovak Helsinki Committee has issued a statement addressing the problem of social intolerance toward Roma, Jews, and other minorities and urging greater government initiative in redressing human rights concerns. Greater public involvement in Slovakia by all segments of society can play a critical role in facilitating the transition to democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the human dimension problems facing Slovakia today have broad implications: they raise questions for the economic well-being of the people of Slovakia, for the regional security of this country, and for Slovakia's integration into the community of nations. Independence in Slovakia may have been achieved overnight. But the establishment of democracy will take greater time and, perhaps, require even more of the people of that country.

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTINE B. ANTOSKIEWICZ

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, on this day, September 29, 1993, the southeast Michigan chapter of the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation will be hosting the 10th annual Alexander Macomb Citizen of the Year Award dinner. The award, instituted in 1984, is named after my home county's namesake, Gen. Alexander Macomb, a hero of the War of 1812.

This year, the March of Dimes has chosen a long-time friend, Christine B. Antoskiewicz, as a recipient of the award. Christine and I worked together at the Macomb County Juvenile Court Division where she has continually championed children's rights since 1964. A voice for children living with abuse and neglect, she is also responsible for initiating a community network that supports the children of Shelter Care.

Through advocacy, education, and community service, the March of Dimes has established itself as an organization with an impeccable reputation. And, the southeast Michigan chapter rightly recognizes Christine for her excellent service and outstanding leadership. Their recognition is an exceptional honor and I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting my friend, Christine Antoskiewicz, as a recipient of the Alexander Macomb Citizen of the Year Award.

TRIBUTE TO ARTHUR WHITFIELD STANLEY

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues excerpts of a speech given by Attorney Mordecai C. Johnson on October 2, 1992, in honor of Mr. Arthur Whitfield Stanley, a longtime civil rights worker and civic leader in Darlington, SC.

The excerpts follow:

ARTHUR WHITFIELD STANLEY, RACE MAN

Our honoree was born on August 19, 1914, the only child of "Mopsy" Gandy and Martha Stanley. He was raised by his mother's mother, Ellen "Ma" Stanley, who called him her little "Man" and conferred upon him her family name. Because of his grandmother, he was fortunate to go to Mayo High School here, to become a star kicker on its football team and to graduate in 1933. For some 30 years, he was President of the Darlington Branch, NAACP.

Travel with me back to the early morning of the Third Wednesday in August of 1914.

At that time, there were numerous ex-slaves for "Man" to listen to. The NAACP was 5 years old. There was no Darlington Branch.

Democracy in this country meant publicly lynching a Black man every week.

Democracy meant high mortality rates. If you were a middle aged Black, you had beat the odds. The tax for being Black was about 40 percent of your life.

Woodrow Wilson's democracy meant *de jure* discrimination everywhere. It was in the schools where the Black teacher was paid about 25% as much money as her white counterpart. It was in transportation because the Supreme Court, in *Plessy vs. Ferguson*, had said it was lawful to segregate passengers by race. It was in the church, the hospital, the jail, the courts, the cemetery.

Arthur Whitfield Stanley has lived through the administrations of more than one-third of our Nation's Presidents.

When Mr. Stanley was 47 years old, his 3 children and others similarly situated got the right to attend school with white children because of a class action called *Stanley vs. The School District of Darlington County*. We took that case all the way to the United States Supreme Court. Thus, the Stanley name is indelibly stamped in the annals of jurisprudence of this nation for as long as the record of the law exists.

At the age of 50, Arthur Stanley, with the nation, witnessed the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For the first time in his life, the law said he could eat in a restaurant and sleep in a hotel without regard to race. He could walk in a public park and read in a public library without racial discrimination. What I reverently call "The Adam Clayton Powell Bill," a provision for cutting off federal money to entities that discriminate, was embodied in Title VI of the Act. And for the first time, the law said that employers couldn't discriminate against a worker because of race or sex.

The next year, Congress passed the Voting Rights Act which put old "Bubba," the literacy tester, out of a job. Twelve years later, Mr. Stanley was elected to the City Council of Darlington.

When Arthur Stanley was 53 years old, he and the rest of us witnessed something that the world had never seen: a Black man—Thurgood Marshall—took a seat on the Supreme Court of the United States.

"Man" Stanley was 69 years old when he shook hands with our State's first Black Senator in this century, his old friend, former head of the State NAACP, I. DeQuincy Newman.

Today, at age 78, "Pop" Stanley has seen the number of Blacks in the General Assembly grow from zero to 22.

Mr. Stanley, President Emeritus of the Darlington County Branch, NAACP, can look back at the days when Black men who stood up were likely to be crushed. They couldn't work on the white man's job because they'd get fired. They couldn't be sharecroppers because they'd be kicked out of their homes. For the same reason, they couldn't be renters. And if they owned a house or business, they couldn't borrow money on it because the banks put the squeeze on them. You could get shot at, your house set afire, run out of the state, like Reverend Brother J.A. DeLaine of Clarendon County; you could, like Reverend J.M. Hinton, State President of the NAACP, be chainwhipped by masked men on a dark road at midnight and, like Black newsman John McCray, jailed because of what you wrote, you could be lynched. That's what happened to you if you stood up; if you were a "race man." And Arthur Stanley stood up. He stood up, though threatened by what had happened to his friends, threatened with bankruptcy, with physical violence. Arthur Stanley often stood alone in Darlington County—like a rock. I won't say he stood fearlessly. He had to be scared sometimes. But he stood up anyway.

And today, Arthur Whitfield Stanley deserves our richest encomium and panegyric, the highest tribute, Black folks can give; today, I proclaim him a "race man!"

My friends, I would not have you believe that I believe that Mr. Stanley has solved all of our problems. You and I know that whatever our accomplishments in the past, there are problems, yes, challenges, ahead of us.

Thousands of years ago, a Black prophet named Jeremiah lamented that, "the harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved."

The long hot summers of the 60s are behind us, and "we are not saved." We have reaped the harvest of laws calling for anti-lynching and equal pay for teachers and voting rights and school integration and economic development and anti-discrimination in housing, in employment, and all the rest. Yet, "we are not saved."

With blacks being about one-third of the population of this State, 16 Black House members out of 124, six Black members of the 46 member Senate, 5% of the State's judgeships is not an apogee. We are yet far from the millennium, the promised land. "We are not saved."

In education, our little Johnnys can't read.

The Black man is still an endangered species—being shot and shot full of drugs and sent to jail in disproportionate numbers,

Dream with me a little while, as we stand on the threshold of the 21st Century.

I dream of young Blacks harnessing the energy of the sun, the strength of the ocean, the power in the lightning and the thunder, thus solving the world's energy problems.

I envision our youngsters farming the seas and deserts, teaching sick folks to heal themselves, teaching hungry folks to feed themselves—in Somalia, in Ethiopia, in Kenya, in Tanzania, in Mozambique. . . .

I close with a poem written by a civil rights lawyer named Johnson, the first Black admitted to the Bar in the State of Florida, who, in 1920, became the first Black Executive Secretary of the NAACP. I want to recite to you a poem written by James Weldon Johnson, born 43 years before Arthur Whitfield Stanley.

This 92-year-old poem has three verses. The first verse is a song of triumph. It calls for singling loudly and resoundingly and powerfully and with great faith, great hope; and it implores us to keep on marching.

The second verse is a recounting of history. It tells of a terrible darkness, from whence we came to the light.

The third verse is a prayer. It recalls God's delivery of us from darkness to light; and it invokes the blessings of the Deity, that He will keep us in the light, standing upright.

You may have heard that poem. It goes like this:

Lift every voice and sing, till earth and heaven ring,
Ring with the harmonies of liberty;
Let our rejoicing rise, high as the listening skies,
Let it resound loud as the rolling sea.
Sing a song full of the faith that the dark past has taught us;
Sing a song full of the hope that the present has brought us;
Facing the rising sun of our new day begun,
Let us march on till victory is won.
Stony the road we trod, bitter the chastening rod,
Felt in the days when hope unborn had died;
Yet with a steady beat, have not our weary feet,
Come to the place for which our fathers sighed?
We have come over a way that with tears has been watered,
We have come, treading our path through the blood of the slaughtered,
Out from the gloomy past, till now we stand at last
Where the white gleam of our bright star is cast.
God of our weary years, God of our silent tears,
Thou who hast brought us thus far on the way;
Thou who hast by Thy might, led us into the light,
Keep us forever in the path, we pray.
Lest our feet stray from the places, our God, where we met Thee,
Lest our hearts, drunk with the wine of the world, we forget Thee,
Shadowed beneath Thy hand, may we forever stand,
True to our God, true to our native land.

CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF FISHERY RESOURCES IN AN AREA IN THE SEA OF OKHOTSK KNOWN AS THE PEANUT HOLE

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to promote the conservation and management of fishery resources in an area in the Sea of Okhotsk known as the Peanut Hole. The bill amends the Central Bering Sea Fisheries Enforcement Act of 1992 (P.L. 102–582) by including the Sea of Okhotsk as a region in which fishing is

not to occur by U.S. fishermen. Fishermen found to violate the statute will be subject to penalties under U.S. law.

The Peanut Hole is a small enclave of international water in the Sea of Okhotsk which is encircled by the 200-nautical-mile exclusive economic zone [EEZ] of the Russian Federation. Fishermen have decimated the pollock stocks there resulting in the need for strong conservation measures. While the Russian Federation has controlled fishing within the boundaries of its EEZ, its regulations have not achieved the desired effect due to the overharvesting by foreign fishermen who have positioned their boats on the other, high-seas side of the line. While delegates from both the Russian Federation and United States have sought long-term, international agreements, certain fishing nations have refused such efforts.

The Peanut Hole has suffered the same difficulties as the Donut Hole, a similar enclave located in the Central Bering Sea and surrounded by the EEZ's of the United States and the Russian Federation. While the Central Bering Sea Fisheries Enforcement Act of 1992 helped to restrict fishing in the Donut Hole, the Congress did not consider the Peanut Hole. Unfortunately, fishermen who can no longer fish in the Donut Hole have consequently flocked to the Peanut Hole. It is feared that they will continue their harvest until they capture the very last fish.

The bill, as introduced, aims to foster improved conservation and management in the Peanut Hole. It is expected that the use of civil penalties will result in greater cooperation for establishing a long-term, international agreements. Such an effort may be the only means to prevent the commercial extinction of once very profitable and plentiful fisheries. I urge you to support this bill in its entirety.

CBO REPORT ON H.R. 2151—THE MARITIME SECURITY AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 1993

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, on September 22, 1993, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries filed its report on H.R. 2151, the Maritime Security and Competitiveness Act of 1993—House Report 103–251.

At that time, the Congressional Budget Office had not yet completed its cost estimate of the legislation and the report was filed without the usual CBO report. Under those circumstances, and in compliance with clause 7(a) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee included in the report its own estimate of the costs that would be incurred in carrying out H.R. 2151.

Subsequent to filing the report, the CBO cost estimate was received. To inform the Members of the House and to comply with the spirit of clause 2(l)(3)(C) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I am hereby inserting the full text of the CBO cost estimate on H.R. 2151:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 28, 1993.

Hon. GERRY E. STUDDS,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 2151, the Maritime Security and Competitiveness Act of 1993.

Enactment of H.R. 2151 would not affect direct spending or receipts. Therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply to the bill.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER,
Director.

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE—COST ESTIMATE

1. Bill number: H.R. 2151.

2. Bill title: Maritime Security and Competitiveness Act of 1993.

3. Bill status: As reported by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on September 22, 1993.

4. Bill purpose: H.R. 2151 would establish the maritime security fleet program within the Department of Transportation (DOT). Under this program, the Secretary of Transportation would enroll eligible privately owned vessels in the Maritime Security Fleet (MSF). Each owner or operator of a vessel in the fleet would enter into a 10-year operating agreement with the department under which the carrier would agree to make its vessels available to the Department of Defense (DOD) when needed for national security. For each ship enrolled in the fleet, the company would receive $2.1 million annually ($2.3 million for 1994), subject to appropriation. All carriers would be able to sign agreements once their eligibility has been determined, but payments for vessels covered by operating differential subsidies (ODS) or Military Sealift Command (MSC) charters would not begin until these other payments ended. We expect that the new agreements would be signed in fiscal year 1995 at the earliest, based on the effective dates and implementation schedule specified in the bill.

Section 10 of the bill would authorize DOT to subsidize the construction of certain vessels built in American shipyards. Under the series transition program, DOT would enter into agreements with shipyards to subsidize the construction of a series of commercial vessels over a five-year period, provided that federal payments do not exceed 50 percent of the ship's cost and that no subsidized vessel is to be purchased for the U.S. coastwise trade. DOT could enter into a subsidy agreement, which would constitute a binding obligation of the United States, only if appropriations were available and only if the department has determined that the receiving shipyard would be able to build additional similar vessels at competitive prices after building the subsidized ships.

The bill includes a number of other amendments to the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. It also would require DOT to study the impacts of the MSF program and to report its findings to the Congress.

5. Estimated cost to the Federal Government: Assuming appropriation of the necessary sums, we estimate that implementation of the bill would cost the federal government between $1.2 billion and $2.4 billion over the period from 1995 to 2010. Of these amounts, $0.5 billion to $0.7 billion would be sent between 1995 and 1998, with annual outlays ranging between $100 million and $200 million during this period. These costs would fall within budget function 400.

BASIS OF ESTIMATE

Maritime Security Fleet Expenditures: Assuming appropriation of the necessary sums, CBO estimates that the federal government would spend between $1.1 billion and $2.2 billion between 1995 and 2010 to subsidize the operation of between 70 and 130 vessels, depending on the number of carriers that are willing to participate in the MSF program and the number of vessels that would be eligible. Because many of the eligible vessels expected to participate have existing ODS or MSC charter contracts, only about $0.1 billion would be spent the first year of the program (fiscal year 1995). We estimate that outlays over the 1995–1998 period would be between $0.4 billion and $0.5 billion.

For purposes of these estimates, CBO has assumed that the full amounts necessary for the 10-year agreements would be appropriated for fiscal year 1995, the year in which all agreements are expected to be signed, regardless of when payments begin. Estimated costs for liner vessels, which account for between $0.8 billion and $1.8 billion of the totals, are based on information obtained from industry sources regarding the number of ships that would be entered into the program. (We expect a minimum of about 40 and a maximum of close to 90.) For bulk vessels, including tankers, CBO has assumed that all ships currently receiving operating differential subsidies would join the program once their existing contracts expire; for the maximum case, we have assumed that all ships now chartered by MSC would also participate. We estimate that payments to bulk carriers, which account for between $0.2 billion and $0.3 billion of the total, would be only about 40 percent of the maximum amounts authorized because most of these carriers probably would be carrying U.S. government cargoes for more than one-half of the year and would therefore be ineligible for the entire $2.1 million annual payment.

Series Transition Payments: In order to comply with the provisions of the MSF program that would require all subsidized ships to be replaced after they reach 25 years of age, we expect that carriers would have to purchase about 10 vessels from U.S. shipyards over the life of the series transition program. Based on current cost differentials and assuming appropriation of the necessary sums, CBO estimates that it would cost the federal government between $150 million and $200 million to subsidize the construction of ten tankers. For the purpose of this estimate, we have assumed that carriers would seek to purchase newly built vessels for the MSF program and that DOT would issue a determination that participating shipyards would be able to produce competitively priced vessels of the same type after constructing the subsidized vessels.

The series transition program could be used to subsidize construction of other vessels for sale to foreign-flag or U.S.-flag carriers serving foreign markets. CBO anticipates little additional activity, however, because, even with the government subsidy, U.S. shipyards would have difficulty attracting foreign buyers, who account for most of the shipbuilding demand.

Other provisions of the bill would not affect federal spending.

6. Pay-as-you-go considerations: Section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 sets up pay-as-

you-go procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or receipts through 1998. CBO estimates that enactment of H.R. 2151 would not affect direct spending or receipts. Therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply to the bill.

7. Estimated cost to State and local governments: None.

8. Estimate comparison: None.

9. Previous CBO estimate : None.

10. Estimate prepared by: Deborah Reis.

11. Estimate approved by: C.G. Nuckols, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLIE MAINS

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Charlie Mains was a very special person, one of God's noblemen.

He was a man with few words, always well chosen to produce wonderful wisdom often laced with scintillating humor.

At his funeral, his son, Tim, told a refreshing story. Charlie Mains had suggested that the son make a speech before an audience and the son was intimidated at such a maiden effort. Tim Mains told his father that if he went before that audience he might fall down. His father's reply: "It's not about falling down; it is about getting back up."

In losing Charles H. Mains, the world has lost far too much:

CHARLES MAINS WAS ATTORNEY

Charles H. Mains, 77, an Indianapolis attorney, died Monday at his home.

Mr. Mains was an attorney for 43 years and had been chief attorney for the Veterans Administration 21 years, retiring in 1984.

He was an Army veteran of World War II and was awarded a Purple Heart.

Mr. Mains was a member of Clermont Christian Church and Clermont Lions Club and was a past district governor of Lions District 25-f.

He also was a member of Bridgeport Masonic Lodge, Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 1120 and American Legion Post 64 and was a trustee of Lions Camp Woodsmoke and a Wayne Township Democratic ward chairman.

He was a graduate of the Indiana University Law School.

Memorial contributions may be made to Camp Woodsmoke or Lions Cancer Control Fund.

Services will be at 11:30 a.m. Thursday in Conkie Speedway Funeral Home, with calling from 2 to 9 p.m. Wednesday. Entombment will be in Crown Hill Mausoleum.

Survivors—wife Gwen Johnston Mains; sons Steve, Tim Mains; daughters Laura Canavesi, Roxie McNelly; brothers Earl, Donald Mains; five grandchildren.

CHARLES MAINS HAD BEEN TOP ATTORNEY FOR THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION HERE

Services for Charles H. Mains, 77, Indianapolis, former chief attorney of the Veterans Administration in Indiana, will be at 11:30 a.m. Thursday in Conkie Funeral Home, Speedway Chapel, with calling from 2 p.m. to 9 p.m. today.

He died Monday.

Mr. Mains, a 1950 graduate of Indiana University School of Law, was chief attorney for the VA for 21 years, retiring in 1984.

He was a member of Clermont Christian Church. He formerly was a Wayne Township Democratic ward chairman. Mr. Mains was a 32nd degree Mason.

He was a member of Clermont Lions Club, past district governor of Lions District 25-F and trustee of Lions Camp Woodsmoke. While district governor in 1974, Mr. Mains coordinated the Marion Country Lions Clubs' participation in The Indianapolis Star's new Computerized Election Bureau.

He was an Army veteran of World War II and received a Purple Heart.

Memorial contributions may be made to Lions Camp Woodsmoke or Lions Cancer Control Fund.

Survivors: wife, Gwen Johnston Mains; sons, Steve and Tim Mains; daughters, Laura Canavesi and Roxi McNelly; brothers, Earl and Donald Mains; five grandchildren.

TRIBUTE TO CHARITY WEBB

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a truly special individual who has contributed significantly to California's educational system. Charity Webb has served over the past year as president of the California School Boards Association [CSBA] and is concluding her term in December. During her tenure as president, Ms. Webb encouraged thoughtful debate and innovative approaches to dealing with the challenges faced by California's educational community. Her outstanding leadership helped achieve a better system of education for California.

Ms. Webb received her bachelor's degree in secondary education at the University of Arkansas. In 1985, she completed the School Board Members and Superintendent's Training Program at the University of Santa Clara.

Ms. Webb's dedication to improving the quality and efficiency of public education has spanned more than 20 years. In this time, she has worked as an educational researcher, substitute teacher, high school teacher and active school board member.

Since 1977 she has served on the Berryessa Union School District Board of Trustees, 6 years as president; since 1984 she has served on the Santa Clara County Board of Education Executive Committee; the Early Intervention Committee and the Nominating Committee; and since 1980 she has been active in the CSBA, serving on numerous committees and as an officer at several posts. In addition, she has been active in the California Coalition of Black School Board Members, the National Caucus of Black School Board Members, the National School Board Association and the Advisory Committee on Blacks in Education.

As a community leader, Ms. Webb has worked tirelessly for many organizations, among them Kids Are Special, the United Way Allocation Committee, Black Concerned Parents of Berryessa and the Santa Clara County Democratic Committee.

Her many honors and awards include the Santa Clara Alliance of Black Educators' Award for advancing the education of children, the Berryessa School Trustees' Award in appreciation for outstanding service to the Berryessa District, the California Coalition of Black School Board Members' Award for outstanding service for her work on the annual conference, and the Political Achievement Award given jointly by the California Black Women's Coalition and the Black Concerns Association.

Mr. Speaker, I highly commend Ms. Charity Webb for her many accomplishments and contributions to public education and I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating her on her exceptional leadership as president of the California School Boards Association. I extend my best wishes to Ms. Webb for continued success in all of her future endeavors.

140TH ANNIVERSARY OF PINE STREET BAPTIST CHURCH IN MILFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to my fellow members the 140th anniversary of the Pine Street Baptist Church in Milford, MA.

Many citizens in the Milford area did not want their contributions going to support other churches. As a result, several people of the Baptist community came together to form their own church.

They have been reaching out to the community ever since their founding 140 years ago. Many of the church's 110 active members have gone out and volunteered in the community. One of the places in the community that has benefited from their generosity is the local homeless shelter. Additionally, many church members have served in Baptist missions around the world.

The church was founded in 1853 and soon after that a building was found in Milford that suited their needs perfectly. The property was bought from the Italian club that occupied it at the time. It was then converted into a church. Services are still being held in that original building.

One of the church's programs that has inspired many of the church members has been the Angel Tree Program. Each Christmas, the children of the Sunday School adopt 30 or 40 children of whom one or both of their parents have been incarcerated. The children give them a Christmas. Food and presents are supplied, along with plenty of love and support.

The present pastor, Paul Traverse, brought much to the church when he arrived on their doorstep 5 years ago. The most important thing that he brought, one of the members said, was his seven gifted children, who brought with them their musical abilities and joyous sense of family that they have shared with all. This has enlightened and inspired the church members, and as a result, many inactive members have come back to the fold.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Pine Street Baptist Church as they celebrate their 140th anniversary and wish them continued success in their upcoming years.

TRIBUTE TO AMY BETH BROOKS

HON. ALAN B. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate Ms. Amy Beth Brooks of Morgantown, WV, for her award-winning script in the Veterans of Foreign Wars' voice of democracy contest.

Ms. Brooks' script is titled "My Voice in America's Future." I would like to submit for the record the text of her script, and commend the VFW for making the Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program available to students across our Nation:

MY VOICE IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By Amy Brooks)

In the beginning: sound of one voice. One single voice speaking out, stating a belief, posing a question. Voice provokes thought, thought provokes action . . . another voice joins the first. With a reciprocation of ideas comes newfound power, influencing others to take up this cry, striving for change . . .

From somewhere amid this chorus comes the sound of my own voice . . . faltering at first, uncertain. How difficult, in an age of extremes, to find a true voice in America's future. And yet as I speak, I begin to realize not only the significance of what I say, but also the wonder of my freedom to say it. My inalienable right as an American citizen, that of absolute free speech, opens infinite doors to my impact on the future of our nation. Thus empowered with the potential to make myself be heard, my voice distinguishes itself from countless others, and I contribute my own personal verse with a new clarity and strength of purpose.

Such is the birthright of every American: the chance to express, with impunity, our most profound thoughts and opinions. That regardless of race, sex, or social status, the power of each person's voice is limited only by the extent of his own will and determination.

In theory, this is an illustration of the ideal society. The possibility that one voice could invoke passion and controversy from an entire nation is the first, best example of the values with which our forefathers shaped this government. In theory, that voice is the thread which binds a people governed by a document called the Constitution.

Well, the Constitution of the United States of America was written in 1787. We are currently in the year 1992; and, as an American citizen weaned on these principles of democracy, I now raise my voice in the assertion that as a culture, we must not lose sight of the intent with which our freedoms were established. Being aware of the responsibilities that accompany these freedoms, my words will help ensure a future in which the basic rights guaranteed by the Constitution are reestablished, regardless of how we may see them being violated today.

To apply purist views to the in-between shades of everyday life is no simple task. The fact is, when we attempt to translate our most fundamental laws to accommodate the values of modern society, what is ideal in theory often becomes flawed or inconvenient in practice.

But if democracy has flourished, it has done so because we are, above all else, a people ultimately committed to upholding justice. Our rights to free speech and to open expression of our individual religions . . . the music we listen to, the clothes we wear, the art we view, and the choices we make for our own bodies, are values that we cannot allow to be compromised under any circumstances.

Know that these assertions are not mine alone. More than a personal conviction, this return to our oldest doctrines is a cry taken up by my entire generation. Our determination to improve our country will indeed be the impetus for a peaceful revolution—a democratic battle, in which the soldiers wear blue jeans instead of frock coats, and carry pencils rather than bayonets.

And though the voices of my generation are as yet young, make no mistake: our words carry in them a pitch of real hope which heralds a stronger future for this nation.

Think . . . what a nation we could be. Though America is rich in history beyond its age, 216 years is a very short time span in the development of a civilization.

We have time to work towards a more ideal government. We have the intelligence and creativity to improve our standards of living. And, most importantly, because of democracy, we have the freedom to voice openly our hopes and concerns for the future of America.

So ends my own personal verse. But my voice, once part of that resounding chorus which shapes history, will never die. Find your own voice in democracy, and project it until your words are acknowledged—whether they be strong, soft, the last to join the cry . . . or those, the very first to rise, in the beginning.

GEORGIA IN TURMOIL

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the situation in the newly independent state of Georgia is extremely alarming. Of all the former Soviet republics, Georgia has been the most unstable, violence-ridden, and violence prone. In the past year, thousands have been killed and many more have become refugees in the war with Abkhazia. Georgia's defeat this past weekend, and the fall of the Abkhaz capital, Sukhumi, to Abkhaz forces aided by Russians and North Caucasians, have inaugurated a new stage in the multiple crises that have bedeviled this beautiful country.

Since 1990, inter-ethnic, inter-necine, and inter-state conflicts have wracked Georgia. In 1991–1992, fighting ravaged the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast, which wanted to unite with the North Ossetian Autonomous Oblast across the border in Russia.

Armed hostilities ended there in June 1992, when Russian-brokered ceasefire arrangements created peacekeeping units composed of Russians, Georgians, and Ossetians to keep the combatants apart. But the respite was brief. Only 2 months later, war erupted in Abkhazia, an autonomous republic which had been trying to negotiate a federative relationship with Georgia. It now appears that Georgia has lost Abkhazia, and it remains to be seen whether they will be able to agree on Abkhazia's status or develop normal neighborly relations.

Exacerbating these territorial and ethnic disputes has been an ongoing crisis of legitimacy in Georgia itself. Zviad Gamsakhurdia, a prominent anti-Communist dissident, came to power in October 1990 parliamentary elections. In May 1991, he was elected President by the population with a reported 87 percent of the vote. But Georgia's anti-Communist, proindependence movement was fractured, and Gamsakhurdia had made some determined personal and political enemies who boycotted the October 1990 voting and refused to acknowledge his right to govern. He, for his part referred to them as "criminals, not an opposition."

In fall 1991, the parliamentary opposition began to echo charges by Gamsakhurdia's extra-parliamentary critics. I visited Tbilisi in September 1991 and, after meeting with all sides, became convinced that a confrontation was unavoidable. It came in December 1991, when armed combat broke out between pro- and anti-Gamsakhurdia forces, forcing the President to flee in January 1992.

The military council which came to power repressed Gamsakhurdia's supporters while negotiating with Eduard Shevardnadze, former Communist Party boss of Georgia and Soviet Foreign Minister. He returned to Tbilisi in March 1992, but his efforts to establish control and stability have failed. Gamsakhurdia's backers, who are especially numerous in western Georgia, reject Shevardnadze's legitimacy. And Shevardnadze could not provide for Georgia's inhabitants the primary service of governments: a modicum of law and order. For most of 1992, various armed militias rampaged through the country, engaging in violence against each other and the civilian population, whom they robbed at will.

Georgia's economy has practically collapsed. And throughout this entire period, Georgia has also had to deal with Russian involvement in the country's ethnic territorial disputes. Though Moscow claims to recognize Georgia's territorial integrity and has denied taking sides, there is convincing evidence that Russia provided support to the South Ossetians. Since August 1992, Russian forces have manifestly backed Abkhazia. Russian planes have bombed Georgian-held Sukhumi, and Russian Defense Minister Pavel Grachev visited Abkhazia last summer, where he openly talked about Russia's strategic interests in the region. Surely, these include weakening Georgia so as to induce its reintegration into a Russian orbit, and maintaining control of the Black Sea—for military considerations and because an oil pipeline from Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan may traverse Georgia, terminating on the Black Sea.

Mr. Speaker, it would have been hard enough in the best of post-Soviet circumstances for Georgians, Ossetians, and Abkhaz to work out their differences. But Russian involvement stroked and exacerbated these disputes, making them all but unresolvable by peaceful means. I am deeply concerned about Russia's blatant interference in Georgia, not only because it has aggravated animosities and prolonged bloodshed, but because it signals the willingness of some in Moscow—especially in the Ministry of Defense—to resort to force to reestablish Russian hegemony over the former U.S.S.R.

Today, the situation has become even more complex. Zviad Gamsakhurdia has returned from exile to Georgia, and a full-fledged civil war between his backers and Shevardnadze's may now break out. Hostilities in South Ossetia, where a tenuous ceasefire has been holding, may also again erupt. Meanwhile, hundreds of thousands of refugees—Georgians, Abkhaz, and many others—have nowhere to live and little to eat.

What happens now? Zviad Gamsakhurdia clearly has support in western Georgia, where he is currently ensconced. Eduard Shevardnadze, though his reputation for having useful friends in high places all over the world has been tarnished, remains the most influential Georgian politician in the rest of the country. Perhaps more bloody conflict between these two contending forces is inevitable. But I fervently hope—as does everyone who has visited Georgia and enjoyed the legendary hospitality of its people—that Georgians will stop killing each other. Perhaps an internationally monitored election or a referendum will determine the people's choice of leader.

But whatever happens in Georgia, Russia has no business fishing in these troubled waters. The speech by Russian Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev at the United Nations yesterday, in which he requested not only endorsement but actual funding by international organizations for Russian peacekeeping efforts in the former U.S.S.R., shows what Moscow wants: Russian forces help stir up ethnic territorial disputes, and then appear as peacekeepers, with U.N. sanction and dollars.

Mr. Speaker, Moscow must not think that we are blind to this game or are willing to comply in its execution. Obviously, Russia has interests in the other Republics, but if we ignore the methods it uses to secure them, we will guarantee not merely Russian hegemony, but we will undermine political reform in Russia itself. Russia must pursue its interests in the former Soviet Republics in a civilized manner; if it subverts their sovereignty, it will subvert its own future and our hopes for it.

H.R. 3167, THE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS OF 1993

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rules of the Democratic caucus, I wish to serve notice to my colleagues that I have been instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to seek less than an open rule for the consideration by the House of Representatives of H.R. 3167, the Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM B. BROWNING

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, on this day, September 29, 1993, the southeast Michigan chapter of the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation will be hosting the 10th annual Alexander Macomb Citizen of the Year Award dinner. The award, instituted in 1984, is named after my home county's namesake, Gen. Alexander Macomb, a hero of the War of 1812.

This year, the March of Dimes has chosen William B. Browning as a recipient of the award. Committed to improving the health of America's babies, the March of Dimes in southeast Michigan rightly recognizes Bill for his excellent service and outstanding leadership. As a board member of the Utica Community Schools, Bill has helped make the Utica schools a statewide educational leader. After 19 years on the board, 12 of which he has served as president, Bill certainly deserves much of the credit for Utica's educational success.

Through advocacy, education, and community service, the March of Dimes has established itself as an organization with an impeccable reputation. Being recognized by the March of Dimes is an exceptional honor and I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting Bill Browning as a recipient of the Alexander Macomb Citizen of the Year Award.

MARCH OF DIMES HONOREES

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the 1993 honorees of the March of Dimes Alexander Macomb Citizen of the Year Award. These exceptional volunteers from Macomb County, MI, are being honored for their special contributions to the fight against birth defects.

The 1993 honorees are Christine B. Antoskiewicz and Bill Browning, and the Penna family, who will be presented a Special Family Award. Their exemplary efforts in the name of children bring us closer to a world without birth defects, child abuse, and neglect.

For nearly 20 years, Christine Antoskiewicz has been a voice for the rights of abused children who may not have been able to speak for themselves. She has taken a leading role as an advocate of children's rights in both her professional and private lives. Since 1964, she has worked at the Macomb County Juvenile Court Division, rising to her present position as supervisor of the Community Provisional Release Program with the Macomb County Youth Home. Giving of her own time, Ms. Antoskiewicz has strengthened community support for ShelterCare, an outreach program for abused or neglected children.

William B. Browning has worked to provide quality education for the children of Macomb County for 19 years. As a member, and later the president, of the Utica Community Schools Board of Education, he gained a statewide reputation as a leader who cares deeply about the children in his district. Earlier this year, Sterling Elementary was given his name in recognition of his dedicated service.

The Penna family will receive a Special Family Award which recognizes their efforts as a family to help further the cause of the March of Dimes. The Pennas are well known in Macomb County for their popular family restaurant that bears their name, but their generous aid to the prevention of birth defects and infant mortality is less well known. Their quiet support over the years shows a true commitment to the children of Macomb County.

I offer my warmest congratulations to all of these deserving honorees. I hope that their example of community service inspires others to also give of themselves. Organizations such as the March of Dimes could not complete their much needed work without people like Christine Antoskiewicz, Bill Browning, and the Penna family.

MILITARY RETIREES AMENDMENT

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for an amendment Representative RALPH HALL offered yesterday to the Defense authorization bill.

I support this amendment for all of the military retirees in the Third District of Texas who were, but now are not, eligible to receive prescription drug benefits.

These retirees, ones who gave at least 20 years in our armed services, are currently being denied prescription drug benefits because they live in the wrong ZIP Code.

Last year, the Department of Defense [DOD] instituted a prescription drug demonstration project to help military retirees who were adversely impacted by the closure and realignment of many of our military bases.

However, the way DOD decided who was eligible for this program was ZIP Code. Those whose ZIP Code is within the invisible 40-mile radius around Carswell Air force Base are eligible, those who are not, tough.

I believe that this type demonstration project which only serves a selected few is unfair and wrong. Mr. Hall's amendment will allow every retiree who is eligible for medical benefits to be included in this program. That is only fair.

As we continue to draw down our Defense structure, we must find innovative and creative ways to solve problems which arise because of reductions and base closures. This amendment is one such innovative way.

I would like to commend my colleague from Texas who took the time to draft and introduce this very sensible and necessary reform.

TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN HEALTH FOUNDATION

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, our current health care crisis is largely a consequence of the high cost of treating illness. Statistics document that heart disease, stroke, cancer, and AIDS are the main causes of deaths in our Nation. Research during the past four decades has clearly shown that diseases are largely man-made and therefore preventable.

Much of this knowledge has been provided through the research of a unique organization whose main research center is in my Congressional District. I am referring to the American Health Foundation, whose scientists have greatly contributed to our present knowledge of the causes of manmade chronic disease, and whose mission is to urge the Nation to adopt preventive strategies toward a healthier Nation.

The American Health Foundation is a not-for-profit private health research organization and one of the Nations leading laboratory cancer centers. Since its founding in 1969, the Foundation has been dedicated to working toward the reduction of avoidable chronic disease through preventive medicine. It is internationally known for its basic disease prevention research as well as for its advocacy of comprehensive school health education and minority cancer prevention projects.

Aware of the fact that other steps toward disease prevention can and must be taken, the leaders of the foundation, and its visionary founder, Dr. Ernst L. Wynder, have included research on health promotion in the design of their disease prevention programs. The application of such programs is Dr. Wynder's chief concern.

Next Monday, October 4, has been designated National Child Health Day. It is a day designed to promote awareness that the health of children, our Nation's greatest resource, should be one of our greatest priorities. This year, Child Health Day, sponsored by the American Health Foundation, will establish the importance of education as the key element in preventive medicine.

Mr. Speaker, we are indebted to the American Health Foundation's scientists and leaders for all they have given us in return for our support through cancer prevention and health education grants. We ought to be aware of the potential for even greater collaboration with these experts that hold key knowledge toward finding the solution of our Nation's health problems.

TRIBUTE TO WYNONNA JUDD

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of one of the top country singers in America. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Wynonna Judd.

Ms. Judd was born in 1964 in Ashland, KY. Growing up, she had no television or telephone to entertain her, so she taught herself to play the guitar. She quickly excelled on the instrument and, by the age of 15, joined a musical partnership with her mother Naomi. Four years later, the tandem reached superstardom.

The Judds became the most awarded country act of the 1980's, amassing over two dozen smash hits and 12 million in record sales. In 1991, Naomi retired, but Wynonna continued her success. She debuted as a solo act in 1992 with her album "Wynonna". One year and 3 million sold copies later, Wynonna hit the road to promote her second album "Tell Me Why". The second effort is also enjoying phenomenal popularity, as evidenced by the sellout crowds and ballooning sales totals.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Judd has brought her unique spirit to music and for that we can be grateful. I wish her all the best as her career continues to blossom.

TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY AND THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of China will be celebrating its 82d National Day on October 10, 1993. Taiwan has much to celebrate. Taiwan's economy is strong, and it has achieved remarkable political progress in the last 5 years.

I join Taiwan's friends on the Hill in wishing Taiwan success and progress in Taiwan's bid to rejoin the United Nations. Taiwan withdrew from the United Nations in 1971. However, in the last 22 years, Taiwan has worked very hard to make itself a vital nation in the world, economically and politically. It is now time to invite Taiwan back to the United Nations. It is unfair and wrong to leave the 20.8 million peace loving people living in the Taiwan area unrepresented in the United Nations.

Taiwan Government officials have made it very clear that the issue of the representation of China was not solved in 1971 when mainland China took the seat of the ROC. The facts are that mainland China has never governed the island of Taiwan, and that the people on Taiwan have had no representation in the world body since 1971.

If readmitted to the United Nations, Taiwan would have a great deal to contribute to the world body. Taiwan would enhance the United Nation's prestige and relevance and make the United Nation a genuine representative global forum.

AGNES McCARTNEY HONORED FOR HER WORK TO PROMOTE CARBON COUNTY

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a wonderful lady and a good friend, Agnes McCartney, who after 30 years has retired as the executive director of the Carbon County Tourist Promotion Agency.

She was the first and only executive director of the tourist promotion agency which was created in 1965.

Originally from Wilkes-Barre, Agnes' association with Carbon County actually began when she and her husband, Frank, moved to Lansford from Harrisburg in 1955. Her husband returned to Harrisburg in 1959 to serve as commissioner of the State police until 1963, but Agnes stayed in Lansford and became known as a fixture in her community and in Carbon County through her myriad of activities.

In 1960, Agnes was hired by the Carbon County Planning Commission. Two years later the county commissioners appointed her as temporary executive director. She performed her job so well that she was there for 11 years.

During her time at the helm of the planning commission, Agnes was instrumental in coordinating the construction of the Mauch Chunk Creek Watershed, a multipurpose flood control and recreational facility in Summit Hill and Jim Thorpe. She also was a force in the development of the Mauch Chunk Lake Park which was named "Watershed of the Year" in 1971.

In April 1974, Agnes became deputy director of the Schuylkill-Carbon Agency for Manpower. She worked to place young people in summer jobs and created the county's action committee for human services and Better Neighborhoods, Inc., in an effort to rehabilitate crumbling buildings.

Thoughout her career with the Agency for Manpower, Agnes continued her work with the county's tourist promotion organization. Late in 1981, the agency was dissolved, and Agnes went back to promoting Carbon County full time.

Due to Agnes, Carbon County, and the city of Jim Thorpe, have been put on the map. Jim Thorpe is well known for its history and architecture and has been featured nationally in many publications, including the Washington Post Magazine.

After all her successes, Agnes certainly deserves some time to herself, although we will certainly miss her. Agnes plans to spend time with her five children and their families now that she has retired. However, she has promised to be on call whenever the good folks of Carbon County need her and her priceless advice and experience. Thank you, Agnes, for your work and commitment to Carbon County. We wish you all the best.

ALASKA NATIVE SUBSISTENCE WHALING EXPENSE CHARITABLE TAX DEDUCTION

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a measure that would provide critically needed tax relief to a few Alaskan Native whaling captains who otherwise may not be able to continue their centuries-old tradition of subsistence whaling. In brief, this bill would provide a modest charitable deduction to those Native captains who organize and support traditional whaling hunt activities for their communities.

The Inupiat and Siberian Yupik Eskimos living in the coastal villages of northern and western Alaska have been hunting the bowhead whale for thousands of years. The International Whaling Commission [IWC] has acknowledged that "whaling, more than any other activity, fundamentally underlies the total lifeway of these communities."

Today, under the regulatory eye of the IWC and the U.S. Department of Commerce, these Natives continue a sharply restricted bowhead subsistence hunt out of 10 coastal villages. Local regulation of the hunt is vested in the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission [AEWC] under a cooperative agreement with the Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

The entire Native whaling community participates in the hunt activities. However, Native tradition requires that the whaling captains are financially and otherwise responsible for the actual conduct of the hunt; meaning they must provide the boat, fuel, gear, weapons, ammunition, food, and special clothing for their crews and must store whale meat until used.

Each of the approximately 35 bowhead whales landed by Native communities each year provides thousands of pounds of meat and muktuk—blubber and skin. Native culture dictates that a whaling captain whose crew lands a whale is responsible for feeding the community in which the captain lives. Customarily, the whale is divided and shared by all of the people in the community free of charge.

In recent years, Native whaling captains have been treating their whaling expenses as a deduction against their personal Federal income tax, because they donate the whale meat to their community and because their expenses have skyrocketed due to the increased costs in complying with Federal requirements in outfitting a whaling crew. The IRS has refused to allow these deductions, placing an extreme financial burden on those who usepersonal funds to support their Native communities' traditional activities. Currently five whaling captains have appeals of these disallowances pending before the tax court or the IRS.

The bill I am introducing today would amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the investments made by this relatively small and fixed number of subsistence Native whaling captains are fully deductible as charitable contributions against their personal Federal income tax. Such an amendment should also retroactively resolve the disallowance and assessment cases now pending within the statute of limitations.

The expenses incurred by these whaling captains are for the benefit of the entire Native community. These expenses are vital contributions whose only purposes are to provide food to the community and to perpetuate the aboriginal traditions of the Native subsistence whaling culture.

Each Alaskan Native subsistence whaling captain invests an average of $2,500 to $5,000 in whaling equipment and expenses in a given year. A charitable deduction for these expenses would translate into a maximum revenue impact of approximately $230,000 a year.

Such a charitable deduction is justified on a number of grounds. The donations of material and provisions for the purpose of carrying out subsistence whaling, in effect, are charitable contributions to the Inupiat and Siberian Yupic communities for the purpose of supporting an activity that is of considerable cultural, religious, and subsistence importance to those native people. In expending the amounts claimed, a captain is donating those amounts to the community to carry out these functions.

Similarly, the expenditures can be viewed as donations to the Inupiat Community of the North Slope [ICAS], to the AEWC and to the communities' participating churches. The ICAS is a federally recognized Indian tribe under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 984). Under the Indian Tax Status Act, donations to such an Indian Tribe are tax deductible (28 U.S.C., 7871(a)(1)(A)). The AEWC is a 501(c)(3) organization. Both the ICAS and the AEWC are charged with the preservation of Native Alaskan whaling rights.

It also is important to note the North Slope Borough of Alaska, on its own and through the AEWC, spends approximately $500,000 to $700,000 annually on bowhead whale and other Arctic marine research and programs in support of the United States' efforts at the International Whaling Commission. This is money that otherwise would come from the Federal budget to support the United States representation at the IWC.

Given these facts and the internationally and federally protected status of the Native Alaskan subsistence whale hunt, I believe expenditures for the hunt should be treated as charitable donations under section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code. I ask my fellow Members to join with me in clarifying the Federal Tax Code to make this a reality for these Native whaling captains.

I ask that a copy of the bill be reprinted at the close of these remarks.

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN EXPENSES INCURRED IN SUPPORT OF NATIVE ALASKAN SUBSISTENCE WHALING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to charitable, etc., contributions and gifts) is amended by redesignating subsection (m) as subsection (n) and by inserting after subsection (l) the following new subsection:

"(m) EXPENSES PAID BY CERTAIN WHALING CAPTAINS IN SUPPORT OF NATIVE ALASKAN SUBSISTENCE WHALING.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual who is recognized by the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission as a whaling captain charged with the responsibility of maintaining and carrying out sanctioned whaling activities and who engages in such activities during the taxable year, the amount described in paragraph (2) (to the extent such amount does not exceed $7,500 for the taxable year) shall be treated for purposes of this section as a charitable contribution.

"(2) AMOUNT DESCRIBED.—The amount described in this paragraph is the aggregate of the reasonable and necessary whaling expenses paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year in carrying out sanctioned whaling activities. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'whaling expenses' includes expenses for—

"(A) the acquisition and maintenance of boats, weapons, and gear used in the hunt,

"(B) the supplying of food for the crew and other provisions for carrying out sanctioned whaling activities, and

"(C) Storage and distribution of the catch from such activities.

"(3) SANCTIONED WHALING ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'sanctioned whaling activities' means subsistence bowhead whale hunting activities conducted pursuant to the management plan of the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission."

"(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to all taxable years beginning before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

DINER OWNER TERRY CONWAY AND TRUCK OWNER PAUL COLLINS LEAD RELIEF EFFORT TO FLOODED MIDWEST

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a trailer rig arrived in Davenport, IA, loaded with nearly 25,000 dollars' worth of supplies for Midwest flood victims.

This relief effort was spearheaded by Terry Conway, owner of Tic-Toc Diner in Kingsbury, NY, who for several months has used the truck as a drop-off station for generous people who wanted to help.

Once Conway got the idea, he contacted Paul Collins, the truck's owner. Within 15 minutes Collins arrived with the truck.

Most of the contributions came from good business neighbors like Leland Paper, which donated almost 17,000 dollars' worth of cleaning materials and detergents; Sutherland Pet Center, which donated a large supply of pet food; and Adirondack Janitorial, which supplied plenty of mops and other cleanup materials.

But at least a quarter of the items came from individuals who wanted to lend a helping hand. Cash donations totaled $500. As an incentive, Conway gave out an estimated 3,000 dollars' worth of ice cream cones this summer to contributors.

Mr. Speaker, Americans have always responded whenever anyone anywhere in the

world was suffering. This relief effort was made possible by the efforts of churches, schools, service clubs, and individuals.

But I would like to single out Terry Conway and Paul Collins for their leadership role in this effort. I'd like other Members to join me in saluting these two gentlemen, because this, Mr. Speaker, is America at its best.

BUILDING A STRONG NONPROLIFERATION POLICY

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the President for his leadership in fighting the spread of the bomb. We cannot stop proliferation until we ban all plutonium production. We need restraints from the nuclear weapon states, "no-first-use," and deep cuts in strategic arsenals.

In the post-cold war world these are reasonable and achievable goals. The President deserves credit for his efforts. I am confident that Congress will build a strong policy that will keep the world safe.

TRIBUTE TO IRENE E. DUPONT—NEW HAMPSHIRE PHOTOGRAPHER WHO BROUGHT FRANCESTOWN'S MAIN STREET TO THE NATION'S CAPITAL

HON. DICK SWETT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me today in paying tribute to Mrs. Irene E. DuPont—an outstanding professional photographer and teacher at the Nashua Senior High School for the last 24 years. An excellent exhibit of her photographs—Vistas of New Hampshire—is currently on display for the next 2 weeks in the Rotunda of the Cannon House Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, it is unusual to find such a diversity of talents in a single individual, as we find in Irene DuPont. Mrs. DuPont is an outstanding teacher who motivates and inspires her students. Perhaps she is so successful because of the great value she places on education. She worked and saved her money for 9 years in order to attend college. After graduating from Notre Dame College in Manchester, NH, she began a career in teaching. At the new Nashua Senior High School, she was asked by the principal to learn something about photography because the new building had a dark room.

That was the beginning of her unusually successful career as a high school photography teacher. She took an 8-week course in photography in Manchester, then later completed studies in photography at the Art Institute in Boston where she received a degree. Some 18 years ago, she started with one class daily of 20 students. Because of the interest in the subject and the magic of herteaching, she now devotes full-time to teaching photography—five classes with 120 students daily.

Her teaching was recognized this past year when she was 1 of only 13 teachers in America to receive the National Teacher Award given by Time-Warner Communications in recognition of classroom activity using both photography and cable television programming. It was also Time-Warner Communications whose financial support made it possible for this exhibit of her photographs to be put on display in the Rotunda of the Cannon House Office Building.

But Irene DuPont's excellence in the classroom is only one of the many facets of her professional activity. She is also a professional photographer of great skill and sensitivity. Her work has been exhibited throughout New England as well as on the west coast. Her photographs have been published in magazines, textbooks, and used as covers on a variety of pamphlets. The photographs in the Rotunda of the Cannon House Office Building are only a sampling of the excellence of her art.

Among the excellent photographs are an outstanding series of Francestown, NH. This is a small community in my congressional district whose Main Street exhibits period architecture. The homes and stores and churches along Main Street are all about a century and a half old. Irene DuPont's photographs capture the historic homes and the people who live in them. This series of photographs was done through a grant from the New Hampshire Arts Council, which covered the cost of film and paper for the photographs.

Another outstanding series of photographs are of New Hampshire's covered bridges—a picturesque part of the Granite State's historic heritage. Our State has the largest number of covered bridges per capita and in relation to the area of the State, and Irene DuPont has photographed all of them. Her photographs have been published in the book Spanning Time, New Hampshire Covered Bridges. When Irene DuPont started photographing bridges in 1982, there were 54 bridges, but four have since been burned by arson. Her work is an important historical record documenting our State's unique architectural and transportation legacy. Not only has she recorded these important landmarks, she has increased public interest in covered bridges, and our State now has tougher laws and stiffer penalties for those who burn or attempt to damage our bridges.

Mr. Speaker, Irene DuPont exemplifies the rock solid values that are typical of the people of New Hampshire. She is an inspiring and an inspired teacher, as well as a chronicler of the heritage of the Granite State. I urge my colleagues to examine her fine work in the Rotunda of the Cannon House Office Building and to join me in honoring her for her work.

TAIWAN AND THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. DAN SCHAEFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most prosperous and economically dynamic places in the world is the Republic of China. One of the world's most generous donors of foreign aid is the Republic of China. The Republic of China has a population four times that of Finland.

Despite all these attributes of statehood, the Republic of China does not have any representation in the United Nations. The 21 million people living in the Taiwan area, in fact, have not been represented in the United Nations since 1971. As much as the People's Republic of China claims jurisdiction over Taiwan, the fact is that the PRC does not have any jurisdiction at all. The Government on Taiwan is the Republic of China.

I take pleasure in saluting the Republic of China for its achievements since its founding 82 years ago. The Republic of China's Government has managed to give its people one of the highest living standards in history. With its generous foreign and humanitarian aid programs, the Republic of China is definitely a giver, in every sense of the word.

The entire world community would benefit from the Republic of China's membership in the United Nations. It would only be fair to the 21 million people living in the Taiwan area and to the millions of people around the world whose jobs involve doing business with Taiwan, either directly or indirectly. The Republic of China belongs in the United Nations just as the United Nations needs the Republic of China among its members.

Mr. Speaker, as Taiwan approaches its 82d birthday, I salute its many accomplishments and call on the United Nations to return it to the United Nations.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in observance of Hispanic Heritage Month, a month-long celebration which seeks to increase national awareness of Latino culture. Over the past decade, our Hispanic-American communities have been energized by an enhanced awareness of their cultural vitality and potential for economic and political self-empowerment.

As a Puertorriqueña, I speak with pride of the contributions of my people to the varied fields of culture, entertainment, sports, business, and public service. But instead of discussing the accomplishments of our more popular entertainers and sports heroes, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss the achievements of those figures who do not receive their share of the limelight. These individuals deserve the praise and admiration that their most famous compatriots receive, yet their accomplishments often go unnoticed or are easily forgotten. By paying tribute to these pioneers of our community, we pave the way for young Latinos to follow in their footsteps.

Let me begin by paying tribute to the Puerto Rican soldiers who have lost their lives fighting for the United States of America. As American citizens, hundreds of Puerto Rican men have gone to battle to fight for the United

States. We must all pay homage to the 731 Puerto Rican soldiers who lost their lives in the Korean war, to the 345 Puerto Rican soldiers who lost their lives in Vietnam, and to the four Puerto Rican soldiers who lost their lives in Desert Storm, including Capt. Manuel Rivera, a Puerto Rican from the south Bronx, who was the first soldier to perish in Operation Desert Storm. His courage, strength, and patriotism should always remain vivid in our memory.

In light of the fighting contributions of these soldiers, let me bring to your attention the struggles and battles of a great Puerto Rican woman, Felisa Rincon de Gautier. Doña Felisa as she is popularly known, was among the first women to register to vote in Puerto Rico. She was the first woman in the Western Hemisphere to be elected mayor of a large city in the Americas, San Juan, Puerto Rico. She served as mayor for 22 years, transforming San Juan into one of the greatest capitals of Latin America. Though she is retired from elected office, Doña Felisa continues her public service through a foundation named in her honor. Doña Felisa is a source of great pride to her native Puerto Rico and to Latino women and men all across this hemisphere.

The triumphs of these figures provide select highlights of not only Puerto Rican achievement, but of Latino achievement as a whole. But for every tale of attainment, hundreds remain hidden or untold as Latinos continue to strive outside the spotlight of national awareness. These individuals make up the backbone of our legacy and culture. Their strength and their battle to find their way in American society is an example to us all. For this reason, we celebrate their accomplishments in a month, long celebration of history, community, and heritage.

I urge my colleagues and the American public to take advantage of this month to explore, learn, and better understand our people, our contributions, and our efforts.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION TO COMPENSATE ALEUT VILLAGES FOR CHURCH PROPERTY LOST, DAMAGED, OR DESTROYED DURING WORLD WAR II

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to increase the authorized appropriation level of funding necessary to fully compensate the Aleut people of Alaska for church property lost, damaged, or destroyed during World War II.

Many Americans are aware of the sad chapter in U.S. history during World War II when Japanese-Americans were stripped of their property and interred for the duration of the war. Few Americans, however, are aware that the Aleut people of the Aleutian chain in Alaska were similarly treated, with even more disastrous results. In an effort to remove civilians from the war effort following the Japanese bombing of Dutch Harbor and their capture of Attu and Kiska islands in the summer of 1942, the military evacuated and relocated all of the people of the Aleut villages on the Pribilof Islands and those west of Unimak Island on the Aleutian chain. Displaced to southeast Alaska, the villagers of the islands were housed in whatever structures could be found or slapped together with little or no effect. Under the protection of the military, these Americans were simply forgotten by their Government. Squalid living conditions, inadequate housing and sanitation facilities, and nonexistent medical care combined to exact a devastating toll on the Aleut people who had placed themselves in the hands of a government sworn to protect them.

Upon their return, the survivors found their homes and buildings destroyed, and their Russian Orthodox churchesburned to the ground. Their sacred icons were destroyed, lost or stolen, and some of these dated to the days of Czarist Russia.

While the causes of the destruction of all of the churches remains unknown, it is known that some were destroyed during the United States recapture of Attu and Kiska, and others were simply looted and burned.

In an effort to acknowledge the damage perpetrated upon the Aleuts and partially compensate them for their losses, Congress passed legislation in 1988 which recognized and compensated Japanese-Americans and Aleuts. As a part of act, the Secretary of Interior was directed to determine the real and personal church property damaged and destroyed during actions taken in the Aleutian chain during World War II. Congress authorized $1.4 million for such purposes. The study results are in, and the estimated costs of replacing the property is $4.7 million. This legislation would give congressional recognition of the obligation owed the Aleuts as determined by the Department of Interior study.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot in strong enough terms detail for the Members of this body the human suffering and dislocation which the Aleut people were forced to abide at the hands of their own Government's neglect. The Aleut people are good people, who have endured much at the hands of first the Russians—when Alaska was owned by the Russians—and then the United States Government during World War II. This legislation is not intended to plow old ground through the sensitive fields of the memories of those Aleuts whose lives were changed forever by World War II. The Aleut people, aided by the inner strength of their abiding faith in their God, are not seeking retribution. I do, however, seek that to the extent that we can as a nation make them whole, we endeavor to do so. We will never be able to reproduce their homes, their churches, their icons or their loved ones. But through adoption of this legislation, we can continue to recognize their extraordinary sacrifice during World War II. I ask that the House rapidly consider and report this legislation.

PROGRAMS AND SERVICES FOR OLDER PERSONS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me to congratulate Programs and Services for Older Persons of Southwestern Illinois on its 20th anniversary. In conjunction with Belleville Area College in Belleville, IL, the PSOP, organized by Mr. Gene Verdu, serves some 20,000 elderly people throughout much of southern Illinois. By providing home-delivered meals, transportation services, part-time jobs, medical assistance, and recreational opportunities, Gene Verdu and the PSOP have extended a welcome hand to the elderly of our community and improved many neighboring communities.

I urge my colleagues to help me extend a hearty congratulations to Gene Verdu and the Programs and Services for Older Persons on their 20th anniversary. Their contributions to the elderly and their efforts to improve the quality of life for hundreds of older Americans in southern Illinois, are worthy of our highest praise.

JOBS IN A COMPETITIVE WORLD ECONOMY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, September 29, 1993 into the CONGRESSINAL RECORD:

JOBS IN A COMPETITIVE WORLD ECONOMY

Although the economic recovery from the 1990–91 recession is now more than two years old, Americans continue to worry about their jobs. Trouble companies are eliminating jobs by the tens of thousands, and even profitable companies with booming sales are shedding jobs. Many people wonder whether they will be able to keep or find good jobs in the face of all the changes that seem to be taking place in the economy. I have noticed a steady erosion in the security of average Americans, and that has led to a lot of quiet anxiety. People wonder whether the U.S. economy can deliver jobs with reasonable pay in this competitive world economy.

The U.S. economy is in the midst of a major restructuring. Technological change and international competition are forcing American workers and businesses to be more flexible and adaptable to changing market conditions. In the long run, these changes should be good for the economy—they increase efficiency, raise productivity, and encourage faster growth and a rising standard of living. But they are also disruptive and increase worker uncertainty. We need to pursue policies that will reassure workers that there will be plenty of good jobs available as these changes take place.

TRENDS

The sluggish performance thus far in the 1990s has obscured the fact that the United

States has been the envy of other industrial countries in its ability to generate jobs over the past two decades. Almost 20 million jobs were created in the 1970s and another 18 million were created in the 1980s. Despite our current problems, the number of people with jobs has reached an alltime high in the past few months.

But many worry about the quality of the jobs being generated. One concern is that too many workers looking for full-time permanent jobs with good benefits have had to accept part-time work. Some evidence suggests that employers are reluctant to hire full-time workers because they do not want to pay benefits such as health insurance. And the number of parttime jobs is indeed growing. Yet the percentage of the working-age population with a full-time job is higher than it was in the 1960s and 1970s. So employers are not, on balance, eliminating full-time jobs and replacing them with part-time jobs.

A more serious concern about the quality of jobs we are creating focuses on trends in wages and earnings. Between 1948 and 1973 strong productivity growth led to strong growth in wages and earnings. After adjusting for inflation, the average worker earned about twice as much in 1973 as in 1948. But real wages have basically stagnated since 1973. Many of the new jobs created have been lower-wage jobs, and much of the growth in compensation has been for fringe benefits that do not show up in the paycheck. Family income has grown primarily because more spouses are working more hours, not because wages are rising.

Another serious concern is the widening gap between the wages of workers of different skill levels. The most skilled and best educated workers are in demand in today's international marketplace, while lesser skilled workers have faced increasing competition from workers overseas and from immigrants.

As one person put it to me the other day, "There are just too few good jobs to go around." Our big problem, it seems to me, is creating jobs for the average worker that pay well. It is not much comfort that every advanced industrial nation is wrestling with this same problem and no country has found the formula.

CAUSES AND CURES

Because this country has been growing slowly over a period of years, people press to defend their own security by seeking to discourage imports or to slow down industrial change. Those approaches only make the economy grow more slowly.

The challenge is not so much to save old jobs as it is to produce new ones based on high value work. The principal reason good jobs are threatened is that a highly competitive world economic order is emerging. The forces propelling this new order are likely to persist, making our economic lives tougher. The problem is aggravated by the fact that too many workers lack the skills employers are looking for to compete in this new order and too few employers are investing as much as they should in improving their employees' skills and training. Another factor is technology. Although it enhances productivity in the long-run, it can be threatening to some workers.

There is a better response, but it will require a lot of stamina. We simply have to make a broad range of investments in our workers' skills to increase productivity, and we need to rein in government budgets to increase savings and investment. Although not glamorous or easy, these are the right things to do.

Productivity-enhancing investment: In the long run, the key to better jobs and better wages is stronger productivity performance. This, in turn, requires an investment strategy aimed at producing more investment in machines and factories, and more research and development into new and better ways of doing things. One of the most important steps is better education and training: a good basic education for everyone, affordable college, school-to-work apprenticeships for young people, and lifetime learning in the workplace. The Clinton administration is considering many of these ideas as it develops a "workforce strategy" designed to ease the transition of Americans from the old economic order to the new. We also need further deficit reduction to encourage more private investment.

Jobless assistance: A range of policies that are good for longer-term growth and job creation could hurt some jobs in the short-run, including deficit reduction, trade liberalization, defense conversion, technological development, and health care reform. We need to carefully examine our policies toward dislocated workers. In some cases cash adjustment assistance may be appropriate. But the primary emphasis should be on providing the training and assistance needed to give less-skilled Americans a real shot at a decent job.

Short-term stimulus: If the recovery continues to be sluggish, we will be tempted to revisit the question of short-term fiscal stimulus—tax cuts or increased government spending. I continue to believe that the primary responsibility for nurturing the recovery rests with the Federal Reserve, which should keep down interest rates. The major objective of fiscal policy at this time should be lower deficits.

CONCLUSION

Most of the task of providing good jobs for American workers rests with the private sector. But government has a role to play in creating a general economic policy environment conducive to noninflationary growth. And we need to examine what government can do to encourage more training and retraining—helping citizens equip themselves to prosper in a world constantly being transformed.

TRIBUTE TO WILMER (WILLIE) SCHAEFF

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize the induction of a fine individual into the State of Michigan Polka Music Hall of Fame. The contributions he made to music in Michigan will not be forgotten.

Mr. Wilmer Schaeff, known as Willie to his friends, was born in Saginaw, MI, on June 5, 1934. The third of seven children in his family, Willie's musical career started when his parents bought an accordion for his oldest brother. At the age of 15 he started playing publicly with various bands, eventually studying music at Delta College. In 1972 he formed his own band called the Music Chef's.

Throughout this time he spread joy to all the people who listened to his expertise. Whether it be at local clubs, halls, or taverns there was always a large crowd on hand to hear and feel his music. They truly enjoyed all that Willie gave them.

On March 23, 1957, Willie married Marie Herbin. It was because of Marie that Willie decided to learn how to play the plectrum banjo. He quickly taught himself and soon was entertaining at various events. They were the parents of four children, three girls and a boy.

Willie served in the Army for 2 years, is a 31-year member of the Pattern Makers League and also belonged to the Saginaw Musical Association. In 1991 he retired from the Advanced Development Laboratory, central foundry, General Motors.

Willie has recorded albums with Frank Feil, Andy Nester, and John Stanulis. He has also played with many great band leaders from around mid-Michigan and across the State.

Willie Schaeff has truly dedicated his life to music and all the joys it could bring. Mr. Speaker, I know that you will join with me in commending this outstanding individual for the service he provides to music enthusiasts everywhere.

CENTENNIAL OF THE BOROUGH OF NORWOOD

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to congratulate the Borough of Norwood as the community celebrates its centennial on October 2, 1993.

Norwood is a community rich in history. In 1893, a group of freeholders petitioned the court of the county of Delaware for application for a charter on behalf of the town of Norwood which was part of Ridley Township. The court allowed the incorporation of Norwood as a borough and also set up the first election of officers on November 6, 1893.

A newly incorporated borough, rich with natural resources and vast acreage, Norwood continued to prosper and major development began following our Nation's First World War.

Today, with a population of 6,000, Norwood Borough is a thriving municipality in Delaware County. It has a thriving business district, and a beautiful waterfront area.

As the Member of Congress representing Norwood, I want to call this momentous occasion to the attention of my colleagues, and urge them to join me in honoring Norwood Borough. Norwood is a fine community in which to live, with hard-working, patriotic people, many of whose families have lived in the area for generations. Any Member of Congress would be proud to represent this outstanding community, and I am pleased to offer my best wishes for another 100 years of continued success.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 134

HON. WILLIAM P. BAKER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, before we can bring about change in our Government, Congress must change the way it does business.

For the sake of reform, there may come a way for the many to bypass the powerful few. For the past 61 years, the discharge petition process has been kept secret. This means a House Member's constituents may never know how he really feels about a specific issue.

Let me provide an actual example: This year, only 70 out of 435 Members signed the discharge petition to force a vote on term limits. Yet 92 Members actually cosponsored the bill. Secret discharge petitions allow Members of Congress to get away with saying one thing in their districts and doing another in Washington.

Currently, when a Member of Congress claims he supports a certain bill, there is no way of knowing whether or not he signed the discharge petition to force a vote on the bill. Because the discharge petition is secret, a Congressman is able to doubletalk his constituents.

Congressional leadership and committee chairmen oppose the discharge petition because they stand to lose much of their power. When the chairman of a committee opposes a particular bill, he has the power to single-handedly kill it by never moving the proposal forward.

Today, we will vote on the discharge petition circulated by Congressman JIM INHOFE of Oklahoma. This successful petition forced a vote on whether all future discharge petitions would become part of the public record. In other words, no more secrets.

This summer, the American people let Congress know how they felt through letters, phone calls, and radio call-in shows. Several Democrats, fearing the wrath of voters more than that of their party leadership, signed the petition.

In the end, all but two Republicans signed this successful petition along with a handful of Democrats. It is significant to note that 30 of the first 36 to sign the discharge petition were Republican freshmen. We were elected on a wave of change and we have not backed down from our commitment to reforming Congress.

It's only the career Members of Congress who fear an educated electorate. They fear that the voters will continue to demand real reform in Washington, and they know that cannot stall indefinitely. Only constant pressure from the voters, and those in Congress genuinely interested in reform, will bring about true change.

MICHEL CALLS FOR ACTION THIS YEAR ON HEALTH CARE REFORM

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, our House Republican leader, BOB MICHEL, today in a speech before the American Medical Association, outlined a course of action for health care reform which deserves the attention of all our colleagues.

In the speech, he urges that we move ahead this year with seven key health care reforms that are common to both the President's proposal and our Republican proposal, and that if we do so we will bring the benefits of these reforms to the American people at a much earlier date than otherwise would be the case.

Because this makes eminent sense, I am inserting the text of the speech at this point in the RECORD:

Standing before you this afternoon, I know there is one great over-riding question on your minds. It is a question that every American is obsessed with this week, the most important question now before the nation: Will the Atlanta Braves or the San Francisco Giants win the National league West pennant race? Since I root for the Chicago Cubs, I am ill-equipped to answer such a profound question. So, instead, I'll get right to the subject of the day, health care reform.

Today and tomorrow you will be deluged by speeches and reports and panel discussions. So let me get quickly to what House Republicans believe are the major points about this health care debate. First, there was much that was good and much that was new in the President's health care speech. But what was good was not necessarily new—and what was new was not necessarily good.

In a few minutes I'd like to outline what we think is good and why we think we can begin action now on those agreed-upon points—not next year, but immediately. You should know that we House Republicans do have a health care plan of our own. It meets all the goals of any sensible reform: it is compassionate, it is affordable, it is workable and it can be implemented—much of it immediately—without ruining a system that needs reform, not total dismantling. I've frequently been asked if Republicans will compromise or will we confront the President on health care reform? My answer to that question is: that's up to the President and his Democratic leadership in the Congress.

If they show a willingness to really sit down and get things done on a bipartisan basis, we are ready to work at the same table. In fact we are already at the table and I'd like to take the President and First Lady at their word when they say they want to work with us. But if they simply want us to become props when it comes time for an Oval Office signing ceremony, or if they want us to sign on to a plan we know is flawed, just for the sake of appearing bipartisan, then they will choose the path of confrontation.

Let me briefly outline for you how we Republicans have come to where we are. We in the House have worked independently of our counterparts in the Senate. We've been checking in with them from time to time and Senator Chafee's proposal seems to have the broadest support to date among Senate Republicans although Senator Gramm and others have differing views. In the House we Republicans have spent well over two years looking at this problem from every conceivable angle. I co-chaired our Task Force with Newt Gingrich who you are going to hear from tomorrow. The further we got into the subject the more we realized how difficult it was going to be to put the pieces together and how costly it will be to go all the way in one fell swoop.

I never criticized the Administration for the delays when they were deliberating for an extended period of time because it indicated to me they too were finding it much more difficult and complex to match reality with those grandiose campaign speeches and promises. To make a long story short, we House Republicans have come up with our bill that we call the Affordable Health Care Now Act, introduced just 2 weeks ago with 116 co-sponsors. No other plan on either side of the House has as many co-sponsors and that would of course include the Cooper and McDermott proposals from the Democratic side.

Now let me try to put this issue in some legislative context:

We've been burned on attempts at health care reform before. I was here when we enacted Medicare and Medicaid and those cost projections then were only a fraction of what they are in reality today. And you all remember our effort at crafting Catastrophic Health Care legislation during the Reagan Administration. It is a cautionary tale. I was a lead sponsor of the proposal, and to begin with, all we asked for was a measly $4.00 a month increase in Medicare premiums to pay for catastrophic coverage. But by the time the plan made its way through Congress, it became overloaded with prescription drugs, etc., so much so that we had to enact a tax on a tax to pay for it and within a year, we were humiliatingly forced to repeal it. So we learned a lesson: all our good intentions went down the tube because the Congress got too benevolent and the senior citizens rebelled at what they were going to have to pay for the coverage.

Let me now turn to the President's plan: The President's speech on Wednesday was many things. It was highly emotional in tone. It was filled with touching, if at times not quite relevant, anecdotes. Above all it was permeated with that combination of fervent idealism and lack of specific detail that marked the President's earlier effort when he told us of his plans for the budget. But there was one thing missing in that eloquent speech last Wednesday: The right questions. The tough questions. The necessary questions. They were conspicuous by their absence.

As you could see last Wednesday night, Congress is very good at quickly rising to its feet and cheering when the TV cameras are there. But what this debate demands is our capacity to stay in our seats and think—and then ask the pertinent questions. The essence of democratic government, especially in crafting legislation, is asking the right questions, asking them at the right time, and not taking rhetoric or equivocations for an answer. That is what we are expecting of all our Republican members of those committees that will be considering the various parts of the President's proposal. And bear in mind, we don't yet have the specific legislative language and probably won't for another couple of weeks.

Last week, we in the Republican Conference heard from Vice President Gore about how bad bureaucracy is and how necessary it was to re-invent government to escape bureaucracy. But last Wednesday,

President Clinton was telling us that a key to his health care reform plan was the creation of a new government bureaucracy, those state "alliances", plus a National Health Board. In fact, the Administration has admitted that federal administrative costs alone for this plan will amount to over $2 billion a year. That translates into upwards of 50,000 additional bureaucrats to meddle into our health care, and those must be the new jobs the President said would be created by his plan.

If government bureaucracy is wrong, and needs "re-invention", why invent a new one to impose on doctors and patients? And speaking of questions, have you noticed that the administration's propaganda machine, which blasts out at high decibels on the President's plan, turns down the volume to a whisper when it comes to discussing Tort Reform and Malpractice Reform? At this point, you might have a question of your own and it probably is: O.K., Bob, we know there is a lot wrong with the plan the President presented—but what do you Republicans plan to do about it?

My answer is this: We will urge the President and the Majority Leadership in the Congress to begin immediate action on seven key health care reforms, which are common to the Clinton proposal and the House and Senate Republican plans. Let's begin now. Let's get action now. Let's address the concerns of those people whose horror stories the President spoke of so eloquently—and let's do it now.

And here are those areas for immediate action:

1. Administrative Reforms.—The President says that billions can be saved by moving to a standard claims form and electronic billing. We agree, and we have included such reforms in our proposal. I am sure all of you would readily concur on the need for reduced paperwork. The sooner we move legislation in this regard, the sooner the actual implementation takes place. So, there is no reason for delay.

2. Malpractice Reform—You all know the cost of malpractice insurance and the tendency to practice defensive medicine when the threat of being sued is constantly hanging over your heads. We have a strong malpractice reform section in our bill. President Clinton supports malpractice reform. Billions can be saved by such reforms. They can move ahead independently of any other health care change. Let's do it.

3. Anti-Trust Reform—Reforming our anti-trust laws to allow greater cooperation among providers, such as the sharing of equipment and facilities, will go a long way to improving the efficiency of our health care system. The Administration, to its credit, recently announced some administrative changes in this regard, but to really do the job, we need legislative action. The President believes in this, we believe in it, so let's act now.

4. Anti-Fraud Reform—There are numerous estimates of what fraud is costing our health care system, but whatever it is we must move ahead expeditiously to root it out. We have a strong anti-fraud section in our bill, and the President specifically spoke to that point in his speech. So this is another area where early action is called for.

5. Medical Reform—There is widespread agreement that the states need more flexibility in administering the Medicaid program, so that they can try out more efficient ways to both reduce costs and cover more people. In fact, in our proposal, we allow the states to enroll the patients in private insurance plans should they prove more effective and we also permit the states to allow uninsured individuals to buy-in to the Medicaid program, as a means of moving toward universal coverage. The states are crying out for more Medicaid flexibility, so there is no good reason not to move ahead now to give it to them. As for Medicare, with all the complaints we hear at our district offices, would you believe the President said, he doesn't want to touch it apparently because it's working so well. We think he just doesn't want to rile up the senior citizen lobby.

6. 100% Deduction for the Self-Employed—We feel it's only fair that the self-employed receive the same tax treatment for the cost of their insurance premiums that is accorded all other employers. This is particularly important to our nation's farmers, who have a difficult time as it is in making ends meet. The President supports this change, it is in our bill, and many Democrats are sponsoring legislation to this end. So there is every reason to include this as part of our package of early reforms.

And finally:

7. Insurance Reform.—There is almost uniform agreement, even in the insurance business itself to a great degree, that individuals changing jobs should not lose their insurance coverage, and that individuals with serious illness are neither denied coverage nor have imposed on them unaffordable premium increases.

These changes go hand-in-hand with the need to insure the availability of affordable group policies to small employers. Last year the Senate twice passed the Bentsen proposal to undertake such reforms. We have these reforms in our proposal. The President supports them. So there is no reason why we should further delay action. These seven reforms are commonsense changes supported by Republicans and Democrats, including the President.

By moving ahead with these reforms now, we speed up the implementation process, and allow the American people to experience the benefits of health care reform at a much earlier date. I call upon the President and the Democratic Leaders in Congress to sit down with us to map out a process for Congressional action on these reforms as soon as possible. We on the Republican side are ready and willing to meet at any time. In conclusion, let me just say: When administration spokesmen and key Democrats come before you and play the violins sweetly, just remember two things:

(1) The President's Health Plan isn't the only game in town—but it will be if critics of his plan don't get organized and

(2) the President's Plan has a long, torturous road ahead of it. There is much that can be done to emerge from this process with a good health plan, and part of it can be implemented quickly.

Along that road, the President is going to have to look us all in the eye and answer some tough questions, those questions that were not answered in his speech. We look forward to working with you, in the A.M.A., to keep what is best in a good system and reform those things which have failed us or are in need of improvement. And remember: keep on asking those questions.

THE RECREATIONAL BOATING SAFETY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1993

HON. W.J. (BILLY) TAUZIN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce H.R. 3168, a bill to improve recreational boating safety. This bill is the result of a concerted effort my many organizations involved in boating safety to recommend improved Federal laws and funding. I want to thank the Coast Guard, National Transportation Safety Board, National Association of State Boating Law Administrators, Boat Owners Association of the United States, and National Marine Manufacturers Association for all of their help in developing this legislation. I want to particularly praise our state boating law administrators who are on the front lines protecting so many of us who enjoy recreation on our Nation's waters. H.R. 3168 will create a Federal requirement for the mandatory wearing of lifejackets for children, encourage States to adopt important boating-while-intoxicated laws, limit the spending of Federal boating safety funds for construction of public access sites, and require boating safety violators to take a boating safety course.

First, H.R. 3168 establishes a Federal requirement for children 12 years of age and under to wear personal flotation devices on recreational vessels under 26 feet on an open deck. Boating is an inherently dangerous activity even for experienced, qualified, and mature individuals. Children who are often less skilled, physically and emotionally immature, and generally unable to care for themselves require protection. In July 1993 a boating accident occurred in Arkansas which tragically illustrated the problem. Five of the seven victimswere children ranging in age from 18 months to 10 years; none of whom were wearing lifejackets. A lifejacket could have saved these innocent lives.

Second, H.R. 3168 caps the amount of Boat Safety Account funds that a State can use for the construction of public boat ramps and piers at 25 percent. All of the States, with the exception of four, use other funding sources other than the boat safety account to construct public access sites. Since States currently receive and are required to spend a certain percentage of funds from the sport fish restoration account for such purposes, the limited funding available for boating safety should be directed primarily towards other important and unfunded boating safety programs such as law enforcement, training, and education. The use of more than 25 percent of Federal boating safety funds for building access facilities takes away from the use of those funds for boating safety purposes.

Third, H.R. 3168 encourages States to adopt boating-while-intoxicated [BWI] laws beginning in fiscal year 1998 by providing incentive funding to those States with adequate BWI laws. In 1998, the State boating safety program will receive an additional $10 million of new funding from the Clean Vessel Act of 1992. As introduced, the $10 million would be divided into two pools. The first $5 million

would be available to States that have either a blood alcohol concentration standard of .10 or less, or have a behavioral standard for evidence of intoxication. The second $5 million would be distributed to States that have an implied consent law.

Finally, H.R. 3168 provides Coast Guard hearing officers with the authority to require boating safety courses in lieu of or in addition to a civil penalty where a person has been found to be in violation of a Federal boating safety law. The Secretary will be given the responsibility to develop regulations that identify a qualified boating safety course, such as Coast Guard Auxiliary, Power Squadron, Red Cross, et cetera.

H.R. 3168 will greatly improve the ability of States and the Coast Guard to protect the safety of thousands of Americans who enjoy boating on our Nation's waterways. I am a strong supporter of all those involved in boating safety at all levels. Passage of H.R. 3168 will save countless children's lives, take drunk boaters off the water, and educate those who violate our boating safety laws.

H.R. 3043, THE INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL LAND RECYCLING ACT

HON. THOMAS J. RIDGE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, at the turn of the century, Pennsylvania, a leader in the industrial revolution, was producing 60 percent of the Nation's steel. The Commonwealth's steel industry furnished the rails for the Nation's railway empire, the structural steel for our modern cities, and the armament for our national defense. Pennsylvania was also a leader in electrical equipment manufacturing, and the extractive industries of lumber, petroleum, natural gas, and coal. Although most of these booming industries no longer exist, scars created from them remain.

Today, tragically, many of these industrial sites, once production hotbeds that fueled the economies of Pennsylvania and the Nation, are polluted and abandoned. We as a nation can no longer afford to ignore these urban plights and leave them for dead. Revitalizing these sites, as well as more recently abandoned sites, in conjunction with addressing our emerging economic needs, can and should become a priority.

Industrial contamination that remains today resulted from what we now know are improper waste-handling practices that were entirely legal at the time. Unfortunately, these old sites are looked upon as sad reminders of industrial decline and of exhausted resources. This should no longer be the case. The majority of these sites are not beyond reuse or dangerously contaminated. Instead of looking at them as hopeless for new applications, we should be looking at abandoned and polluted sites with economic development possibilities in mind.

While the potential certainly exists, recycling and reusing abandoned sites for entirely new purposes will not occur until the stumbling blocks that hamper development are removed.

Two major policies often block effective reuse of old industrial sites. First, in States like Pennsylvania, new property owners are automatically held responsible for cleaning up all past pollution on a site even when they had nothing to do with the polluting. And, second, the majority of existing cleanup standards are not based on the actual risk contaminants pose to public health or the environment, but on a policy which automatically assumes every site must be cleaned up to a pristine condition.

The result has been cleanup policies that have had the unintended consequence of preventing the reuse of existing industrial sites because few companies are willing to buy a previously developed site only to be forced to clean up the waste that someone else has intentionally or unintentionally left behind.

Throughout our Nation, economic development agencies, financial institutions, and private companies avoid using existing industrial sites and build on natural and recreation areas, prime farmland, and open space out of fear of being held responsible for cleaning up pollution they did not cause. If this trend continues, virgin land throughout our Nation will be lost to development while polluted and abandoned industrial sites will remain stagnant. In these difficult economic times, parties interested in developing any abandoned site should be encouraged, not discouraged to do so.

In an effort to encourage interested yet cautious parties to undertake such efforts, I have introduced the Industrial and Commercial Land Recycling Act. My legislation, H.R. 3043, uses a commonsense approach in a manner that effectively addresses the problems associated with recycling industrial and commercial sites.

More specifically, H.R. 3043 reverses the growing practice of using new land as opposed to reusing old land through five main objectives.

My legislation: Encourages innocent landowners and responsible companies to voluntarily clean up sites so tax dollars do not have to be spent on cleanups and costly enforcement actions do not have to be taken; provides guidelines to develop and implement cleanup plans which reduce and eliminate real risks to public health and the environment; limits the cleanup liability of innocent public agencies, financial institutions, and other parties where cleanup plans have been approved and completed; requires guarantees that new jobs will be created or jobs retained on industrial sites where cleanup plans have been completed; and helps to ensure that professionals involved in creating cleanup plans are competent.

Under my legislation, for example, innocent landowners who had no responsibility for contamination on an industrial property, or responsible owners who voluntarily come forward before an enforcement action is taken by the Federal Government, can submit cleanup plans to the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] to recycle or reuse the property for commercial or industrial purposes. A cleanup plan would detail any pollution on the site and the risk it poses to public health and the environment, taking into account the future use of the property.

The plan would also describe any cleanup measures needed to reduce or eliminate the exposure of the public or the environment to contaminants that cause them harm. After undergoing public review, the plan would then be approved or disapproved by EPA. A property owner would then be able to move forward and implement an approved plan.

When EPA certifies the cleanup plan is completed, the property owner must post a cleanup guarantee fee to be held by EPA for 2 years to make sure the cleanup has been done properly. The property owner must also guarantee to retain or create a specific number of jobs over the next 5 years.

In addition the property owner, a financial institution investing in the property, and tenants, are relieved from further liability for pollution identified in the cleanup plan once the EPA-approved plan is fully implemented. A property owner would forfeit cleanup liability protection, however, if it was obtained under fraudulent conditions or if employment guarantees were not fulfilled.

With no distinction between the procedures for cleaning up abandoned industrial sites which may have relatively low concentrations of contaminants and contamination, present environmental laws and policies only serve as stumbling blocks to effectively reusing these sites. What is needed is an initiative designed to encourage the private cleanup of industrial sites. My legislation does just that. H.R. 3043 strives to clean up abandoned industrial sites to a level that is safe for its intended reuse, protect open space and farmland from unnecessary development, while retaining or creating jobs.

REMARKS BY DR. PAUL BERG

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues some remarks made by Dr. Paul Berg, Willson Professor of Biochemistry and director of the Beckman Center for Molecular and Genetic Medicine at Stanford University School of Medicine, before the congressional biomedical research caucus on Monday, June 28, 1993.

The text of Dr. Berg's remarks follows:

REMARKS BY DR. PAUL BERG

My name is Paul Berg, and I am presently Willson Professor of Biochemistry and Director of the Beckman Center for Molecular and Genetic Medicine at Stanford University School of Medicine.

My research over the past 40 years would, by most acceptable definitions, be classed as basic in that it focused initially on cellular mechanisms of metabolism and growth, and then veered into molecular biology and genetic chemistry for the majority of my research career. I consider myself fortunate to have been an early participant in the science that led to what is now referred to as the "Genetic Revolution." I have been, and continue to be, a forceful advocate for strong Federal support of basic research and for science education. Both are essential if we are to maintain our scientific leadership in the world. I have also been active in trying to promote applications of basic science discoveries to more applied purposes, specifically more rapid applications in medicine.

Towards that end the Beckman Center of which I am director aims to develop closer intellectual and working ties between basic and clinical scientists. I also serve as scientific consultant to two biotechnology research companies near Stanford, one being concerned with new drug discovery and the other with developing tools for improved detection of genetic disease.

My comments today will focus on some of the challenges that need to be met in order to develop more effective interactions between the largely Federally funded research carried out in university laboratories and the commercial sector whose focus is to convert such research findings into societally valuable products, at a profit. Let me begin by reflecting on the roots of one of today's triumphs: biotechnology.

Fifty years is a relatively short span in the history of medicine. But it was during this period, beginning at the start of World War II, that much of our understanding of the underlying mechanisms of human disease was acquired. The events that occurred during this period are unmatched by any earlier period in biology or medicine. Moreover, there has been an astonishing increase in our capacity to investigate problems that had previously seemed either unapproachable, or too profound, or even beyond the reach of science. Cell biology, genetics, biochemistry, and its offspring, molecular biology, have been the driving forces in revealing the unity and wonders of life's molecules and processes.

But a new kind of biomedical science has emerged that will lead the way to major advances in our understanding of complex biological systems, particularly of man, and in the process create new opportunities for the management of human disease. In this new kind of biomedical science, old disciplines are being transformed and merged to become hybrid sciences, enriching each other with their techniques, instruments, and most importantly by their ways of thinking about biological systems. The former barriers between disciplines and departments in our universities and research institutes are disappearing largely because solving problems of mounting complexity requires diverse ideas, skills and approaches. Many young investigators have been quick to recognize this restructuring and the intellectual opportunities it provides.

Moreover, the boundaries that traditionally separated basic and applied research have become more porous. As a consequence, basic research is a step away from practical applications. This fact, and the promise that current research in molecular biology holds for developments in medicine, agriculture and industry have created what we now refer to as the biotechnology industry.

I define biotechnology as the application of biological concepts, organisms and materials to industrial, agricultural and medical processes.

Even now, with biotechnology still in its embryonic state, a recent report from Ernst and Young documents product sales in excess of $6 billion, and modest projections indicate that the biotechnology industry may generate 10–15 times that amount of sales volume by the turn of the century. These projections take account of major products that are in the final stages of development, trial and regulatory review. In the U.S., there are presently 1200 biotechnology companies employing about 80,000 people. At the present rate of growth, it is estimated that there could be twice that number of biotechnology companies and, therefore, they could be one of the leading generators of entrepreneurial initiatives and new jobs during the next few decades. Some have gone so far as to tout biotechnology as the next industrial revolution.

What spawned biotechnology? There is no debate about its origins: it was a consequence of extraordinary developments in biochemistry, genetics and cell biology during the 25 years following World War II. Key discoveries emanating from the leading research universities and institutes in the U.S., as well as abroad, laid the foundations for the crucial breakthroughs that gave birth to genetic engineering, the key element of biotechnology.

In virtually every instance, the research leading to the critical discoveries was funded by the respective governments for the purpose of understanding basic life processes. Rarely was the funding motivated by an expectation of practical application. Nobody engaged in the work could have predicted how it would turn out or where it would lead, nor could they predict the benefits today; it was sufficient that the research was engrossing, fascinating and filled with surprises. As it turned out, serendipity and odd luck turned up a trick that made it possible to modify the genetic makeup of organisms ranging from viruses and bacteria to plants and animals in precise and predetermined ways.

This capability has changed the way we study life processes and enabled us to alter a variety of organisms to serve our needs. Thus, it is possible to convert bacteria, yeast and even mammalian cells into veritable factories for the production of precious therapeutic agents: for example, TPA for dissolving life threatening blood clots in the heart and brain, erythropoietin for treatment of severe anemias, human insulin for diabetes, growth hormone for dwarfism, drugs for the cure of hepatitis and vaccines for its prevention. Hopefully, the AIDS virus will be conquered soon and targeted destruction of cancer cells will follow. Moreover, industrial processes, making use of substances produced by genetically engineered organisms, are being simplified and made more efficient and economical.

Agriculture is being revolutionized because of our ability to make genetically modified plants that are more resistant to plant pests, better able to withstand harsh environments of killing frost. Using the new technologies, plants can be engineered to prevent premature spoilage of fruits and vegetables, thereby making them more marketable. Even more astonishing are recent developments that permit plants to produce human proteins or to produce rare oils at a fraction of the current costs.

These advances are merely the first generation of opportunities. They were recognized soon after the scientific breakthroughs were made. But more scientific innovations are inevitable, leading to second and succeeding generations of commercial initiatives.

There are some who decry the need for more research, and, indeed, suggest that our advancing technologies are driving up the cost of health care, creating more problems than are solved. Reflect, however, what our society and costs would be like without the polio vaccine or sensitive methods for detecting HIV–1 in our blood supply or without biogenetically engineered blood clotting factors for our young hemophiliacs. Should we neglect further researches, and forego the potential treatments of cancer, heart, mental and autoimmune disease, many of which are within our grasp?

Our pharmaceutical industry is the most productive in the world in terms of the new and effective drugs it generates. The productivity of new drugs amongst the rest of the developed world's pharmaceutical industries pales by comparison with ours.

And yet, the record of our pharmaceutical company R&D is unimpressive.

We obviously need to improve.

And we can improve if we take better advantage of the genius of our universities and research centers. But how? By their nature, commercial research enterprises are relatively focused and restricted to the research they support. By contrast, academic research is generally more basic, less targeted and far ranging. But we can't rely wholly on academic institutions to improve our productivity.

1. Universities are not suited by temperament or resources to carrying out the development component of the R&D mission, so discoveries made there often languish.

(a) Developing, commercializing and marketing a widget, discovered or developed in the course of a basic research project, is beyond the province of the discoverer or the university; neither is suited to do it well or have the resources to do it successfully.

(b) Neither is the sponsor of that research, the Federal government, suitable or appropriate to undertake that role.

(c) In our system, perhaps the most successful if not the least objectionable, is the commercial sector.

(d) Nevertheless, irrespective who carries it on to development, the discoverer and colleagues, who understand the fundamentals, and the opportunities created by the breakthrough, are invaluable to those who will make the investment for ultimate commercialization.

This dependence is seen in two ways.

This is a map of the U.S. where each dot represents an existing biotechnology company. It is not a surprise that the heavy cluster of dots congregate around the major research universities where the fundamental research was and is being done. That is not accidental. It derives from the entrepreneurial drive of many of the universities' scientists as well as recognition by the venture capital community that the universities are the font of new knowledge and technology, and that locating nearby enables the nascent companies to draw on that expertise.

What new discoveries are in the offing? Perhaps ones that will tell us more about cancer, aging or how the brain works. I predict that we'll see many more dots on this map 5 years from now, and they will cluster around the institutions that make the key discoveries—that is, if our institutions are not hamstrung by short-term objectives.

I want to end my comments by emphasizing the essential link between a robust basic research enterprise and the flow of products and solutions that can assure the health and welfare of our society. Much of the basic research has been and will continue to be done in our universities, so we'd better look to their health and stop beating up on them. Our research universities are still the envy of the world, and for many good reasons. Yet it has become fashionable of late to denigrate their activities with relatively trivial accusations. It is also tough for scientists looking to move their discoveries to commercial fruition when they are accused of conflict of interest, and, at the same time, criticized for not contributing to solving our nation's problems.

Let me conclude with a quotation from Sir Peter Medawar's essay "On the Effecting of

All Things Possible": "If we imagine the evolution of living organisms compressed into a year of cosmic time, then the evolution of man has occupied but a day. Only during the past 10–15 minutes of the human day has our life been anything but precarious. We are still beginners and may hope to improve. To deride the hope of progress is the ultimate fatuity, the last word in the poverty of spirit and meanness of mind."

TRIBUTE TO FRANK SOHOREC

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize the induction of a fine individual into the State of Michigan Polka Music Hall of Fame. The contributions he has made to music in Michigan will not be forgotten.

Mr. Frank Sohorec was born in Chesaning, MI, on February 4, 1936. Mr. Sohorec is the third child of John and Katherine Sohorec. He graduated from Chesaning High School in June 1954.

In June 1959, he married Betty Kalisek. They have three daughters; Deborah, Michele, and Wendy, along with seven grandchildren.

Frank's interest in music began at an early age. In the eighth grade he took his first drum lesson. After entering high school he picked up the baritone horn and played in the high school junior band. His sophomore year his help was needed on the family farm, so he was forced to drop his musical studies and only take one-half day of school. This did not stop his interest in music however. He listened to every station that broadcast polka music and went to every polka dance he could.

Frank's next move in music was the purchase of his first set of drums, followed a year later the joining of the Czech Notes Band in 1964. He played actively until 1986 when he retired.

During this time he spread joy to all the people who listened to his musical expertise. Whether it was a local clubs, out of State hotels, or the many weddings he played, there was always a large crowd on hand to hear him play. They truly enjoyed all that Frank gave them.

He played with many bands during this time, including some times when he had jobs with two bands and had to call on others to help him out. The late Bedrick Smeage gave Frank the title of all star drummer.

During his 22 years of playing he was on over four albums with area bands, and has played with over 20 well known polka artists from the mid-Michigan area in many different venues.

Frank Sohorec truly dedicated his life to music and all the joys it can bring. Mr. Speaker, I know you will join me in congratulating and commending this outstanding individual for the service he provided to the people of Michigan.

CLEAN WATER ACT

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will amend the Clean Water Act to allow coastal cities to treat their sewage in a cost-effective—and environmentally sensitive—manner.

Existing law requires every city—regardless of environmental conditions and circumstances—to treat sewage at the secondary level. Yet scientific studies have proven that sewage treated at advanced primary level and discharged into the ocean at depths greater than 300 feet does no environmental harm. And upgrading such a sewage system to secondary treatment can cost billions of dollars.

My own city of San Diego is blessed with unique environmental conditions. The Continental Shelf drops off very sharply from the California coast. There is also a very active ocean current. As a result, once a sewage plant outfall pipe is placed a sufficient distance from shore, the effluent is rapidly dispersed. No benefit accrues to the local marine environment by treating the sewage to secondary levels currently required by the Clean Water Act. In fact, environmental damage is caused by increased energy costs and sludge production.

While San Diego does not need to upgrade its wastewater treatment plant, it does need to implement an aggressive water reclamation program. Over 90 percent of San Diego's water comes from outside the region. As water resources become more and more scarce, such dependence will become a real obstacle to future economic prosperity.

The legislation I am introducing addresses both of these concerns. It allows the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue a permit modifying the secondary sewage treatment requirements where it can be clearly demonstrated that such standards would not result in any harm to the marine environment and where an aggressive water reclamation program is being implemented.

This will allow our city to put its scarce resources where they are truly needed. Attention can be focused on water reclamation, which is vital to our long-term viability, and not to a needless and costly upgrade of our waste water treatment plant.

I hope that my legislation will be folded into the Clean Water Act Reauthorization bill which the House of Representatives will be considering later this year.

I would eagerly welcome the support of my colleagues on this issue of critical importance to many cities in this Nation.

TOWARD A NATIONAL EXPORT STRATEGY

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, today the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee submitted a report to the Congress entitled "Toward a National Export Strategy." I wholeheartedly support this report because it addresses the problems we have regarding this country's overall trade policy.

I am very pleased that President Clinton is following through with his commitment to develop a national export promotion strategy. The report outlines over 60 specific actions, many of which can be taken immediately, to help the United States create jobs and compete in today's global market.

One of the greatest obstacles for high tech companies has been regulatory export controls. The Clinton administration intends to streamline the export licensing process and liberalize export controls on computers and telecommunications products. For example, the Clinton administration will propose an increase in the threshold for exports of computers, propose an increase in the definition of a supercomputer, and expand the availability of distribution licenses for computer exports.

The United States now faces tough competition from around the globe in nearly every high-technology sector. Customers who are frustrated with the restrictions of our export controls have the option of buying from other countries, and are making that choice with increasing frequency. Our customers are being replaced by competitors.

Increasingly, export control regulations have failed to keep up with rapidly changing market developments. Many technologies are still subject to export restrictions in the United States long after they become freely available in other countries.

All this means that when United States high technology companies try to compete in world markets, we do so with one hand tied behind our back much of the time.

Our congressional office has probably had more experience working with export license agreements and has been working for an overhaul of this system longer than any other office. We finally have an administration that agrees. The report that is being released by the Clinton administration states that our goal is to help American businesses achieve dynamic export growth. The Federal Government will be paving the way for businesses to do this by providing them with information, technical assistance, financial resources, and Government support.

The United States has many new export markets for its goods and services. The Pacific rim countries, Central and Eastern Europe, and the former Soviet Union are just a few of these new markets. To compete in this larger, more complex world market, the United States must adjust its attitudes and improve the methods we use to promote exports.

President Clinton knows that the Federal Government must play an important and more focused role in helping the private sector sell more goods and services overseas. This administration will create a user-friendly Federal export promotion service by consolidating the existing services and creating one-stop shopping to help exporters. In addition, the Federal Government will improve coordination and increase participation in its advocacy efforts to result in improving U.S. companies' chances of success.

We have waited too long for these reforms, but the Clinton administration is taking action

now. These actions collectively constitute the beginning of a coordinated, focused, and aggressive national export strategy. We need such a strategy to help U.S. companies compete more effectively in global markets and create more high-quality jobs for American workers.

TRIBUTE TO THE PENNA FAMILY

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, on this day, September 29, 1993, the southeast Michigan chapter of the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation will be hosting the 10th annual Alexander Macomb Citizen of the Year Award dinner. The award, instituted in 1984, is named after my home county's namesake, Gen. Alexander Macomb, a hero of the War of 1812.

This year, the March of Dimes has added a special family award and has named the Penna family as the first recipients. Committed to improving the health of America's babies, the March of Dimes in southeast Michigan rightly recognizes the Pennas for their service and outstanding leadership. Best known for their excellence in food, the Pennas operate a family-owned restaurant and a banquet center. As a proud Italian immigrant family, the Pennas have discovered the American dream while never forgetting the needs of the less fortunate. Their success has enabled them to bless the March of Dimes with generous financial support.

Through advocacy, education, and community service, the March of Dimes has established itself as an organization with an impeccable reputation. Being recognized by the March of Dimes is an exceptional honor and I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting the Penna family as recipients of the Alexander Macomb Citizen of the Year Award.

TRIBUTE TO LT. GEN. JAMES H. DOOLITTLE

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1993

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding American patriot and World War II hero, an aviation pioneer, successful businessman, and beloved family man, USAF Lt. Gen. James H. "Jimmy" Doolittle, who passed on earlier this week.

General Doolittle was popularly known for his daring feat of personally leading the first air raid on Tokyo on April 18, 1942, as part of the first bombing mission launched from an aircraft carrier, a feat many believed to be impossible. Doolittle's raid proved to be a tremendous morale booster for United States and the Allied Forces at a low point in the war by shattering the Japanese high command's sense of invulnerability and demonstrating that Japan was not impenetrable. The B–25 bombers his squadron flew did not carry enough fuel to allow them to make it back to the carrier or to reach ally territory, thus, all 16 planes in the mission had to be crashlanded and then abandoned after dropping their bombs. Doolittle's original role was to recruit and train the pilots for this dangerous mission, but during the 4-month training project he became so involved that at the last minute he signed on as the squadron commander in order to lead the raid. Jimmy Doolittle provided extraordinary leadership to the volunteer crews who were faced with being forced to land in enemy territory or perish at sea. And for this great service, he was awarded our Nation's highest award, the prestigious Medal of Honor, presented by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in a White House ceremony.

Doolittle was promoted to brigadier general, skipping the rank offull colonel in 1942 and soon promoted to the rank of major general later than year. In 1943, he was named the commanding general of the North African Strategic Forces. A few months later in 1944, he was promoted to lieutenant general and took over the 8th Air Force in the European theater providing the critical leadership to shift this air unit to more offensive air combat tactics. A highly decorated officer in World War II, in addition to being awarded the Medal of Honor he was bestowed the Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star, and the Air Medal and granted recognition from the Chinese and French Governments. In 1985, Doolittle was promoted to four-star general. His stars were pinned by President Ronald Reagan and Senator Barry Goldwater.

Doolittle set aviation records for speed and distance in the 1920's and 1930's as an Army pilot and as a private pilot for the Shell Oil Co. In 1922, he flew a DH–4 equipped with crude navigational equipment from Pablo Beach, FL, to San Diego, "an extraordinary achievement with the equipment of the time," as cited on the citation that accomplished his Distinguished Flying Cross, which he was awarded for flying this mission with the Signal Corps Reserve. His flight demonstrated the ability of the U.S. Air Corps to move to any part of the United States in less than 24 hours. In 1924, Jimmy Doolittle received an Oak Leaf Cluster for his Distinguished Flying Cross by performing a series of acceleration tests and extreme maneuvers that might occur in air combat. Subsequently, in 1925, Doolittle won the Schneider Trophy race, the first of many to come, reaching a recordsetting 232 mph in a Curtiss Navy racer equipped with pontoons, while serving on the Naval Test Board at Mitchell Field in New York.

While in the midst of illustrating his flying prowess, he was also pursuing his academic ambitions, graduating from the University of California with a B.A. in 1922, earning an M.S. in 1924 from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology [MIT], and becoming one of the first to earn a doctorate in the field of aeronautics, also from MIT in 1925.

His work in aviation includes the development of the first artificial horizontal and directional gyroscopes. During these experiments, he flew the first blind flight, wearing a hood while taking off and landing safely using experimental flight instruments. These developments have been noted to be his finest contributions to the field of aviation. While with the Shell Oil Co., he was largely responsible for the development of high octane gas which was critical for the operation of larger, more powerful aviation engines. Additionally, he worked diligently to convince engine manufacturers to produce more powerful engines, a feat that played a contributing role in the Allied Forces winning the war.

While probably most notably known as a war hero, pilot, and research engineer, ever ready to share his wealth of technological knowledge and skills with the world, Jimmy Doolittle was married for 71 years to his high school sweetheart, Josephine, who preceded him in 1988, a magnificent accomplishment in itself, and quite possibly his proudest. He was survived by his son, Col. John Doolittle, retired, and his daughter-in-law Priscilla Doolittle. He will always be remembered in history as a legend, and one of America's most outstanding patriots.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 30, 1993, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 1

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on the nomination of William B. Gould IV, of California, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

SD–430

OCTOBER 5

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1346, to replace the Copyright Royalty Tribunal with copyright arbitration royalty panels to be appointed and convened by the Librarian of Congress.

SD–226

OCTOBER 6

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine proposals to reorganize the Department of Agriculture.

SD–138

2:30 p.m.

Veterans' Affairs

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SR–418

OCTOBER 7

2:30 p.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Agricultural Research, Conservation, Forestry and General Legislation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the implementation of American agricultural research priorities.

SR–332

OCTOBER 13

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 720, to clean up open dumps on Indian lands.

SR–485

11:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the role of the Department of Veterans Affairs under the Administration's proposal to reform the nation's health care system.

SR–418

OCTOBER 19

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Surface Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the use of intelligent vehicle highway systems for commercial vehicles.

SR–253

OCTOBER 20

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on issues relating to Indian self-goverance.

SR–485

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine violence in television programs, focusing on S. 1383, to prohibit the distribution to the public of violent video programming during hours when children are reasonably likely to comprise a substantial portion of the audience, S. 973, to require the Federal Communications Commission to evaluate and publicly report on the violence contained in television programs, and S. 943, to protect children from the physical and mental harm resulting from violence contained in television programs.

SR–253

OCTOBER 21

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on S. 447, to facilitate the development of Federal policies with respect to those territories under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior.

SD–366

Environment and Public Works

Clean Air and Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the implementation of the acid rain provisions of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

SD–406

2:30 p.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to review research on the health effects of agent orange and other herbicides used in Vietnam.

SR–418

OCTOBER 28

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on issues relating to Indian child abuse.

SR–485