partially refundable child credit and my legislation also simplifies this partially refundable credit by repealing the provision which reduces the credit by AMT liability.

In order to eliminate the complexities of the AMT for nonfundable credits and the child credit for families with three or more children, and to have revenue neutral legislation, the income limits for the beginning of the phase-out of the child credit have to be reduced from $110,000 to $89,000 for joint filers and $75,000 to $60,000 for single filers. Even with this reduction in the thresholds for the child credit, the thresholds are still higher than the thresholds which were included in last year's House Democratic substitute.

My legislation simplifies the child credit for all taxpayers. The vast majority of Americans will have a modest tax reduction or will not be affected. I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation. Proposing such legislation is not without risk—opponents can distort it for political purposes. However, I believe that it is important to propose constructive solution to problems. The complexity of the child credit is a problem that needs to be addressed.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, AND JUDICIARY AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4276) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Mollohan census amendment to H.R. 4276, the FY 1999 Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies, appropriations bill.

This important measure will remove language in the bill that withholds half of the FY 1999 appropriation for the decennial census until future legislation releasing the funds is enacted. By avoiding the risk of a census shutdown, the Bureau can proceed without hindering its ability to prepare for the most accurate census possible.

Americans want, and deserve, an accurate census conducted with the latest scientific methods and technology available. However, the recent census was the first census enumeration to be less accurate than its predecessor. It is estimated the 1990 census undercount, of which 8.8 million people were not included, was 33 percent less accurate than that of the 1980 census. Subsequently, 4 times as many blacks, 5 times as many Hispanics, American Indians, and non-Hispanic whites, and 2 times as many Asians and Pacific Islanders were not included.

As the U.S. Census Bureau prepares for the largest peace-time mobilization effort undertaken by the Government, we must apply modern scientific sampling methods to ensure a more accurate census.

The census is a constitutional requirement for the reapportionment of the House of Representatives. An accurate census is also absolutely essential for a fair distribution of Federal funding for roads, transit systems, schools, senior citizens centers, health care facilities, and children's programs, including Head Start and the school lunch program. With such services and resources at stake for our urban communities and rural areas, we must be mindful of the human capital costs involved with an ''undercount'' of the population.

In 1991, Congress directed the Secretary of Commerce and the National Academy of Science (NAS) to determine the most scientifically accurate and cost-effective means of conducting the decennial census. The National Academy of Science panel concluded that statistical sampling would fulfill such criteria. These findings were echoed in 1992 and 1996 reports from a second panel of experts who stated that sampling is critical to the success of the 2000 census.

The Mollohan amendment directs the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to review the Census Bureau's plans and determine if they are consistent with recommendations made by the academy in response to bipartisan legislation enacted in 1991. By enlisting the aid of the academy, the U.S. Census Bureau can refine and improve their techniques in order to attain a more accurate census.

The Bureau's ''census 2000 plan'' has been endorsed by the American Statistical Association, the American Demographics Association, and virtually all other professional organizations concerned with the census.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress must ensure that adequate and timely funding is available for the task of determining our Nation's population. Any delay in funding to fulfill our constitutional obligation would delay and place in jeopardy many of the planning requirements necessary for an accurate census. By removing the six month cap on funding for census 2000, the Congress will enable the Bureau to continue its preparations for its most important task ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to ensure that progress will continue toward the most fair, accurate, and inclusive census in our Nation's history. Support the Mollohan amendment.

IN HONOR OF THE CHURCH OF ST. CLARENCE

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Church of St. Clarence.

St. Clarence Church has served as a welcoming community for the citizens of North Olmsted for twenty years. Bishop James E. Hickey named the Church of St. Clarence in memory of his immediate predecessor, Bishop Clarence Issenman. He designated Reverend Thomas A. Flynn as its founding pastor in June, 1978.

The Church of St. Clarence consists of the Parish School of Religion, the Gathering Room and St. Kevin's Chapel. St. Clarence uses these three components to achieve a mission statement that calls for opportunity, education, and friendship among its community's members. St. Clarence provides its members with opportunities to worship God by offering the Eucharist on a daily basis at St. Kevin's Chapel. St. Clarence's Parish School of Religion hopes to educate and nurture all its members by making available classes in religion, including those of bible study. The Gathering Room promotes a community of prayer and friendship by providing a place for members to meet outside of regular church hours for extra-curricular activities. The Church of St. Clarence clearly meets the needs of all its members.

The population of St. Clarence's Parish has grown significantly since its first beginnings in 1978. I stand here today in reassurance that St. Clarence will continue to grow and serve every one of its members, past and future, with the same commitment and the same faith that has helped it develop into the thriving community it is today. Once again, congratulations and God Bless!

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, AND JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. DEBORAH PRYCE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4276) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes:

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my fellow Buckeye State colleague, Mr. TRAFICANT, and I commend him for his leadership on this issue.

All families in Ohio, which include my constituents in and around Columbus, were placed in serious harm's way as a result of the recent breakout of six inmates from the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center located in Youngstown. Five of the escapees were murderers who had been transferred to Youngstown by the District of Columbia.

We are all a little bit relieved to know that, thanks to excellent law enforcement, five of the six inmates have been caught, but one remains at large and remains a menace to all citizens of this country.

Mr. Chairman, what is particularly alarming about this situation is that some of those murderers who escaped had absolutely no business being transferred by the District of Columbia to the Youngstown facility, which is designed to house medium risk criminals—not the extremely violent, high-risk variety like those thugs who escaped. This situation is unacceptable, and the people of Ohio will not stand for it.

Who is responsible for this? One thing appears certain, the District of Columbia agreed only to transfer medium-risk criminals to Youngstown. Yet, in the words of the director of the D.C. Corrections Department, many of the prisoners transferred by the District of Columbia to Youngstown were inmates who had

''committed murder and mayhem'' and were ''some of the most recalcitrant inmates to come out of'' the D.C. penitentiary.

In other words, the District of Columbia either was grossly negligent or they callously hoodwinked the people of Ohio. Either way, the gentleman from Youngstown, and I demand that the District of Columbia fully account for this situation and be held accountable, accordingly.

Mr. TRAFICANT'S amendment will help ensure that the events of the past are not repeated by the District of Columbia. In addition, I believe we should explore other avenues in coordination with state officials like Ohio attorney general Betty Montgomery, who has expressed to me her commitment to make sure that the people of Ohio are protected.

I urge support for the Traficant amendment.

CRISIS IN CYPRUS

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we are on the verge of yet another crisis in Cyprus.

The Greek Cypriots propose to purchase new S–300 missiles from Russia, and by all accounts, Russia intends to proceed with delivery of the missiles this fall. The installation of these sophisticated new antiaircraft missiles and accompanying powerful air surveillance radars needlessly escalates the level of military confrontation in Cyprus, and pushes the two sides further away from a more sensible path of mutual arms reductions. It also raises the disastrous prospect of conflict between two of our NATO allies, Turkey and Greece. Indeed, the placement of these missiles in Cyprus seems intended for no other reason than to provoke conflict.

The Cyprus problem has been with us for a long time. United Nations peacekeeping forces have been there for a quarter of this century. Some of our European allies have invested, and continue to invest, considerable effort in finding a long-term solution there. The United States, of course, is also actively engaged in diplomatic efforts in Cyprus. The problem is daunting and filled with frustrations. For example, I was disturbed to read last week that the Foreign Minister of Greece had referred to the President's efforts in Cyprus as ''utter lies''. These kinds of remarks from senior government officials are not helpful.

I wish the Greek Cypriots would reconsider their decision to deploy these dangerous new missiles, but I fear that they will not. Unfortunately, restraint has not been a common feature of Cyprus' history. In light of this, I am very troubled that Russia will allow this sale to go forward. Russia is a member of the United Nations Security Council, and I simply cannot understand why President Yeltsin would permit these missiles to be sent into this explosive environment—particularly after repeated Security Council resolutions expressing concern about the introduction of sophisticated weaponry in Cyprus, and admonitions to all parties to avoid further expansion of military forces and armaments.

Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues and I have sent a letter today to the President urging him to speak directly to President Yeltsin about this crisis, and to prevail upon him to cancel the S–300 missile transfer. At a time when Russia is looking to the United States and other members of the international community for help with its financial crisis, I think that Russia should understand that international cooperation is not a one-way street and not limited to the subject of finance. Like all of us, Russia has a responsibility to promote solutions, not new crises. I hope that President Yeltsin will see that this missile sale threatens to damage Russia's goodwill in the United States, and this makes it more difficult for us to cooperate on other issues.

A few weeks ago, some of my colleagues here spoke of the Cyprus problem, but the common message was not solution-oriented. Instead, we heard that one side in Cyprus was to blame for all its problems, and the other side was innocent. I want to suggest to my colleagues that taking sides in this old and complex problem is not constructive, and will not enhance the ability of the United States to be an effective catalyst for solutions. I also want to point out that the history is not so clear as some have suggested.

Even before this most recent crisis was precipitated by a weapons purchase from Russia, the last major crisis in 1974 began for reasons that some of us have forgotten. The American Secretary of State at the time, Henry Kissinger, succinctly summarized the events in his book, ''Years of Upheaval'':

After World War II, the old enemies Greece and Turkey were allies in NATO with a common stake in the security of the eastern Mediterranean. But their atavistic bitterness found a focus in the island of Cyprus, forty-four miles from mainland Turkey, with a population 80 percent Greek and about 20 percent Turk—a lethal cocktail.

As in many other nations of mixed nationalities, a tenuous civil peace had been possible while the island was under foreign rule. But when the British granted independence to the island in 1960, with Britain, Greece, and Turkey as guarantors of its internal arrangements, the subtle Greek Orthodox Archbishop Makarios III, leader of the Greek Cypriot community and of the campaign against British rule, found himself obliged to concede a degree of self-government to the Turkish minority, offensive to all his notions of government or nationality. He did not have his heart in it, and with independence he systematically reneged on what he promised, seeking to create in effect a unitary state in which the Turkish minority would always be outvoted. The history of independent Cyprus was thus plagued by communal strife, and in 1967 Turkey's threat to intervene militarily was aborted only at the last moment by a strong warning from President Johnson. It had become since an article of faith in Turkish politics that this submission to American preferences had been unwise and would never be repeated. I had always taken it for granted that the next communal crisis in Cyprus would provoke Turkish intervention.

Makarios nevertheless continued to play with fire. In 1972 he introduced Czech arms on the island for the apparent purpose of creating a private paramilitary unit to counterbalance those set up by the constitution. In 1974 he again took on the Greek-dominated National Guard in an effort to bring them under his control. Greece was then governed by a military junta, violently anti-Communist, deeply suspicious of Makarios's flirtation with radical Third World countries, which it took to be a sign of his pro-Communist sympathies. It therefore encouraged plans to overthrow him and install in Cyprus a regime more in sympathy with Greece, oblivious to the fact than an overthrow of the constitutional arrangement on Cyprus would free Turkey of previous restraints. . . .

On July 15—six days after my return from the Soviet Union and Europe—Makarios was overthrown in a coup d'état just as he returned from a weekend in the mountains; he was nearly assassinated. He was replaced by an unsavory adventurer, Nikos Sampson, known as a strong supporter of union with Greece. A crisis was now inevitable.

There was nothing we needed less than a crisis—especially one that would involve two NATO allies. Whomever we supported and whatever the outcome, the eastern flank of the Mediterranean would be in jeopardy. . . .

During the week of July 15 I therefore dispatched Joe Sisco to London, Ankara, and Athens. Britain, as one of the guarantor powers, was seeking to mediate between the parties. Sisco's mission was to help Britain start a negotiating process that might delay a Turkish invasion and enable the structure under Sampson in Cyprus to fall of its own weight. But Turkey was not interested in a negotiated solution; it was determined to settle old scores. On July 19 it invaded Cyprus, meeting unexpectedly strong resistance. . . .

During the night of July 21–22, we forced a cease-fire by threatening Turkey that we would move nuclear weapons from forward positions—especially where they might be involved in a war with Greece. It stopped Turkish military operations while Turkey was occupying only a small enclave on the island; this created conditions for new negotiations slated to start two days hence, with the Turkish minority obviously in an improved bargaining position and with some hope of achieving more equitable internal arrangements.

On July 22, the junta in Athens was overthrown and replaced by a democratic government under the distinguished conservative leader Constantine Karamanlis. Within days, the mood in America changed. The very groups that had castigated us for our reluctance to assault Greece now wanted us to turn against Turkey over a crisis started by Greece, to gear our policies to the domestic structures of the government in Athens and Ankara regardless of the origins or merits of the dispute on Cyprus, to take a one-sided position regardless of our interest in easing the conflict between two strategic allies in the eastern Mediterranean. . . . For two weeks we maintained our tightrope act, but during the weekend following Nixon's resignation the crisis erupted again, culminating in a second Turkish invasion of the island. While Ford struggled to restore executive authority over the next months, a free-wheeling Congress destroyed the equilibrium between the parties we had precariously maintained; it legislated a heavy-handed arms embargo against Turkey that destroyed all possibility of American mediation—at a cost from which we have not recovered to this day. . . .

What I learn from this is that we do a disservice to ourselves and to the cause of peace in Cyprus by being too quick to take sides in the matter. The situation requires a steady hand and an honest broker, and we do not contribute either if the Congress of the United States is waving the flag of one of the parties to the dispute.

I hope the President can persuade our friends in Russia to adopt this same approach, and to abandon this very dangerous new transfer of weapons to Cyprus.