of $34.2 million per year wasted at foreign airshows and arms bazaars. This figure is up over 31 percent over the period from 1994 to 1995.

The Clinton administration has been underreporting cost and involvement to the U.S. by excluding transportation costs to and from the foreign shows. The costs reported by the Pentagon to Congress are 15 to 20 times less than the actual costs, leaving the U.S. taxpayer to pick up the tab. An example of this practice is the transfer of a B–2 bomber from the United States to France for a demonstration at an air show in Paris in 1995. This flight to Paris involved at least a 24-hour round trip ticket. The cost to operate the plane for one hour is $14,166, for a cost of over $330,000. The total cost submitted to Congress by the Pentagon to cover the entire show was underestimated at $342,916.

The bill I am introducing today, the ''Restrictions on Foreign Air Shows Act'' bans any further direct participation of Defense personnel and equipment at air shows unless the defense industry pays for the advertising and use of the DoD wares. The bill prohibits sending planes, equipment, weapons, or any other related material to any overseas air show unless the contractor has paid for the expenses incurred by DoD. If a contractor decides to participate in the air show, he or she must lease the equipment, cover insurance costs, ramp fees, transportation fees, and any other costs associated with the air show. If a contractor is making a profit by showing the aircraft, they will also be required to pay for the advertisement and use of the aircraft. In addition, military and government personnel will not be allowed at the show unless the contractor pays for their services during the air show.

This bill in no way outlaws the use of U.S. Aircraft or other equipment in foreign air shows or other trade exhibitions. The bill simply takes the financial burden off of the American taxpayer and puts it on the defense contractor. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE CRUISE LINE INDUSTRY IN ALASKA AND THE UNITED STATES

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1999

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to address an issue that is very critical to the constituents of my home State of Alaska. The issue I wish to speak about is the significant contribution which the cruise line industry has made to the great State of Alaska and this country.

Alaska is a State where the land mass is larger than all of the Northeastern and Great Lakes States put together. Approximately 600,000 Americans live there. Many Americans have heard of Alaska and have some image of its wildness but fewer than 10 percent of Americans have ever visited. Nonetheless, the opportunity for Americans to visit this great state has increased tenfold with the presence of the cruise industry. Furthermore, the economic benefits that the cruise lines bring have greatly impacted Alaska.

Recently, Price Waterhouse Coopers (PwC) and Wharton Econometric Forecasting Associates concluded a Study on the Economic Impact of the Cruise Industry on the U.S. economy. This study reveals that the cruise industry spent $6.6 billion in the United States in 1997, and generated an additional $5 billion of impact on the economy. In the United States alone, the cruise lines purchased $1.8 billion in transportation from airlines, $794 million in fuel and lubricants, $626 million in business services, $1 billion in financial services, and $600 million in food and beverage supplies. In the State of Alaska in 1998, the cruise industry spent with Alaskan business and service providers $363,274,000. These statistics are significant and make clear that the cruise industry has benefited both the state of Alaska and our Nation.

This study also reveals that the cruise industry created 176,433 jobs for U.S. citizens in 1997. These jobs included direct employment by the industry and jobs attributable to the U.S. based cruise line suppliers and industry partners. Through its annual growth of 6–10 percent, the industry is responsible for thousands of new jobs every year for Americans. The cruise industry is the single largest direct employer in the maritime sector of the United States. In my State of Alaska in 1998, the cruise industry was responsible for the employment of 17,189 Alaskans. That is 3 percent of the population of our State.

Another issue that I wish to address is the matter regarding Federal and State taxation of the cruise industry. Some critics state that the cruise industry does not pay federal and state taxes in the United States. This statement is false. In fact the recently completed study revealed that the industry pays millions of dollars in taxes each year. In 1997, the cruise industry paid over $1 billion in Federal, State, and local taxes in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the contributions made by the cruise industry to our great Nation. The benefits have been abundant, both throughout this nation and in my home State, Alaska. In view of the many contributions, I wish to acknowledge the vital role which the cruise industry plays in sustaining the economy and the maritime sector of this country.

TRIBUTE TO FRANKYE SCHNEIDER

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1999

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to may dear friend, Frankye Schneider, who this year is being honored by the 40th Assembly District of the Democratic party. For more than two decades, Frankye held the position of senior deputy to Los Angeles County Supervisor Ed Edelman. Frankye has always considered it an honor to work in politics. She cherished the opportunity to use the resources and power of government to help individual citizens.

Frankye was the perfect model of a professional and compassionate staff person. She was never too busy to listen to the concerns of another resident, and to speak out on behalf of a homeowners' association, chamber of commerce or non-profit agency. Although districts in Los Angeles County contain more people than many states, it somehow seemed as if everyone was on a first-name basis with Frankye.

It would be impossible in such a short space to mention each and every contribution Frankye made to our community during the time she worked for Supervisor Edelman. The list of people and organizations that benefitted from her efforts is truly myriad. Frankye had an extremely wide range of interests, including the arts, the environment, education, mental health and juvenile justice.

She is a lifetime member of the PTA, immediate past president of the San Fernando Valley Community Mental Health Center, and a former Board Member of New Directions for Youth and the United Way. After she left the staff of Supervisor Edelman, Frankye worked for the Los Angeles County Museum of Art and the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History.

Frankye has a deep and abiding interest in the fortunes of the Democratic Party. She was a founding member and the first chair of the Democratic Party of the San Fernando Valley, and she has represented the 40th Assembly District at California Democratic party conventions for many years. Frankye also did extensive volunteer work for George McGovern's 1972 presidential campaign and Tom Bradley's 1973 campaign for mayor of Los Angeles.

Frankye doesn't know the meaning of the word ''retirement.'' She continues to stay active in the community and with a variety of organizations. She also spends as much time as she can with her three children and four grandchildren.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Frankye Schneider, who has devoted much of her life to bettering the lives of others. Her dedication and selflessness inspire us all.

CONSTITUTIONAL IMPASSE CONTINUES IN BELARUS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1999

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, the alternative Presidential election concluded in Belarus within the timeframe envisioned by the legitimate 1994 Constitution. While the opposition Central Election Commission (CEC) concluded that the final results of the voting were invalid because of various violations deriving from the impediments placed by Belarusian authorities, the ballot served as an important barometer of democratic engagement by the citizens of Belarus. In the months leading up to the election, President Alyaksandr Lukashenka had imprisoned one of the two Presidential candidates—former Prime Minister Mikhail Chygir—on what were clearly politically motivated charges, arrested hundreds of election officials and volunteers, and instituted administrative proceedings against others. Nevertheless, the authorities were unable to thwart the election in at least one critically important respect—according to the opposition CEC, the voting itself was valid because more than half—or 53 percent of the electorate—participated. When one considers that these were unsanctioned elections that