EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REFORM IMMIGRATION LAWS

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, today, this first day of the 104th Congress, I am introducing a package of three immigration reform bills that deserve top priority as the new Congress works to make America a better place to live.

As I am sure many of my colleagues in this body experienced on the campaign trail last year, Americans are deeply concerned about immigration and its impact on their lives. They are anxious about the changing face of this country and the problems associated with our system of immigration. I don't blame them. On any given day, there are countless news reports about the destructive consequences of our dysfunctional immigration policies. But one need not rely on the media for an understanding of this issue, as more and more Americans are getting firsthand knowledge of the ill-effects of out-of-control immigration.

At the forefront of the immigration debate is illegal immigration. After all, many States, including my State of Arizona, have been hard-pressed to find the resources required to deal with this growing problem. They have had to resort to filing suit against the Federal Government for reimbursement. And, let us not forget what took place in California last November. Through the passage of proposition 187, Californians overwhelmingly conveyed a message that they will no longer be the victims in the illegal immigration crisis. It is just a matter of time before other States follow California's lead.

These actions prove that the Congress has been negligent in its duty to put forth an immigration policy that is fair and responsible and in the best interests of the States and the American people. Through congressional inaction we have sent a message to other countries that our borders are insecure, that we don't have an interest in enforcing our laws, and that we have a never ending supply of public assistance benefits.

We must act now to correct this perception. That is why I am introducing the Immigration Accountability Act of 1995. This bill goes to the heart of the illegal immigration crisis by prohibiting the payment of Federal benefits to illegals and ending the practice of conferring citizenship on the children of illegal aliens. In addition, the bill would strengthen our often-abused asylum system by providing for the expeditious processing of meritorious claims and the prompt exclusion of those who attempt to defraud the system. Finally, the bill calls for a significant increase in the border patrol. By increasing our border security and eliminating these compelling illegal immigration incentives, I believe we can turn the tide of illegal immigration.

Illegal immigration is a serious problem and I am delighted that many Members of the new Congress have expressed their willingness to confront it. However, there is another problem that is more complex, and just as pressing. I am referring to legal immigration. We are currently experiencing unprecedented levels of legal immigrants, perhaps 15 million in the 1990's. Through ill-conceived immigration laws, we are accommodating people in other countries who wish to live here with little regard for those already here, citizens and immigrants alike.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to take a break, a temporary pause, from the uncontrolled immigration that has resulted in overcrowded schools and hospitals, scarce employment, inadequate housing, and a deteriorating standard of living. I am proposing, through the Immigration Moratorium Act of 1995, that we limit immigration to the spouses and minor children of U.S. citizens, legitimate refugees, and those immigrants who have been waiting in the immigration backlog for more than 10 years. This would bring our immigration numbers in line with the traditional U.S. average of about 297,000 per year.

I am convinced that my moratorium bill would yield highly positive results. A moratorium would allow us to begin absorbing and assimilating the millions of newcomers who have settled here in recent years and also give us an opportunity to revamp our misguided and outdated policies to suit the realities of today's America. Furthermore, an additional benefit of a moratorium is that it would free up manpower and resources to deal with illegal immigration.

I realize that some of my colleagues believe it to be politically unpopular to advocate a reduction in legal immigration. However, I would like to point out that as immigration levels have risen, so has public opinion turned against increased immigration. A CNN/USA Today poll found that 76 percent of Americans feel immigration should be stopped or reduced until the economy improves. And, all opinion surveys show that the sentiment to restore a more modest immigration flow is about as strong among noncitizens as among citizens, and among nonwhite Americans as among white Americans. I encourage the Members of this body to give these statistics serious consideration before abandoning the idea of reducing legal immigration.

The last bill of my immigration reform package, the Immigrant Financial Responsibility and Sponsorship Act of 1995, is directed at rapidly growing immigrant welfare use. The percentage of immigrants below the poverty line is 50 percent higher than that of natives. Even more astonishing is that the estimated 1993 public assistance and services costs for immigrants was $10.42 billion. At a time when we are searching for ways to reform the welfare system in this country it would be foolish to let this costly trend continue.

Under my bill, aliens would be required to demonstrate that they are unlikely to become a public charge. If they cannot do so, they will not be admitted to the United States unless a suitable sponsor gives a proper bond and guarantees financial responsibility for the alien. This is a reliable and fair way to ensure that those immigrants who wish to come to this country will not wind up on our already-overburdened welfare rolls.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of the U.S. Congress, we have an obligation to the American people to restore a sense of fairness and responsibility to our immigration laws. I believe that my bills take a significant step toward fulfilling that obligation. I urge my colleagues to join me.

REPEAL OF SECTION 903

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the United States taxes the income of its citizens and corporations whether it is earned at home or abroad. The U.S. foreign tax credit provides relief to U.S. taxpayers from the double-taxation so they will not determine where a company invests. Nevertheless, when Congress adopted the section 903 of the Internal Revenue Code, an unfair tax advantage was given to companies that invest abroad. For that reason, I have introduced legislation to repeal section 903.

Mr. Speaker, section 903 extends credibility to those foreign taxes imposed in lieu of foreign income taxes. This means that all foreign taxes such as foreign sales, excise, and value added taxes are creditable as business costs towards their foreign taxes paid. There is no constraint on the type of foreign tax that can be credited. This leaves domestic U.S. companies at a distinct disadvantage. They are only able to deduct taxes that are in lieu of income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, section 903 was enacted in 1942 when certain countries taxed companies on a different basis from our concept of net income. These countries were less sophisticated and imposed taxes on a gross income basis, while the United States concept of net income had become quite refined. In order to make up for the difference, Congress extended credit to all foreign taxes. Since 1942, however, foreign tax systems have become quite sophisticated. Thus, the scope of section 903 has been expanded to include a credit for taxes paid to foreign countries in lieu of foreign income tax.

Mr. Speaker, creditable foreign taxes must be limited to income taxes and taxes of similar nature. This is because under present law indirect taxes and other taxes in lieu of taxes can be shifted onto either consumers or labor. A tax is shifted when a corporation is able to maintain its profits at their pre-tax level despite paying an income tax by raising prices. Therefore, these companies are receiving relief from a tax burden in the form of tax credits that they do not bear. The consumers and workers incur part of the burden of the tax.

Mr. Speaker, the foreign tax credit should be designed to provide relief from double-taxation and to make sure that tax incentives do

not exist. Taxes in lieu of should instead be deductible to relieve only the portion of the tax borne by the taxpayer. Until section 903 is repealed, more countries may adjust their tax laws in order to take advantage of section 903. In my district, thousands of jobs have been lost when companies moved their operations overseas. It is appalling to think that our tax system gave them incentives to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to cosponsor this important piece of legislation.

GATT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, December 14, 1994 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

GATT

Congress recently approved one of the most important—and controversial—measures of 1994: the latest expansion of the 47-year old General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT]. It is the most ambitious trade agreement in history.

The agreement among 124 nations, negotiated over seven years, will lower tariffs (import taxes) by one third, reduce international subsidies for farm exports, strengthen protections for patents and inventions, and take steps toward regulating trade in services and investment. Congress held dozens of hearings on the negotiations and passed numerous measures to guide the Reagan, Bush, and Clinton administrations in their pursuit of U.S. trade interests. Last week both the House and the Senate passed GATT by overwhelming margins. Dozens of Indiana manufacturers and farm groups urged passage of GATT, while many other Hoosiers expressed concern about protecting U.S. interests. The intense debate on GATT focused on three main issues: the impact of GATT on American jobs, on the budget deficit, and on U.S. sovereignty.

JOBS AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

Many people have expressed concern about the impact of GATT on U.S. jobs, yet the case for job growth under GATT is strong. GATT commits 124 countries to reduce tariff taxes for agriculture, services, and manufactured goods, with the global savings totaling $744 billion over ten years. Since the U.S. economy is already one of the fairest and most open in the world, other countries will be reducing their tariffs and restrictions much more than we will. The U.S. should be the biggest winner under the expanded GATT, and the agreement should give our economy a boost.

Lower trade barriers and tariffs will save U.S. consumers money and also create jobs through more exports and new investment. The Council of Economic Advisors estimates that within a decade GATT will boost U.S. economic output by $100–200 billion a year. GATT should directly benefit many Hoosier workers. Indiana manufacturers will see a 33% reduction in tariffs on their products. Distillers will benefit from lower tariffs on U.S. spirits, and copyright protections will outlaw counterfeit foreign products. According to the Indiana Farm Bureau, Hoosier farmers can expect an additional $1.05 billion in income from GATT over ten years. Overall, GATT could add $1,700 to the annual income of the average U.S. family within a decade.

BUDGET CONCERNS

Because the U.S. has agreed to reduce its tariffs by an average of 1.6%, certain federal revenues will decrease. The Congressional Budget Office estimates this loss will be $11.9 billion over the next five years. To offset it, the package approved by Congress cuts spending in a number of programs, charges fees for certain customs services and broadcast licenses, and closes some tax loopholes.

More importantly, GATT's impact on the economy—new jobs and more exports—should create new federal income tax revenue that greatly exceeds any reduction in tariff revenue. GATT-related economic activity is estimated to reduce the federal deficit by some $60 billion over the next ten years. GATT is fiscally responsible.

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

At the direction of Congress in 1988, U.S. negotiators sought a stronger enforcement mechanism against unfair trade practices. Under the new agreement, the World Trade Organization [WTO] would replace the informal negotiating group that has existed for almost fifty years. In the past, a country with unfair trade practices could refuse to obey a ruling and not lose benefits. Now, unfair traders have to obey the rulings or face still consequences.

The WTO would issue rulings on trade disputes concerning goods, services, and intellectual property. For example, Canada could file a complaint against Japan for unfairly restricting Canadian wheat imports. If the WTO agreed with Canada, and Japan refused to change its practices, Japan would have to pay compensation or be subject to Canadian trade penalties.

SOVEREIGNTY

Many Hoosiers believe that any international trade council should not infringe on U.S. sovereignty. I strongly agree, and I worked hard to include strict safeguards in the package to protect our sovereignty.

First, GATT will continue to make nearly all decisions by consensus—there has not been a vote in more than thirty years. Second, the WTO cannot change any U.S. laws or policies. Only Congress and the President can do that, and no WTO ruling has any standing in U.S. courts. Third, we can withdraw from the WTO at any time or pass legislation overriding any part of GATT. With my support, Congress and the President also agreed to create a special U.S. panel to review WTO decisions. If this panel identifies three unfavorable WTO rulings, any Member of Congress can demand an immediate vote on withdrawing from the WTO. Finally, the United States has the world's largest market and most powerful economy. Other countries are not likely to impose trade sanctions in WTO disputes for fear of getting into a trade war with the U.S.

CONSEQUENCES OF REJECTION

Failure by the U.S. to ratify the agreement would have meant an enormous missed opportunity and an abdication of our international leadership. The U.S. dominated the negotiations: how could other countries have confidence in us if we failed to approve an agreement so beneficial to our interests? Without this agreement, countries would erect new trade barriers, and protectionism would rise. All of our economies would suffer. Democratic reforms would slow, shaky financial markets could boost interest rates, and world stability—so closely tied to economic cooperation—could be undermined.

Of course, GATT is not perfect. As a trade agreement it does not directly address important concerns such as child labor or political freedom, but GATT does increase the incentives for other countries to cooperate with us on these issues. Overall compliance of other countries with GATT will have to be closely monitored.

CONCLUSION

GATT should mean more secure, high-paying jobs for Hoosiers and a better standard of living. The U.S. cannot afford to pass up the economic benefits of GATT. The WTO should be a strong advocate for U.S. interests while protecting our sovereignty, and free and fair trade will continue to promote peace and prosperity around the globe.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE ALASKA NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1971

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 at the request of Cook Inlet Region, Inc. [CIRI].

Congress enacted the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act [ANCSA] in 1971 to address claims to lands in Alaska by its Eskimo, Indian, and Aleut native people. Lands and other benefits transferred to Alaska Natives under the act were conveyed to corporations formed under the act. Alaska Natives enrolled to these corporations were issued shares in the corporation. CIRI is one of the corporations formed under ANCSA and has approximately 6,262 Alaska Natives enrolled, each of whom were issued 100 shares of stock in CIRI, as required under ANCSA.

ANCSA stock, unlike most corporate stock, cannot be sold, transferred, or pledged by the owners of the shares. Rather, transfers can only happen through inheritance, or in limited case, by court decree. The ANCSA provisions restricting the sale of stock were put in place to protect Native shareholders from knowledgeable or unscrupulous transactions, and to allow the corporation to grow and mature in order to provide long-lasting benefits to its shareholder.

The drafters of ANCSA initially believed that a period of 20 years would be a sufficient amount of time for the restrictions on sale to remain in place. Therefore, the restrictions were to expire 20 years after passage of ANCSA on December 31, 1991.

As 1991 approached, bringing with it the impending change in the alienability of Native stock, the Alaska Native community grew concerned about the effect of the potential sale of Native stock. The Alaska Federation of Natives, a statewide organization representing the State's 90,000 natives, spearheaded a legislative initiative to address the 1991 stock sale issue. Many of the Native corporations, including CIRI, actively solicited their shareholders' view on this critical matter, through meetings, questionnaires, polling, and formal votes. In 1987, 3 years prior to the 1991 restriction-lifting date, Congress enacted legislation which reformed the mechanism governing stock sale restrictions in a fundamental way under the 1987 amendments, instead of expiring automatically in 1991, the restrictions on alienability continue automatically unless and until the shareholders of a Native corporation vote to remove them. The 1987 amendments provide several procedural mechanisms to

bring such a vote, including action by the board of directors and petitions by shareholder.

To date, no Native corporation has sought to life the alienability restrictions. Fundamentally, this is because Native shareholders continue to value Native ownership of the corporations and Native control of the lands and other assets held by them.

CIRI has conducted a number of continuing surveys, focus groups, and special shareholder meetings to ascertain the views of its shareholders regarding the alienation restrictions on CIRI stock. Two results have consistently stood out in these assessments.

First, the majority of CIRI shareholders favor maintaining Native ownership and control of CIRI. These shareholders, whose numbers consistently register at the 70 to 80 percent level, see economic benefits in the continuation of Native ownership, and also value the important cultural goals, values and activities of their ANCSA corporation.

Second, a significant percentage, albeit a minority of shareholders, favor assessing some, or all, of the value of their CIRI stock through the sale of that stock. These shareholders include, but, are not limited to elderly shareholders who have real current needs, yet doubt that sale of stock will be available to them in their lifetime: holders of small, fractional shares received through one or more cycles of inheritance; non-Natives who have acquired stock through inheritance but without attendant voting privileges; and shareholders who have few ties to the corporation or to Alaska, 25 percent of CIRI shareholders live outside of Alaska.

Under current law, these two legitimate but conflicting concerns cannot be addressed, because lifting restrictions on the sale of stock is an all or nothing proposition. In order to allow the minority of shareholders to exercise their desire to sell some or all of their stock, the majority of shareholders would have to sacrifice their important desire to maintain Native control and ownership to CIRI.

CIRI believes this conflict will eventually leave the interests of the majority of its shareholders vulnerable to political instability. In addition, CIRI recognizes that responding to the desire of those shareholders who wish to sell CIRI stock is a legitimate corporate responsibility. More importantly, CIRI believes that there is a way to address the needs and desires of both groups of shareholders, those who wish to sell stock and those who desire to maintain Native ownership of CIRI, so that the sale of stock will not compromise the ''nativeness'' of the company, and will not jeopardize the economic future of the company for those who choose not to sell. The method embodied in this legislation is one that other companies routinely use: the buying back of its own stock. The newly acquired stock would then be canceled.

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this bill at length with CIRI and I am convinced this is the best and only option available for their shareholders to voluntarily sell their stock back to CIRI. It is identical to that which passed the House last session and I hope it will move as expeditiously as possible.

INTRODUCTION OF HEALTH INSURANCE DEDUCTION FOR SELF-EMPLOYED BUSINESS OWNERS

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, prior to December 1993, self-employed business owners were allowed to deduct 25 percent of the cost of their health insurance and this deduction has expired. I am introducing legislation that will make the cost of health insurance deductible for self-employed business owners.

The purpose of this legislation is to restore and to make permanent the 25 percent deduction and to gradually increase the deduction to 100 percent. The bill phases in the 100 percent deduction over a period of 4 years. For calendar years 1994 and 1995, health insurance would be 25 percent deductible; in 1996 and 1997 it would become 50 percent deductible; and in 1996 and thereafter health insurance would become 100 percent deductible. Increasing the deduction to 100 percent would provide small businesses with an incentive to provide expanded health insurance coverage. Also, corporations are permitted to deduct 100 percent of the cost of providing health care insurance.

One of the major problems facing small businesses is the high cost of health insurance. Increasing the deduction would allow business owners to spend more on health care. This legislation provides businesses with an incentive to purchase health care insurance.

Congress can immediately begin to reduce the cost of health care coverage by extending the 25-percent deduction for self-employed individuals' health insurance. The high cost of health care insurance is one of the impediments to health care access. I urge you to support this legislation.

CAMINO REAL CORRIDOR AND COMMISSION

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to re-introduce legislation to create the Camino Real Corridor and Commission. I introduced this bill during the previous session, and I continue to believe that the passage of this legislation is indispensable to the goals of facilitating national trade and growth in the coming years.

While the passage of the North American Free-Trade Agreement will no doubt affect the entire Nation, perhaps no area will witness greater changes than the Southwestern region along the Mexican border. Not only will the area continue to experience the benefits of increasing international economic integration, but it will also be profoundly impacted by the large influx of traffic that is the necessary byproduct of expanding trade. The district which I represent, El Paso, TX, has an infrastructure system that will be among the hardest hit by the increasing levels of commerce between the United States and Mexico.

El Paso is one of the most important border crossings in the world. Over $12 billion in trade passes over the El Paso-Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua border each year; 18 percent of United States exports to and 25 percent of United States imports from Mexico pass through this trans-border metropolitan region. Furthermore, it is the busiest point of entry for commercial trucks. In light of the fact that the trade volume transported through this port of entry is projected to nearly double by the year 2000, and that the population of the El Paso area is one of the fastest-growing in the Nation, the highways and border infrastructure of this area warrant our particular attention.

But we must bear in mind that El Paso is only one point on a trade route that extends from the Mexican State of Chihuahua into the interior portion of the United States. A natural trade corridor is emerging from the Mexican border State of Chihuahua to Denver through El Paso and New Mexico. The Mexican Government has already demonstrated its commitment to the region, with the construction of a new highway system that extends to the State of Chihuahua through several of Mexico's largest cities in the industrialized north—a highway over 600 miles long. On the U.S. side, the emerging corridor bears great resemblance to the highway systems designated by section 1105c of the 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act as ''corridors of national significance''. Like those highway systems, the highway system from El Paso to Denver has undergone a great increase in use, particularly in the form of commercial traffic, since the designation of the Federal Interstate System. This trend will be amplified in the next decade, as trade and population growth continue to soar in the region.

Therefore, today I am re-introducing legislation to create the Camino Real Corridor. As I noted previously, the historical reference herein recognizes the importance of this trade route to the development of the Southwest. The Camino Real de la Tierra Adentro, the Royal Highway of the Interior Lands, was the route traveled by people from Mexico City to Santa Fe. The modern corridor would be achieved through the enhancement of the trade route that today connects El Paso to Albuquerque to Denver, and of the border arterials that feed into this route. The improvements in infrastructure along this route would include the use of intelligence vehicle highway systems where appropriate. Thus, information, communications, and control technologies will be applied to improve the efficiency of this surface transportation system. These changes would guarantee that the roads which carry goods between Mexico and the interior portions of the United States could handle the heavy flow of traffic that is anticipated in the upcoming decades. Further, Denver is at the crossroads to the West and Midwest, and positioned to develop north to Canada.

Unfortunately, good roads alone cannot guarantee the efficient cross-border passage of people, goods, and capital. Indeed, many of the current delays in United States-Mexico trade occur at the border. So to ensure the smooth operation of the corridor system, I have also proposed the creation of the Camino Real Corridor Commission. This Commission would report to the Secretary of Transportation, and would be responsible for making recommendations to maximize effective utilization of the highways and border

crossings of the corridor. It would also ensure the development of more efficient trade routes. One year after its formation, this Commission would make recommendations to the Secretary of Transportation indicating the most desirable routes for East-West expansion of the corridor, and for possible expansion of the corridor to the Canadian border.

We should not wait until our borders and our trade routes are completely overwhelmed to take decisive action. Rather, our infrastructure and our border enforcement agencies should keep pace with growing trade levels, and with the realities of increasing international interdependence.

The Camino Real Corridor is clearly the best place to start, but it need not be an end point. This project ought to serve as a model for future initiatives in other major border cities. It will also serve as a starting point for an important highway network that will connect Mexico with the interior United States, and possibly with Canada.

I recognize that we are operating in a political climate where it is more popular to criticize than to create, and much easier to deconstruct than to construct. But it is important to recognize that one of the fundamental roles of the Federal Government has always been the funding and oversight of interstate projects that are central to national growth and prosperity. The creation of the Camino Real Corridor is such a project, and consequently, it deserves support.

REPEAL THE ''MOTOR VOTER'' BILL

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1993, President Clinton signed into law a $200 million unfunded Federal mandate called ''The National Voter Registration Act of 1993.'' I am today introducing a bill to repeal it.

This law, commonly referred to as the ''motor voter'' bill, tramples on States rights by requiring them to implement a law that allows people to register to vote by mail, or when they apply for a driver's license, or welfare. Proponents of the measure argued that this was the answer to voter apathy. They reasoned that by making voter registration easier, voter turnout would increase. However, there is little, if any, evidence to validate this contention. In fact, over the past three decades, voter registration requirements have grown easier and easier, yet voter turnout has actually decreased over the same time period.

Moreover, by easing registration requirements, and not providing the States with the funds necessary to keep their registration lists up-to-date and clean, the motor voter bill will most likely increase election fraud.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Congress should not be legislating in this area. The States know best how to develop voter registration programs in their own jurisdictions with the least cost and chance of fraud and abuse. It is senseless to undermine their voter registration programs by requiring them to comply with a nationalized costly mandate.

Our new congressional leaders have pledged to make it tougher for the Federal Government to place unfunded Federal mandates on the States. The bill I am proposing today is in step with the pledge, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

NATIONAL FIREARMS POLICY COMMISSION ACT

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, during the 103d Congress, I introduced H.R. 4423, the ''National Firearms Policy Commission Act,'' legislation that will bring the President, Members of Congress, Justices of the Supreme Court, gun ownership advocacy groups, law enforcement groups, and private citizens together to exchange their views on Federal firearms policy so that a consensus on Federal policy can be reached. I rise today to reintroduce this legislation, and I invite all of my colleagues to become cosponsors of this important bill.

In the 103d session alone, Congress passed two of the most sweeping firearms policy bills in the history of this country: the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban. From the introduction of those bills to the final vote, America came to see just how large the gap between both sides of the gun control debate is. And yet despite all the debate on these two pivotal pieces of legislation, it has become even clearer that each side's views are only being further entrenched, not altered through pragmatic discussion that will ensure that each side is heard. My bill will promote that type of pragmatic discussion.

Specifically, this legislation will establish a 39-member Commission, which will include the following parties: the U.S. Attorney General, five Members of the House, five Senators, three Supreme Court Justices, five private citizens appointed by the President, five private citizens appointed by the Senate, five private citizens appointed by the House, five members representing gun ownership advocacy groups, and five representatives from law enforcement. The chairman of the Commission will have 6 months to transmit its recommendations to the President and Congress. Aside from travel expenses, members of the Commission will serve without pay. The Commission will, however, be authorized to hire and pay its own staff and staff from other Federal agencies.

For the past 10 years, Congress has been caught in the middle of a tug of war between law enforcement and the NRA. As a result, Congress has been unable to develop a real consensus on how to address violent crime and firearms policy. The goal of the Commission I have proposed is to forge a consensus on these issues and present to Congress and the President a list of legislative initiatives that can be adopted with bipartisan support.

Let us bring rational dialogue to Federal firearms policy. Please cosponsor this important legislative initiative.

TRADE AND JOB SECURITY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, December 21, 1994 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

TRADE AND JOB SECURITY

America's middle-class workers are increasingly frustrated and concerned about their economic future. They are working harder and longer than ever but their income is just not growing. Many are concerned about their job security and worry that their job could be the next to be eliminated. One third of those recently polled said they are worse off than they expected to be at this age, and close to two thirds said they do not expect their children to do as well as they have done. Too many individuals believe the American dream is simply beyond their reach.

It used to be that if workers were conscientious and performed their jobs well they could expect to advance and prosper in the years ahead. Today, however, many workers—both blue collar and white collar—face an uncertain future. They may encounter foreign competition, corporate downsizing, automation, or the increased use of computers. In a recent survey, three out of four employers said that their own employees fear losing their jobs. As the Secretary of Labor puts it, the middle class has become the anxious class.

EXPANDING TRADE

One of their biggest concerns is foreign competition created by the dynamic global marketplace. Congress and all recent Presidents have taken steps to expand U.S. trade opportunities. Since the late 1970s, several bilateral and multilateral agreements have been approved, including the Tokyo Round expansion of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement, the North America Free Trade Agreement, and the new GATT agreements that create, among other things, the World Trade Organization. Next might be free trade agreements with Chile and other countries in the Western Hemisphere.

On balance, I think expanded trade is a plus for American workers. Trade now accounts for a large share of U.S. economic growth, and it means expanded sales for U.S. businesses. The recently approved expansion of GATT, for example, will provide stable rules for trade and remove restrictions that limit sales of our goods and services abroad. The Council of Economic Advisors estimates that GATT will boost U.S. economic output $100–200 billion within ten years.

At the same time I recognize that expanded trade is a threat to some U.S. workers. Trade may generate more U.S. jobs than it eliminates, but it does put some Americans out of work. While the President talks about the millions of good paying jobs created by free trade, many middle-class workers believe the benefits of trade go to a few talented, well-educated professionals and executives while they fall behind.

STEPS NEEDED

The remedy is not to simply close our markets to trade. We are one of the most competitive countries in the world and many U.S. jobs are already tied to exports and trade. But we do need to take several steps to improve our ability to deal with this changing environment and reduce job insecurity for many Americans.

First, we must continue to reduce the federal budget deficit. Keeping the deficit down means less borrowing by the government, thus freeing up funds at lower interest rates for businesses to invest. That should boost the economy and spur job creation. We need to make sure that the U.S. economy continues to generate more jobs than are lost to foreign competition.

Second, we must reassess the more than 150 federal job training and retraining programs to see which ones work and which ones don't. Some should be expanded, others simply dropped. We should accelerate our efforts to create ''reemployment centers'' and put more of the resources into the hands of ordinary Americans rather than government agencies, so people can get the skills they need in a way that makes sense for them. We need a better safety net for individuals and communities experiencing the downside of open trade.

Third, we must encourage companies to spend more of their profits to continually upgrade the skills of their workers and to retrain workers whose jobs have been lost through trade or technology. U.S. firms generally invest less in worker training than firms abroad, and what they do invest is more heavily concentrated on professional and managerial workers. Skilled workers and important assets, and businesses need to invest more in their development.

Fourth, federal policies should help important industries threatened by foreign competition. Federal research and development grants, tax policy, and deregulation all can help strengthen important U.S. industries and make them more competitive in the global market. We also need to expand the federal manufacturing extension program, which helps small companies adopt the latest production techniques.

Fifth, we must not allow other countries to use the open markets provided by the trade agreements to unfairly harm our industries. We must vigorously prosecute dumping and other unfair trade practices. If a surge of imports is displacing our workers, GATT allows us to take steps to limit those imports. At the same time, we must vigorously pursue our rights in cases where foreign practices restrict our exports. We must make sure that trade agreements mean a level playing field that promotes U.S. exports.

Finally, we must have accurate data about the impact of more open trade on U.S. jobs. Many economists believe that government trade statistics underestimate U.S. exports by some 10%, for a variety of technical reasons. If so, estimates of jobs created by exports are also underestimated. We also need better data on identifying industries hurt by imports.

CONCLUSION

Overall, we must pursue policies which promote economic growth, help strengthen U.S. companies, continually upgrade the skills of our workers, and find new markets for our products abroad. Our number one priority is jobs—good and secure jobs. Our challenge is to promote broad participation by our workforce in this changing environment so that anxious workers can become assured, productive, capable Americans. Improving Americans' job security must be among our highest priorities in the upcoming session of Congress.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION CONCERNING ALASKA NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1971

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 at the request of the Alaska Federation of Natives. This bill is the result of the work of the Legislative Council of the Alaska Federation of Natives to correct existing technical problems with the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act [ANCSA] and the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act [ANILCA]. I am introducing an identical version of that which passed the House during the 103d Congress. It is my intention to move this bill early this year based on agreements reached last year.

This bill makes a number of technical changes to ANCSA and ANILCA. It also makes a number of substantive additions which address issues not anticipated at the time of passage of ANCSA. Because of Alaska's relative youth as a State of the Union and the unprecedented amount of Alaska-specific Federal legislation passed since statehood, it is imperative that we respond to occasional oversights and/or quirks in the overlapping laws to ensure that unintended consequences do not occur. This effort is designed to rectify such instances.

The legislation is designed to resolve specific problems. To offer a flavor of the nature of the legislation, a few illustrations are in order.

For example, the bill would make it possible for the Caswell and Montana Creek Native groups to receive approximately 11,520 acres of land pursuant to a February 3, 1976, agreement and subsequent March 26, 1992, letter of agreement with Cook Inlet Region Inc. [CIRI]. This will fulfill their land entitlement from CIRI under the ANCSA.

Another provision would relieve ANCSA corporations of liability for hazardous wastes or contaminants left in, or on, ANCSA lands prior to their conveyance to Native corporations. It also directs the Secretary of the Interior to remove all contaminants left by the United States, an agent of the United States, or lessees prior to conveyance of these lands to the Native corporations. In some instances, the Government has conveyed lands and property interests to Alaska Natives which have been rendered valueless because of such contamination. It was clearly not the intention of ANCSA to extinguish Native claims by conveying contaminated property to recipients.

The Chugach Alaska Kageet Point land selection provision would allow Chugach Alaska Native Corp. to select a specific tract of land at the edge of its own current boundaries.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the spirit of cooperation which was reached last year will continue so we can move this noncontroversial piece of legislation early in this session.

COMPREHENSIVE PREVENTIVE HEALTH AND PROMOTION ACT OF 1995, H.R. 23

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce H.R. 23, legislation which will help produce a healthier nation. This measure will cover individuals for periodic health exams, as well as counseling and immunizations.

The Comprehensive Preventive Health and Promotion Act of 1995 will direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services [HHS] to establish a schedule of preventive health care services and to provide for coverage of these services under private health insurance plans and health benefit programs of the Federal Government.

More specifically, the Secretary of HHS, in consultation with representatives of the major health care groups, will establish a schedule of recommended preventive health care services. The list of preventive services will follow the guidelines published in the ''Guide to Clinical Preventive Services'' and the ''Year 2000 Health Objectives.'' The preventive services will cover periodic health exams, health screening, counseling, immunizations, and health promotion. These services will be specified for males and females, and specific age groups.

Additionally, HHS will publish and disseminate information on the benefits of practicing preventive health care, the importance of undergoing periodic health examinations, and the need to establish and maintain a family medical history to businesses, providers of health care services, and other appropriate groups and individuals.

Moreover, prevention and health promotion workshops will be established for corporations and businesses, as well as for the Federal Government. A wellness program will be established to make grants over a 5-year period to 300 eligible employers to establish and conduct on-site workshops on health care promotion for employees. The wellness workshops can include: Counseling on nutrition and weight management, clinical sessions on avoiding back injury, programs on smoking cessation, and information on stress management.

Finally, my legislation directs HHS to set up a demonstration project which will go to 50 counties over a 5-year period to provide preventive health care services at health clinics. This program will cover preventive health care services for all children, and adults under a certain income level. If above the determined income level, fees will be based on a sliding scale. Additionally, the project will entail both urban and rural areas in different regions of our Nation to educate the public on the benefits of practicing preventive health care, the need for periodic health exams, and the need for establishing a medical history, as well as providing services.

Mr. Speaker, we can all agree that our current health care system needs to be improved, and our Nation needs to become healthier. Experts have concluded that practicing preventive health care does work, and will produce a healthier nation. Although there is a

consensus on the benefits of practicing preventive health care, only approximately 20 percent of health insurance companies offer coverage for periodic health exams.

The Comprehensive Preventive Health and Promotion Act of 1995 has all the necessary ingredients that will be needed in a national health care plan, and will be applicable to that plan.

Accordingly, to all my colleagues who share my concern regarding the importance of producing a healthier nation, I invite and urge you to cosponsor this measure, sending a clear message to our Nation's citizens that Congress is taking steps to improve our Nation's health care system.

At this point I request that the full text of my bill be inserted in the RECORD for review by my colleagues:

H.R. 23

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Comprehensive Preventive Health and Promotion Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF SCHEDULE OF PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE SERVICES.

(a) INITIAL SCHEDULE.—

(1) PROPOSED SCHEDULE.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with representatives of individuals described in subsection (d), shall establish a proposed initial schedule of recommended preventive health care services. In accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, the Secretary shall publish such proposed schedule in the Federal Register and provide for a 90-day period for receiving public comment on the schedule.

(2) FINAL SCHEDULE.—The proposed schedule of recommended preventive health care services established under paragraph (1) shall become effective for the first calendar year that begins 90 or more days after the expiration of the period for receiving public comment described in paragraph (1).

(b) ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT.—Not later than October 1 of every year (beginning with the first year for which the schedule established under subsection (a) is in effect), the Secretary, in consultation with representatives of individuals described in subsection (d) and in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, may revise the schedule of preventive health care services established under this section for the following calendar year.

(c) USE OF SOURCES FOR ESTABLISHING SCHEDULE.—In establishing the initial schedule of recommended preventive health care services under subsection (a) and in revising the schedule for subsequent years under subsection (b), the Secretary shall take into consideration the recommendations for preventive health care services contained in the Guide to Clinical Preventive Services presented to the Department of Health and Human Services by the United States Preventive Services Task Force and the Year 2000 Health Objectives of the United States Public Health Service.

(d) INDIVIDUALS SERVING AS CONSULTANTS.—The individuals described in this subsection are as follows:

(1) Hospital administrators.
(2) Administrators of health benefit plans.
(3) General practice physicians.
(4) Mental health practitioners.
(5) Pediatricians.
(6) Chiropractors.
(7) Physicians practicing in medical specialty areas.
(8) Nutritionists.
(9) Nurses.
(10) Experts in scientific research.
(11) Dentists.
(12) Representatives of manufacturers of prescription drugs.
(13) Health educators.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUALS ENROLLED IN PRIVATE HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR CARRIERS AND PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each carrier and employer health benefit plan shall include in the services covered for each individual enrolled with the carrier or plan the preventive health care services applicable to the individual under the schedule of preventive health care services established under section 2.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(A) The term ''carrier'' means any entity which provides health insurance or health benefits in a State, and includes a licensed insurance company, a prepaid hospital or medical service plan, a health maintenance organization, the plan sponsor of a multiple employer welfare arrangement or an employee benefit plan (as defined under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974), or any other entity providing a plan of health insurance subject to State insurance regulation, but such term does not include for purposes of section 103 an entity that provides health insurance or health benefits under a multiple employer welfare arrangement.

(B)(i) Subject to clause (ii), the term ''employer health benefit plan'' means a health benefit plan (including an employee welfare benefit plan, as defined in section 3(1) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974) which is offered to employees through an employer and for which the employer provides for any contribution to such plan or any premium for such plan are deducted by the employer from compensation to the employee.

(ii) A State may provide (for a plan in a State) that the term ''employer health benefit plan'' does not include an association plan (as defined in clause (iii)).

(iii) For purposes of clause (ii), the term ''association plan'' means a health benefit plan offered by an organization to its members if the organization was formed other than for purposes of purchasing insurance.

(C) The term ''full-time employee'' means, with respect to an employer, an individual who normally is employed for at least 30 hours per week by the employer.

(D) The term ''health benefit plan'' means any hospital or medical expense incurred policy or certificate, hospital or medical service plan contract, or health maintenance subscriber contract, or a multiple employer welfare arrangement or employee benefit plan (as defined under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974) which provides benefits with respect to health care services, but does not include—

(i) coverage only for accident, dental, vision, disability income, or long-term care insurance, or any combination thereof,

(ii) medicare supplemental health insurance,

(iii) coverage issued as a supplement to liability insurance,

(iv) worker's compensation or similar insurance, or

(v) automobile medical-payment insurance, or any combination thereof.

(E) The term ''small employer carrier'' means a carrier with respect to the issuance of an employer health benefit plan which provides coverage to one or more full-time employees of an entity actively engaged in business which, on at least 50 percent of its working days during the preceding year, employed at least 2, but fewer than 36, full-time employees. For purposes of determining if an employer is a small employer, rules similar to the rules of subsection (b) and (c) of section 414 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall apply.

(b) ENFORCEMENT THROUGH EXCISE TAX.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 43 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to qualified pension, etc., plans) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

''SEC. 4980C. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH EMPLOYER HEALTH BENEFIT PLAN STANDARDS REGARDING PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE.

''(a) IMPOSITION OF TAX.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby imposed a tax on the failure of a carrier or an employer health benefit plan to comply with section 3(a)(1) of the Comprehensive Preventive Health and Promotion Act of 199.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a failure by a small employer carrier or plan in a State if the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that the State has in effect a regulatory enforcement mechanism that provides adequate sanctions with respect to such a failure by such a carrier or of such a plan.

''(b) AMOUNT OF TAX.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be an amount not to exceed 25 percent of the amounts received by the carrier or under the plan for coverage during the period such failure persists.

''(2) LIMITATION IN CASE OF INDIVIDUAL FAILURES.—In the case of a failure that only relates to specified individuals or employers (and not to the plan generally), the amount of the tax imposed by subsection (a) shall not exceed the aggregate of $100 for each day during which such failure persists for each individual to which such failure persists for each individual to which such failure relates. A rule similar to the rule of section 4980B(b)(3) shall apply for purposes of this section.

''(c) LIABILITY FOR TAX.—The tax imposed by this section shall be paid by the carrier.

''(d) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(1) CORRECTIONS WITHIN 30 DAYS.—No tax shall be imposed by subsection (a) by reason of any failure if—

''(A) such failure was due to reasonable cause and not to willful neglect, and

''(B) such failure is corrected within the 30-day period beginning on earliest date the carrier knew, or exercising reasonable diligence would have known, that such failure existed.

''(2) WAIVER BY SECRETARY.—In the case of a failure which is due to reasonable cause and not to willful neglect, the Secretary may waive part or all of the tax imposed by subsection (a) to the extent that payment of such tax would be excessive relative to the failure involved.

''(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the terms 'carrier', 'employer health benefit plan', and 'small employer carrier' have the respective meanings given such terms in section 3(a)(2) of the Comprehensive Preventive Health and Promotion Act of 1995.''

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 43 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new items:

''Sec. 4980C. Failure to comply with employer health plan standards regarding preventive health care.''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to plan years beginning after December 31, 1995.

SEC. 4. COVERAGE OF PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE SERVICES UNDER MEDICARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1861(s)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(s)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (O);

(2) by striking the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (P) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(Q) in the case of an individual, services applicable to the individual under the schedule of preventive health care services established under the Comprehensive Preventive Health and Promotion Act of 1995 (to the extent such services are not otherwise covered with respect to the individual under this title);''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1862(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395y(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''and'' at the end,

(B) in subparagraph (F), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting '', and'', and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(G) in the case of items or services described in section 1861(s)(2)(Q), which are not provided in accordance with the schedule of preventive health care services established under the Comprehensive Preventive Health and Promotion Act of 1995;''; and

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking ''paragraph (1)(B) or under paragraph (1)(F)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (B), (F), or (G) of paragraph (1)''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to services furnished on or after January 1, 1995.

SEC. 5. COVERAGE UNDER STATE MEDICAID PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) INCLUSION IN MEDICAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 1905(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (21);

(B) in paragraph (24), by striking the comma at the end and inserting semicolon;

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (22), (23), and (24) as paragraphs (25), (22), and (23), respectively, and by transferring and inserting paragraph (25) after paragraph (23), as so redesignated; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (23) the following new paragraph:

''(24) services applicable to the individual under the schedule of preventive health care services established under the Comprehensive Preventive Health and Promotion Act of 1995 (to the extent such services are not otherwise covered with respect to the individual under the State plan under this title); and''.

(2) COVERAGE MADE MANDATORY.—(A) Section 1902(a)(10)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)(A) is amended by striking ''(17) and (21)'' and inserting ''(17), (21), and (24)''.

(B) Section 1902(a)(10(C)(iv) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)(C)(iv)) is amended—

(i) by striking ''(5) and (17)'' and inserting ''(5), (17), and (24)''; and

(ii) by striking ''through (21)'' and inserting ''through (24)''.

(C) Section 1902(j) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(j)) is amended by striking ''through (22)'' and inserting ''through (24)''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to calendar quarters beginning on or after January 1, 1995, without regard to whether or not final regulations to carry out such amendments have been promulgated by such date.

(2) In the case of a State plan for medical assistance under title XIX of the Social Security Act which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b), the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such title solely on the basis of its failure to meet these additional requirements before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of such session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

SEC. 6. COVERAGE OF PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE SERVICES FOR VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1701(6) of title 38, United States Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) with respect to any veteran, any preventive care services applicable under the schedule of preventive health care services established under the Comprehensive Preventive Health and Promotion Act of 1995, to the extent such services are not otherwise treated as medical services under this paragraph.''.

(b) PROVIDING SERVICES IN OUTPATIENT SETTING.—Section 1712(a)(5)(A) of such title is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: '', or any other medical services applicable to the veteran under the schedule of preventive health care services established under the Comprehensive Preventive Health and Promotion Act of 1995.''; and

(2) in the second sentence, by inserting after ''admission'' the following: ''or any services applicable to the veteran under the schedule of preventive health care services established under the Comprehensive Preventive Health and Promotion Act of 1995 (other than services applicable under such schedule that are reasonably necessary in preparation for hospital admission)''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to services furnished on or after January 1, 1995.

SEC. 7. COVERAGE OF PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE SERVICES UNDER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFIT PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 8904(a) of title 5, United States Code, are each amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(G) With respect to an individual, any preventive health care services applicable to the individual under the schedule of preventive health care services established under the Comprehensive Preventive Health and Promotion Act of 1995.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to services furnished on or after January 1, 1995.

SEC. 8. COVERAGE OF PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE SERVICES FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

(a) PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE SERVICES INCLUDED IN AUTHORIZED CARE.—Section 1077(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(13) Any preventive care services applicable under the schedule of preventive health care services established under the Comprehensive Preventive Health and Promotion Act of 1995, to the extent such services are not otherwise authorized as health care services under this subsection.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (13) of section 1077(a) of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), shall apply with respect to health care services furnished on or after January 1, 1995, to dependents of members or former members of the uniformed services authorized to receive such services.

SEC. 9. PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a demonstration project to demonstrate the effectiveness in providing preventive health care services in improving the health of individuals and reducing the aggregate costs of providing health care, under which the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(1) make grants over a 5-year period to 50 eligible counties to assist the counties in providing preventive health care services (in accordance with subsection (b)) to individuals who would otherwise be unable to pay (or have payment made on their behalf) for such services;

(2) conduct the study described in subsection (c); and

(3) carry out the educational program described in subsection (d).

(b) GRANTS TO COUNTIES.—

(1) SERVICES DESCRIBED.—A county receiving a grant under subsection (a)(1) shall provide preventive health care services to individuals at clinics in accordance with the schedule of preventive health care services established under the Comprehensive Preventive Health and Promotion Act of 1995, except that—

(A) the county may furnish services to individuals residing in rural areas at locations other than clinics if no clinics that are able to provide such services are located in the area; and

(B) the Secretary may revise the schedule of services otherwise required to be provided to take into account the special needs of a participating county.

(2) ELIGIBILITY OF COUNTIES.—A county is eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a)(1) if it submits to the Secretary, at such time and in such form as the Secretary may require, an application containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

(3) GEOGRAPHIC BALANCE AMONG COUNTIES SELECTED.—In selecting counties to receive grants under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall consider the need to select counties representing urban, rural, and suburban areas and counties representing various geographic regions of the United States.

(c) STUDY OF STATE PREVENTIVE CARE REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the requirements regarding preventive health care services that are imposed by each State on health benefit plans offered to individuals residing in the State.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(d) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with experts in preventive medicine and representatives of providers of health care services, shall publish and disseminate information on

the benefits of practicing preventive health care, the importance of undergoing periodic health examinations, and the need to establish and maintain a family medical history to businesses, providers of health care services, and other appropriate groups and individuals.

(e) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''State'' means each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 10. PROGRAMS TO ESTABLISH ON-SITE WORKSHOPS ON HEALTH PROMOTION.

(a) GRANTS TO BUSINESSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish a program under which the Secretary shall make grants over a 5-year period to 300 eligible employers to establish and conduct on-site workshops on health care promotion for employees.

(2) ELIGIBILITY.—An employer is eligible to receive a grant under paragraph (1) if the employer submits an application (at such time and in such form as the Secretary may require) containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require, including assurances that the employer shall use funds received under the grant only to provide services that the employer does not otherwise provide (either directly or through a carrier) to its employees.

(3) INFORMATION AND SERVICES PROVIDED.—On-site workshops on health care promotion conducted with grants received under paragraph (1) shall include the presentation of such information and the provision of such services as the Secretary considers appropriate, including counseling on nutrition and weight management, clinical sessions on avoiding back injury, programs on smoking cessation, and information on stress management.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAMS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—The Secretary of Labor shall establish a program under which the Secretary shall conduct on-site workshops on health care promotion for employees of the Federal Government, and shall include in such workshops the presentation of such information and the provision of such services as the Secretary (in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services) considers appropriate, including counseling on nutrition and weight management, clinical sessions on avoiding back injury, programs on smoking cessation, and information on stress management.

CLEANING UP THE CLEAN AIR ACT

HON. JAY KIM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a very important piece of legislation which will help rectify a severely unfair application of the Clean Air Act. This bill, which was blocked by the then-majority Democrats in the 103d Congress, will provide my home State of California with the flexibility every other State in our Union currently enjoys. Specifically, this bill will direct the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] to withhold the enactment of its Federal implementation plan [FIP], as ordered by the courts, until such time as it has an opportunity to review California's State implementation plan [SIP].

We all want clean air—especially in California. Thus, my intentions are not to weaken clean air standards—and this legislation does not do so. Rather, it helps attain those standards within the context of full support for the principles of States rights. I do not believe the EPA, a Federal bureaucracy, has any right to completely dismantle those principles, even if the courts appear to be the real culprits in this game of high stakes chess. No longer can the Federal Government blindly push States into complying with laws which are not suited for their particular situations or problems.

It is with that in mind that I call on my fellow colleagues to join in protecting the principles upon which this Nation was built. For those of my colleagues who do not represent the State of California, I remind them that this type of precedent could have equally devastating consequences in States such as Texas, Ohio, Virginia, and any others that do not meet the stringently set path that the big brother EPA dictates. Let us make it clear to all Americans that we, the Republican majority, will not stand idly by while the rights of our States are so easily swept aside.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that committee and floor action can be taken expeditiously as this is a very time sensitive issue.

LINE-ITEM VETO LEGISLATION

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to propose an amendment to the Constitution giving the President line-item veto authority. This legislation is identical to the line-item veto bill I introduced last Congress.

In years past, the leadership of this body worked hard to see that no real line-item veto bill passed the House. They argued that a true line-item veto would give too much power to the President. I disagreed then and I disagree now.

In theory, Congress may not need the President's help in deciding how best to spend the taxpayer's money. However, in practice, the temptation to slip special interest or parochial spending programs into otherwise necessary appropriation bills has been too strong to resist. Allowing the President to identify and veto such programs would protect not only the budget process, but the taxpayers' pockets.

Mr. Speaker, the line-item veto has proven itself in State after State where it has been tried. There is no reason not to allow it at the Federal level.

IRS BURDEN OF PROOF

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, last year, I introduced H.R. 3261 to protect taxpayers from capricious behavior by the Internal Revenue Service. Today, I am again introducing this bill to ensure American taxpayers get a fair shake in tax court. Too often, the IRS is an agency out of control; too many Americans fear the IRS and that's wrong.

Mr. Speaker, my bill has three sections to protect Americans from IRS abuses. First, damages paid to the taxpayer are increased from $100,000, current law, to $1,000,000. Second, the Internal Revenue Service must notify the taxpayer promptly in writing upon request as to the specific implementing regulations that they are found liable for. No more ambiguous computer generated letters using code numbers. No more unprepared confrontations with the IRS. These two seemingly innocuous sections of my bill are extremely vital and will go a long way in rebuilding the American people's faith in our Government.

The last part of my bill is the most important: it shifts the burden of proof from the taxpayer to the IRS in civil tax cases. Under current law, if the IRS accuses someone of tax fraud, which could be an honest mistake on the 1040 form, he or she must prove his or her innocence in civil court, the IRS does not have to prove your guilt. An accused mass murderer has more rights than a taxpayer fingered by the IRS. Jeffrey Dahmer was considered innocent until proven guilty. Mom and Pop small business owners, however, are not afforded this protection.

Mr. Speaker, during the last session, I highlighted the need for this legislation on the House floor by reading letters and cases I have received from people around the country. You may remember the case of David and Millie Evans from Longmont, CO. The IRS refused to accept their cancelled check as evidence of payment even though the check bore the IRS stamp of endorsement. Or how about Alex Council, who took his own life so his wife could collect his life insurance to pay off their IRS bill? Months later, a judge found him innocent of any wrongdoing. I have heard hundreds of stories of IRS abuses like these on radio and television talk shows. Thousands of Americans have written to me personally with their horror stories.

Opponents argue that my bill will weaken IRS's ability to prosecute legitimate tax cheats. This bill will not affect IRS's ability to enforce tax law, it only forces them to prove allegations of fraud. My bill will ensure that IRS agents act in accordance with the standards of conduct required of all Department of Treasury employees and the Constitution of the United States of America where you are innocent until proven guilty.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to cosponsor my new bill. It will be my No. 1 legislative goal for the 104th Congress. All I seek is fairness for the American people.

THE 1995 AGENDA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report for Wednesday, November 30, 1994, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE 1995 AGENDA

There is a deep, free-flowing discontent in the country today. It is difficult to pin down, but it seems to be a fear of the future—a sense of insecurity about jobs, health care, pensions, and the future of the family. Americans are anxious about their future and their children's future in the rapidly changing economy. They are also disgusted with the performance of government. Hoosiers say

to me over and over again that government should not try to rescue every one, that government should get off their backs, that they do not want to see their money spent on expanding programs when they are not getting enough bang for the buck now. In short, they want less welfare, less taxes, less spending, and, most of all, less government. They want to shake up Washington.

AGENDA FOR 1995

Although they oppose a big and intrusive government, Americans still have a long list of problems they want addressed. They want us to fix the economy, and for most of them that means boosting their incomes. They still want the health care system reformed. Americans are very concerned about the cost of health care and fear losing their insurance. They like the idea of universal coverage, and certainly want more control of health care costs. They do not want government control over health care decisions. They do not like the stresses put on the family, and want a more effective fight against crime.

Americans want the size and cost of government reduced. They do not favor a passive government, but rather a government that helps them solve problems without overtaxing or overregulating. They feel that government does not benefit them, but benefits somebody else. They want a government that belongs to them. They surely want a reduction in taxes and serious welfare reform. Welfare reform outdistances even a tax cut for the middle class or health care as the top legislative priority of Americans. They want to end welfare dependency, but not end support for people struggling to be self-sufficient. Americans also want us to clean up politics. They do not approve of the way Congress operates and they think most Members have become disconnected from the lives of ordinary Americans.

The agenda for the next Congress will likely revolve around several themes. First, shrink government. We need to sort out what is the reasonable role of government, what can be accomplished by government and what cannot, and what policy areas could be passed on to the states and private sector from a decentralized federal government. My hope is that in the next few years we can move toward decentralization and smaller institutions. Second, restore confidence in government. Several reforms are needed, including ethics reform, campaign finance and lobbying reform, and addressing the problem of negative campaigning. Policymakers need to govern from the center, and adopt a moderate, centrist approach to issues. Third, fix the economy. We need to build on recent successes in reducing the deficit, and pass a line-item veto and a balanced budget amendment. We should pass a middle-income tax cut, provided we can find a way to pay for it and not add to the national debt. I worry about each side trying to up the tax cut proposal of the other side, with the result of a huge increase in the deficit. Fourth, improve personal security. We need to continue our efforts against crime, and work on scaled back health care reform and welfare reform. There is significant momentum for cutting back the welfare system, restructuring it, making it cost less. Fifth, bolster national defense. We need to shore up our national defense and improve readiness, and adopt a position of selective engagement—not being the policeman of the world but intervening only when it is clearly in our national interest.

DIFFICULTY OF GOVERNING IN AMERICA

America has become a much harder place to govern than in the past. It has become larger, more diverse, more crowded. I am impressed with how the public's demand for services collides with government's eroding ability to respond. In many respects our political circuits today are overloaded, and it is difficult for elected officials to address obvious national problems in a deliberate, thoughtful, and thorough way. Interest groups clamor for more attention and more benefits and then defend them vigorously. With the clash of interest groups and ideologies, developing a consensus and putting together coalitions to pass legislation has become increasingly difficult.

The public debate has become much more polarized. Interest groups are very effective at manipulating the voter. They understand that nothing rouses the faithful like a negative message denouncing the other side as evil incarnate. Polarized rhetoric and extreme positions arouse the faithful, and stimulate membership and contributions. At the same time, the news media seem to believe that the road to the truth lies in finding two extremes and letting them clash. They like to transform every discussion into a debate. They do not want a commentator interested in context, complexity, or moderation—despite the fact that most Americans are not on the extremes but in the center.

I am also impressed with how little confidence people have in the institutions of government. Press, television, talk radio, and politicians themselves enthusiastically join in undermining confidence in government today. I wonder how far this erosion in confidence can go and still have a functioning democracy.

CONCLUSION

Americans are demanding wholesale changes in Washington. They are perturbed by complex and disturbing trends of economic hardship, crime, the decline of the family and family values, and the erosion of the American dream. They are taking a long, hard, skeptical look at the condition of their government, and they do not like what they see—too much wasteful spending, too much bureaucracy, too much intrusion into their lives, too little in the way of results.

Policymakers must sort out what government can still usefully do and what it cannot do. We must prove to Americans that their institutions of government can still achieve something and are worth preserving. We need to be advocates of good sense and effective, unapologetic government but also a government that understands its limits. We also need to be more honest with Americans, letting them know that they cannot have benefits without paying the cost of them.

FISHERY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT AMENDMENTS OF 1985

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Fishery Conservation and Management Amendments of 1995. In the last Congress the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee held 11 hearings in 5 different States and received testimony from over 100 witnesses. These witnesses represented all segments of the fisheries industries and other interested parties including fishermen, processors, environmentalists, State government officials, and administrative agencies. Near the end of the 103d Congress the Fisheries Management Subcommittee reported a bill which unfortunately was not considered by the full Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Today, I am introducing legislation to re-authorize and amend the Magnuson Fisheries Conservation and Management Act. The bill contains nearly identical language to the bill reported by the subcommittee last year. The major differences involve the removal of certain controversial provisions, inclusion of stronger language addressing the bycatch issue and the unique needs of certain rural Alaskan fishermen, as well as some changes that would have been made had the bill been addressed by the full committee last year.

This legislation addresses all of the major concerns discussed during our series of hearings in the last Congress. While some may not totally agree with the way we address some of these concerns, I think this legislation takes a major step in continuing the management of our Nation's fisheries while also addressing some of the problems we have encountered in specific areas of fisheries management.

Mr. Speaker, there are two areas of concern that I feel must be addressed by this re-authorization legislation. We must allow the Regional Fishery Management Councils to address the issue of bycatch. The councils are in a unique position to create specific bycatch reduction measures, tailored for each fishery that they manage. I have also always believed that community development quotas [CDQs] are a legitimate tool of the councils for use in managing our fisheries resources. I have always believed that CDQ's did not have to be specifically authorized for the councils to include them in their first fisheries management plans and the courts have now finally agreed with me on this point. Community development quotas are just one of many tools which can be used by the councils to address the needs of fishery dependent communities. We will continue to look at this issue as we move those legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to move quickly with the bill, so that we can get on with the sound management of our Nation's fisheries resources. Our fishermen and processors deserve no less.

REDECLARE THE DRUG WAR

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we cannot solve the crime and violence problems which plague this country without an all-out war on drugs. Make no mistake about it. This Republican-controlled Congress will pay a major role in the war on drugs. We'll step up to the plate and assume our full share of responsibility. But so must the administration. Our first, joint priority must be to restore control over the places where Americans live and raise their children.

As a consequence of the Clinton administration's half-hearted effort to fight the drug war we have witnessed a dramatic increase in the use of drugs. Unless the problem is returned to the front burner one of the few enduring legacies of the Clinton Presidency may be the reemergence of illegal drugs and the violent crime associated with drugs.

The American people understand that we cannot solve the crime and violence problem which plagues this country, without an all-out effort to resolve the drug problem. The root cause of violence and crime in this country is illegal drugs. Look at the facts. According to the Partnership for a Drug-Free America:

Drug use is related to half of all violent crime.

Illegal drugs play a part in half of all homicides. In fact, 48 percent of all men arrested for homicide test positive for illicit drugs at the time of arrest.

Over 60 percent of prison inmates are there for drug related crimes.

Illegal drug use is a factor in half of all family violence. Most of this violence is directed against women.

Over 30 percent of all child abuse cases involve a parent using illegal drugs.

The number of drug-exposed babies now accounts for 11 percent of all births in the United States.

Over 75 percent of adolescent deaths are a result of drug related violence.

An important first step in curbing drug demand in this country is to make the so-called casual users and hard core users accountable. The best method to accomplish this involves testing in the workplace. By requiring the testing of all Government employees and officials we can set the standard for the private sector. The bill being introduced today was drafted by constitutional scholars in response to possible court challenges.

The findings provision states that the sale, possession and use of drugs pose a pervasive and substantial threat to the social, educational, and economic health of the United States. The impact of drug abuse if reflected in the violence that it causes and in the disintegration of families, schools, and neighborhoods. The effects of rampant drug use is amply illustrated by national violent crime statistics across the United States. And recent studies demonstrate that drug use by young people is on the rise.

The legislation introduced today is a starting point of the action this Congress must take to turn around the war on drugs, including:

A bill to require random drug testing of all executive, judicial, and legislative branch Government employees and officials.

A bill to deny Federal benefits upon conviction of certain drug offenses.

A bill to ensure quality assurance of drug testing programs.

A bill to require employer notification for certain drug crimes.

A bill to require mandatory drug testing for all Federal job applicants.

A bill to provide the death penalty for drug kingpins.

A bill to prohibit federally sponsored research involving the legalization of drugs.

A bill to deny higher education assistance to individuals convicted of using or selling illegal drugs.

These bills will increase user accountability. It is imperative that we put tough new laws on the books to hold both casual and heavy drug users accountable. These new laws will establish that involvement with illegal drugs has clear consequences. We must increase the social and legal costs of illegal drug consumption.

Mr. Speaker, I would conclude by quoting the chairman of the Partnership for a Drug Free America, Mr. James Burke, "We cannot and will not make progress with crime, violence or other ills until we make a long-term commitment to addressing a common denominator in so many of these problems—drug abuse."

INTERSTATE CHILD SUPPORT ACT

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, during the next few months, there will be considerable debate about personal responsibility. One of the most important parts of this discussion will focus on parents' responsibility to nurture and support their children. Let me emphatically state that this obligation rests with both parents. All too often, the mother is left to shoulder this burden alone. There are both societal costs and personal tragedies that could be averted if we can successfully change this culture of neglect. We must send a clear message that both parents are legally and morally bound to support their children and then be prepared to track down those parents unwilling to live up to their obligations.

While past legislation has improved collections for child support, we as a Nation still have a long way to go. Only half of all custodial parents receive their full child support awards, leaving millions of children without adequate support. Congress must end this disgrace.

Although the Republican Contract With America sets out few details on child support enforcement, I believe this is an issue that we can act on with broad bipartisan support. I am therefore reintroducing child support legislation that reflects many of the recommendations of the U.S. Commission on Interstate Child Support, on which I served. The bill would enhance coordination for collecting child support across state lines, improve Federal tracking of delinquent orders, institute direct wage withholding, withhold business and driver's licenses from individuals owing child support, and deny Federal benefits to individuals with large child support arrearages.

It is certainly worth noting that welfare reform cannot succeed without better child support enforcement. We cannot ask young, poor mothers to go out and get a job, only to let young fathers evade their responsibility. Not only would enhanced child support enforcement reimburse certain welfare costs, but in some cases it may prevent families from going on welfare in the first place.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in sending a clear message that both parents have a responsibility to provide for their children.

FORCED BUSING MUST STOP

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration recently decided that over $1.3 billion of Missouri tax dollars are not enough. Since 1981, taxpayers in the State of Missouri have watched as their money constructed an Olympic swimming pool, supported fencing teams, and financed court-ordered forced busing. And now, when nearly everyone in Missouri has come to agree that desegragation efforts have failed miserably, the Clinton Administration wants the State to do more than spend money, it wants the State to show results for students.

Unfortunately, the administration does not understand what people have been saying for years: increased education spending does not automatically lead to increased learning. At the same time that the State of Missouri has been struggling to meet its court-ordered obligations in Kansas City and St. Louis, children in the rest of the State have gone without in their schools. Enough is enough.

I am extremely concerned that instead of admitting that forced busing does not work, the administration wants to broaden desegragation efforts. In fact, the Clinton administration is working against Missouri's efforts before the Supreme Court because it is worried that if the Supreme Court sides with the people of Missouri, it could become easier for dozens of other jurisdictions nationwide to end school desegragation cases. This is wrong, and once again I am introducing legislation to amend the U.S. Constitution and prohibit any governmental entity—including Federal courts—from compelling a child to attend a public school other than the public school nearest the student's residence.

While I am hopeful that the Supreme Court will correctly decide in favor of the State of Missouri and against the Clinton administration, this legislation is necessary to ensure children, parents and communities are protected from liberal civil rights lawyers, Federal courts and Washington bureaucrats. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution. If court-ordered desegragation is not currently happening in their districts, it is most likely only a matter of time before they find themselves in the same situation as the people of Missouri. This resolution will prevent this disastrous situation from repeating itself across the Nation.

INTRODUCTION OF IRA PROPOSAL

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Individual Retirement Options Improvement Act of 1995. This legislation makes changes to the Internal Revenue Code to improve Individual Retirement Accounts [IRA's].

The purpose of this legislation is to increase our national savings rate. The legislation consists of two major components which are to encourage savings by increasing the amount of deductible contributions which may be made to an individual retirement account and to allow homemakers to be eligible for the full IRA deduction. First, the legislation allows an individual who is an active participant to deduct the allowable amount and to deduct 50 percent of the excess amount for that taxable year. This provision increases the deductible

amount which individual taxpayers are currently allowed for IRA's. The legislation does not increase the $2,000 limit. Second, the legislation addresses the spousal IRA issue. The legislation allows homemakers to make the same deductible IRA contribution as their working spouses.

The purpose of this legislation is to increase our national savings rate. IRA's are a proven tool to boost our savings rate. This legislation increases the amount that can be deductible in an IRA. Taxes are just deferred. The focus of this proposal is savings for retirement. A new analysis commissioned by Merrill Lynch on the financial wealth of American families shows that half of American families currently have below $1,000 in net financial assets. Action needs to be taken to improve this statistic.

Allowing homemakers to contribute the full amount to an IRA corrects an inequity and creates an incentive for savings. Increased retirement savings will result in economic growth and help retirees become financially independent. We have to encourage individuals to save for their retirement. This legislation is a step in the right direction. I urge you to support this legislation.

THE EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1995

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Export Administration Act of 1995. The text of this bill generally reflects the provisions reported to the House last year by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, together with certain of the modifications recommended to the House last year by other committees. Title I of this bill originated with legislation that I introduced in the 103d Congress as H.R. 3412.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade of the Committee on International Relations, I intend to renew the effort to reform our export control system and see it through to completion, with enactment of reform legislation.

The legislation I have introduced today is the starting point for this final push to enactment. In essence, we are picking up where our committee left off last year. Prior to acting on this legislation, our subcommittee will consult with other members of our committee, with other committees and interested Members and with representatives of the President as well as other interested parties. Refinements and modifications will be made and reflected in a measure which will be presented to the subcommittee for its consideration and approval as soon as possible.

My goal is simple: To reform our outdated export control system, help our high technology industries and create new American jobs.

The last time Congress reformed the Export Administration Act was in 1979, some 15 years ago. The last time it was amended in any significant way was in 1988. Therefore, the current law simply does not reflect the profound changes which have occurred during the past 5 years alone: the end of the Cold War and COCOM; the new challenge of proliferation; the breakup of the Soviet empire; the beginnings of a market economy in China; the diffusion worldwide of advanced computer and communications technology; and the advent of a new global trade agreement.

Yet our export control system still operates under an old statute, needlessly impeding many high technology exports while not adequately focusing on proliferation threats. Testimony last year to our subcommittee indicated that some $30 billion in American exports are affected by this outmoded system, together with the thousands of jobs which would otherwise be created by reforming the system.

In introducing this legislation, I welcome recommendations from my colleagues on how this bill can be further strengthened.

I intend to continue our subcommittee's tradition of approaching legislation in an effective bi-partisan manner and to bring to the House a bill that every Member can vote for and that the President can sign into law.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT LEGISLATION

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to reintroduce a balanced budget amendment. This amendment, if ratified by three-fourths of the States, will mandate that the President submit and Congress pass a balanced Federal budget.

The last budget Congress balanced was in 1969. Since then, both deficits and the national debt have soared to astronomical levels. We must put an end to this obscene accumulation of debt or face the prospect of a national bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, there are many in this body who will say that the balanced budget amendment is not needed, or that to balance the budget we will have to cut vital and important programs to the bone. Nothing could be further from the truth.

While it is true that Congress has always possessed the ability to balance the budget, the fact that it hasn't done so in 26 years indicates that a balanced budget has not been among Congress' top priorities. And while it is also true that things have changed around here, what has not changed is the threat our national debt poses to the economic futures of our children and grandchildren. We must assure them that we will do everything in our power to allow them to live in a debt-free nation.

I am sensitive to the concerns expressed by those who fear a wholesale slaughter of vital and important Federal programs. To be sure, balancing the budget will not be without a certain degree of pain and sacrifice. However, it would not require the wholesale dismantling of vital programs, such as Social Security, that its critics allege. Indeed, balancing the Federal budget could only strengthen Social Security and other programs whose trust funds are invested in Government securities.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country voted for change—for a different approach to government. We should give it to them. I can think of no better starting point than to pass a balanced budget amendment.

INVESTMENT IN AMERICA ACT

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, every session since coming to Congress in 1985, I have introduced a bill to reinstate a 10-percent domestic investment tax credit [ITC] for the purchase of domestic durable goods. I am reintroducing this bill today, and I invite all Members to become cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Ways and Means Committee intends to overhaul tax policy in the upcoming 104th session. I believe my 10-percent investment tax credit bill should be considered as a part of that new tax plan.

The way this bill works could not be simpler. If an American consumer buys a domestic product like a new machine or computer to improve their business, the consumer can take a 10-percent tax credit if that product was made in America. If the consumer purchases a new American-made automobile or truck, they can take a 10-percent tax credit. The tax credit would be worth up to $1,000.

Investment tax credits are not new, but mine incorporates Buy American language to assist economic enhancement. I believe that repealing the investment tax credit in 1986 was one of the major reasons for the downfall in investment. As a result, American companies are competing with one hand tied behind their backs. Under my bill, at least 60 percent of the basis of the product must be attributable to value within the United States to take advantage of the credit. In other words, language the Commerce Department already uses to define an American-made product.

The purpose of the Investment in America tax credit is to stimulate the economy by spurring consumers and businesses to purchase American-made goods to enhance our long-term competitiveness. I don't know of a simpler way to change our complex tax policy for the better. I have always argued that the social problems this country faces can be linked to the unfair and harmful trade and tax policies enacted by the Congress. The 104th Congress offers us a unique opportunity to make a difference in the direction this country is headed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to cosponsor my bill. As a Congress, we need to show the American people that we are sincere about making America a strong nation once again.

THE NEW CONGRESS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, November 16, 1994, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE NEW CONGRESS

The 104th Congress that convenes in January will have both the House and Senate under Republican control for the first time since 1955. That changed makeup as well as the current mood of the country say a lot

about the congressional agenda and about how the President will have to deal with Congress.

THE NEW MAKEUP OF CONGRESS

The shift of Congress to Republican control will have a major impact on the legislative agenda.

I hope that one lesson for the new Congress is that both parties recognize they have to treat each other with greater respect. Power imposes responsibility, and it is much tougher to govern than make calls from the bleachers. I hope one result of the election is to make politicians think about Congress as an institution and what needs to be done to improve it.

Members of Congress also need to get a firmer grasp on the difference between doing what is right for tomorrow and what is politically popular for today. We have to get a longer-term perspective into our politics. We must ask what our country is going to be like when we reach the twenty-first century, how we can keep the economy strong and prosperous, and how we can assure that our children have jobs and opportunity for personal fulfillment.

THE MOOD OF THE COUNTRY

The current mood of the country also shapes what issues will be tackled by the 104th Congress.

The mood of the country is often described as anti-government. My own judgement is that Americans primarily oppose wasteful, duplicative, and corrupt government. They are prepared to support government that delivers services efficiently. They are saying that the growth of government needs to be curbed and that the performance of government needs to be improved. In a broader sense, Americans think the country is losing its moral roots and that politicians are not doing anything about it. They want more attention to traditional values as well as an improved level of government performance.

Americans are alienated from government, their elected representatives, and the political process. They feel a deepening powerlessness and pessimism over the future of the nation. As one Hoosier put it to me, ''I don't really feel that the people of this country have any control over what is going on.'' There is a feeling that the country has become too big, too complicated, too diverse.

Again and again, Americans say they are uneasy about their future and feel that they are not getting ahead. One principal reason for this is that the job market is changing in swift and unpredictable ways. People are no longer sure that even with two incomes in the family they can maintain their standard of living. Their feeling that things might get worse and their deep sense of insecurity are very difficult for a politician to deal with.

I find Americans distressed about many aspects of society today: the amount of violence and vulgarity, the rise of illegitimacy, the decay of responsibility, the loss of traditional values. The real message is their fear of the future. They are deeply concerned about crime, job security, retirement income, and adequate health care. They express a feeling that something is eating away at the security of their lives.

Americans certainly support welfare reform and tax cuts. They have a strong view that the tax burden on middle-class families has risen steadily in recent decades and that there has been a decline in real income. Americans are turned inward and they worry about their own financial difficulties. They have become less interested in foreign affairs and the problems of the poor and the minorities in this country.

Congress has been dealing with many of the problems people want addressed—the deficit, jobs, welfare reform, making government leaner and more effective. We are not dealing with those problems satisfactorily from their standpoint. Often they are not aware of what has been done.

Americans have become much more interested in local concerns. Many of them feel the federal government is no longer as important as it once was. They have redefined what is really important to them. The closer politics is to their home and their family, the more important it is to them. In many communities, I find that infrastructure improvements and personal security for their families are the dominant concerns.

It is clear that policymakers need to sort out which roles should be played by federal, state, and local governments and which should be shared with the private sector. There is certainly a strong feeling among the voters that the federal government is simply trying to do too much.

THE PRESIDENT'S APPROACH TO CONGRESS

With the changes in the 104th Congress, the President confronts two approaches about how to deal with his legislative agenda. He can push ahead with comprehensive changes in health care and welfare. He knows he will not succeed, but he could put the blame on Congress for refusing to pass his programs. The other approach is to try to work out agreements with the Republicans.

I would urge the President to proceed on a path of compromise. He will have to work to develop a spirit of bi-partisanship. That will not be easy. In effect, he will have to govern from the middle. But, of course, it takes two to make a deal and the Republicans will want their agenda to be given priority. If the President tries bi-partisanship and it fails, he will have little choice but to go on the offensive.

My advice to the President is that he has to broaden his political base by governing from the center out, not from the left in. He needs to forge an alliance with the new members of Congress who are very close to their constituents and in tune with the new politics of the country.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION CONCERNING KENAI NATIVES ASSOCIATION, INC.

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to correct a significant inequity in Federal law with respect to land uses of property conveyed to the Kenai Natives Association, Inc. [KNA]. The legislation, which will mark the final outcome of a process begun nearly 14 years ago and which was the subject of a congressional hearing last Congress and the enactment of one interim law, would correct the land entitlement inequities of KNA by authorizing and directing the completion of a land exchange and acquisition package. The legislation will allow KNA for the first time to make economic use of the majority of lands conveyed to the corporation under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971.

We began the final stage in this process by directing, through enactment of Public Law 102–458, an expedited negotiation of a land acquisition package between the Fish and Wildlife Service and KNA. Over the past year, negotiations were completed, resulting in a package which is identical to the elements of the legislation I am introducing today.

KNA has waited since 1982 to resolve its land selection problem with property which is within the boundaries of the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge. KNA has reached a tentative agreement with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with an exchange agreement on lands within the refuge. I believe that they have waited long enough for ratification of the agreement and believe they deserve to have this behind them. This legislation will authorize and direct the Secretary to make an offer to KNA to complete an exchange and acquisition of lands owned by KNA.

This legislation represents an agreement reached during the 103d Congress. It is my intention to move this legislation quickly and get it behind us. I urge my colleagues support so that KNA can move forward with their agenda.

I am pleased with the efforts by KNA, its former president, the late Katherine Boling, and board of directors as well as the Fish and Wildlife Service to finalize this acquisition. KNA and the Fish and Wildlife Service have set aside past differences and have resolved the land use disagreement which has prevented KNA from using most of its lands conveyed under ANCSA. At the same time, another purpose of Public Law 102–458 and, a Federal goal, was acquiring for public ownership land along the Kenai River. These missions would be accomplished by the legislation I am introducing today.

The Service has completed all the necessary negotiations on land acquisitions and exchange components and completed the necessary public review and legal reviews required for exchanges in Alaska. I commend the Service for their efforts to acquire a key parcel of land along the Kenai River, inside the boundaries of the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge, for public use. This acquisition is the crucial component of this legislation. Just as crucial is the need to allow KNA to make economic use of lands conveyed to the corporation to settle native land claims. It is wrong under any sense of fairness or the law to convey lands to native corporations in settlement of recognized land claims yet at the same time prohibit the use of those lands.

Mr. Speaker, we need innovative measures to resolve land use conflicts in Alaska. Secretary Babbitt has noted the need for innovative exchanges throughout the Nation to properly manage Federal lands. This legislation represents a fine example of an exchange which resolves a longstanding land dispute on a voluntary basis.

I believe we can and should resolve this dispute on a voluntary basis. If we fail to do so, the result will only be ill-will, an extreme inequity to the Alaska Natives of KNA, litigation and the loss of an important opportunity to acquire public, riverfront lands, along the Kenai River. Further, there will remain a significant doubt that any land use conflict involving Federal lands in Alaska can be resolved in a cooperative fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked closely with the former chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, Mr. MILLER, on this matter for many years. I believe we have an opportunity to correct an inequity, acquire valuable habitat, and show that innovative answers to land use problems will work in Alaska. I am anxious to move forward on this legislation which resolves this matter on a voluntary, willing seller

basis early this year based on agreements reached during the last session between all interested parties.

THE MILITARY RECRUITER CAMPUS ACCESS ACT

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Military Recruiter Campus Access Act, which would deny all Federal funds to educational institutions that bar or impair military recruiting. As you know, this phenomenon has proliferated across the country in recent years.

This has outraged me for years, Mr. Speaker. Simply justice demands that we not give taxpayer dollars to institutions which are interfering with the Federal Government's constitutionally mandated function of raising a military. Further, with the defense drawdown, recruiting the most highly qualified candidates from around the country has become even more important.

Last year, we began to deal with this injustice with the overwhelming passage of my amendment to the fiscal year 1995 DOD authorization bill which, with the support of Senator NICKLES, became law on October 1. That law, which denies any DOD funds from going to colleges and universities which are discriminating against recruiters, has already begun to have some positive effect. I am told by the Pentagon that schools across the country are getting the message and preparing to accommodate recruiters rather than lose their precious funding.

But to pick up the stragglers who are still not complying, further action is necessary. We have additional leverage, Mr. Speaker. My amendment last year covered only DOD funds, which amount to roughly $3 billion annually. But the Federal Government provides an additional $8 billion annually in grant and contract funding to colleges and universities through other departments and agencies such as HHS, Agriculture, and the National Science Foundation.

Barring military recruiters is an intrusion on Federal prerogatives, a slap in the face to our Nation's fine military personnel, and an impediment to sound national security policy. We should draw the line on this in the 104th Congress, Mr. Speaker, I urge bipartisan support for the bill.

INTRODUCTION OF PREPAYMENT OF LIFE INSURANCE BENEFITS BILL

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation which has had strong bipartisan support in the past, legislation to provide for the prepayment of death benefits on life insurance contracts for the terminally ill.

I first introduced this legislation in the 101st Congress. It had over 100 bipartisan cosponsors in the 102d Congress. I subsequently worked closely with the Bush administration in its attempt to accomplish this important goal by regulation. The regulations, however, were not final when the Clinton administration took office and have not been finalized. The Clinton administration included this provision in the President's Health Care plan and it was subsequently included in both the Ways and Means Committee and Mitchell Health Care bills. A version of this legislation is also included in the Republican contract.

This legislation would allow individuals who are certified by a physician to have a terminal illness or injury which can reasonably be expected to result in death within 12 months, to receive the proceeds of their life insurance contracts on a tax free basis.

I believe that access to these assets will make the lives of the terminally ill significantly easier with little cost to the Federal Government.

Under current law. life insurance proceeds payable on death are generally tax free. This legislation, therefore, should have only a minor revenue impact in that the only change would be one of timing—tax free receipt of life insurance proceeds one year earlier than otherwise would be the case.

In addition, access to these assets is critical to those many terminally ill individuals, who have no health insurance. To the extent that these individuals tap their life insurance policies to pay their final health care costs,. Federal dollars will be saved.

ENGLISH IS OUR COMMON THREAD

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, many times before I have taken to the floor to speak about the importance of the English language. For decades, English has been the de facto language of the United States. In recent years, 19 States have designated English as their official language. Support for these efforts has been overwhelming. I strongly believe that English should be the official language of the United States Government. I have been a persistent sponsor of such legislation, and I will again today introduce the Language of Government Act.

At the same time, however, I want to recognize the important contributions of other languages through a sense-of-the-Congress resolution. In an increasingly global world, foreign languages are key to international communication. I strongly encourage those who already speak English to learn foreign languages.

As a nation of immigrants, America is comprised of people of all races, nationalities, and languages. These differences make our Nation the wonderful place it is. While being different, all of these people can find a common means of communication in the English language. English is the common thread that connects every citizen in our great Nation.

MAKING THE POSTAL SERVICE MORE COMPETITIVE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, remember that lame old excuse, ''the check is in the mail.'' In days gone by, those who heard it hoped and prayed it was true. For if it was, they knew that they would soon be getting their money.

Not so today. As far too many people have found out, putting the check in the mail gives neither the sender nor the would-be recipient any assurance whatsoever that it will actually arrive at its intended destination. Or that it will get there in time to avoid late charges or black marks on one's credit rating.

Over and over this past year, we heard stories about mail being dumped, burned or stashed by mail carriers or hidden away in warehouses by postal managers not wanting to admit how far behind their delivery efforts had fallen. At least a half dozen of these instances occurred in the Chicago area alone.

On top of that, reports of slow mail delivery have been too numerous to mention. As a result, people have lost confidence in the Postal Service and remedies such as a new $7 million logo or a 3-cent increase in the cost of first class postage have done nothing to restore it.

To be fair, the U.S. Postal Service [USPS] has made repeated efforts in recent months to improve the quality and timeliness of its service. But this is not the first time questions have been raised about the USPS's performance or that attempts to improve it have been made. To the contrary, there has been enough past efforts, the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 being the most prominent, to suggest that a whole new approach is needed.

Generally speaking, most USPS employees are conscientious, hard working individuals who want to do a good job. For the most part, the problem is not so much with them as it is with the system in which they operate. Put simply, that system lacks the incentives necessary to bring about the gains in productivity and customer service that are essential if the USPS is to live up to the public's expectations. For one thing, the USPS is insulated against competition in the delivery of first class mail which means customers need not be won over but can be taken for granted. For another, it is subsidized by the Federal Government, which means there is less pressure to be efficient. For a third, it does not have the bottom line incentives—such as the profit motive and profit-sharing arrangements—which make many private companies so productive.

A quick look at the parcel delivery business bears out this assessment. Thirty years ago, most all parcels were delivered by the Postal Service. Today, competitors like FED-EX, UPS, and DHL handle a vast majority of packages shipped around the country, despite the built-in advantages enjoyed by the USPS. Also, the growing movement towards corporate competition in, or the privatization of, postal services in other countries reinforces that hypothesis. New Zealand, for instance, converted its postal service from a government department to a state owned but decontrolled corporation in the late 1980's and has

watched it flourish ever since. Last year, Holland partially privatized its postal service and Germany is doing the same starting this month. Also, there has been considerable discussion in Great Britain about the possibility of privatizing parts of the Royal Mail and Parcelforce, a move favored by a number of its top managers.

In this country, the objection to privatization has been that it would result—allegedly—in cream skimming by USPS competitors which would leave the USPS with the financially troublesome prospect of being left with only rural and bulk mail to deliver. However, the logic behind such an assumption not only does a disservice to the capabilities of USPS employees but it overlooks the significance of the telecommunications revolution now underway. What with the growing popularity of FAX machines, modems, internet, E-mail and the like, the truth of the matter is that the USPS is more likely to be left with rural and bulk mail to deliver if it doesn't go private than if it does. Only by keeping up with the times and the competition, which can best be done by operating in the same way as the competition, can be USPS hope to thrive in the future.

Understandably, many USPS employees, fearing for their jobs, have certain reservations about going that route. Since change often breeds uncertainty and uncertainty is unsettling, such a reaction is only natural. However, change also brings opportunity and that would certainly be true if the USPS were to be converted into a private corporation. And it would be especially true if that corporation were to be an employee owned one. Not only would the new entity be able to explore new markets and develop new ways of doing business, both of which could benefit postal workers, but making it employee owned would give workers more control over their futures as well as a share of the profits.

For all these reasons, I have decided to introduce once again legislation that would convert the U.S. Postal Service into a totally private, employee-owned corporation. As was the case with my previous bills to this effect, this measure calls for this transition to be implemented over a 5 year period, after which the USPS's current monopoly over the delivery of first class mail would end. However, there is one difference between this bill and my previous legislation. To make the prospects for the success of this new private sector corporation even more likely and attractive, the measure I am introducing today calls for the cost-free transfer of the assets held by the USPS to that corporation. Now only will that make the transition to private status easier to arrange, but it will speed the day when American taxpayers will no longer have to subsidize an operation that has been losing money as well as the mail.

Given the clear need for more than just minor adjustments to our postal delivery system, I hope my colleagues will carefully consider this legislation and then give it their support by signing on as co-sponsors. If America is to be truly competitive in the forthcoming era of computers and telecommunications, we simply cannot afford a correspondence delivery system that is neither prompt nor reliable. Instead, we need a system that is state of the art and the best way to get it is make use of, by making the USPS a part of, the private sector.

ENDING THE FOREIGN AID PIPELINE MESS

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to bring to an end a multibillion-dollar problem with our foreign aid programs: the so-called foreign aid pipeline. The pipeline consists of funds appropriated in prior years, up to a decade ago, but which are not expended and just sit in accounts waiting for some bureaucrat to dream up a way to spend it.

Responding to my request for an investigation in 1991, the General Accounting Office reported that nearly $9 billion has been sitting in the pipeline, for up to 10 years. GAO recommended that such unneeded funds be canceled after 2 years, with a couple of specific exceptions.

In 1991, the House adopted my amendment to cut off this pipeline, but the underlying bill was not enacted. Again in 1993, a version of my amendment was incorporated into the Foreign Affairs Committee's foreign aid reform bill, but that bill also was not enacted.

Today, I am renewing my initiative to cut off this multibillion waste of taxpayers' funds. GAO estimated that about half of the funds in the pipeline could be recovered by enacting my proposal, as much as $4.5 billion. My bill was drafted after consulting with experts at the GAO.

At a time when Congress is debating reductions in programs for Americans, foreign aid should be cut first. The place to start cutting is in the foreign aid pipeline, because it has already been determined to be a source of waste.

As the new Congress proceeds to considering legislation to make spending savings, I intend to seek action on this bill and end this misuse of taxpayers' money.

USE OF UNDERUTILIZED BUILDINGS IN ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce legislation that I sponsored in the 103d Congress that would require the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to take advantage of abandoned and underutilized buildings and grounds in economically depressed areas of the country when selecting new site facilities. I invite all Members to cosponsor this legislation.

I believe that in this age of reinvestment in our large cities, programs such as Enterprise Zone and HUD grants offer economically depressed communities the opportunity to pick themselves up and forge ahead with their recovery. I also believe, however, that Federal agencies, such as NASA, should look at those same communities when looking to expand their facilities. Much like a major sports team, NASA expansion into an economically depressed area would boost the area's financial status, self-esteem, and morale. Often these last two simply cannot be fixed with a simple Government-sponsored grant.

My legislation would also allow older buildings and underused facilities in decaying cities the chance to be fully utilized, thereby furthering the economic and cosmetic recovery of those cities. And because those facilities would already be in place, NASA would not have to spend a fortune on constructing all new buildings and support infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, NASA's operations should not just be something we see pictures of on television. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation so that all Americans can take advantage of this country's space program.

THE 103D CONGRESS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, October 19, 1994, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE 103D CONGRESS

The 103rd Congress promised to govern. In the end, despite significant achievements, it was unable to deliver on much of the legislative program. But it should not be judged solely on the numerous measures which were defeated in the closing weeks. Among them were the bills dealing with health care, campaign finance, lobbying disclosure, telecommunications, and toxic waste clean-up. There is no doubt it was a bad ending to the Congress.

But the 103rd Congress really did quite a lot. It was reasonably productive even through extraordinarily contentious. In the end I think it was a respectable Congress, not spectacular but at least average.

MEASURES PASSED

Important legislation passed by the 103rd Congress included deficit reduction, the North American Free Trade Agreement, family and medical leave, ''motor voter'' registration, national service corps, Hatch Act revisions, the crime bill, interstate branch banking, Goals 2000 education reform, and deep cuts in the federal workforce. GATT may be added to this list during a special post-election session. It is easy to imagine another 8 to 12 pieces of major legislation that could have been passed near the end but were not. In judging the Congress it is important to think in terms of not only what it did but also what groundwork it laid. My guess is that basic agreements were reached in several areas in preparation for passage next year. That includes a telecommunications bill and superfund reform.

The central achievement of the 103rd Congress was passage last year of one of the largest deficit reduction packages in history—reducing the projected deficits over five years by some $430 billion. The deficit will fall three years in a row—the first time that has happened since the Truman Administration. This has helped boost the economy—raising the overall growth rate, boosting productivity, and reducing the unemployment rate. Some 4.6 million new jobs have been created since January 1993, compared to 2.4 million over the previous four years. Passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement abolishing trade barriers between the United States, Mexico, and Canada has led to a sharp increase in U.S. exports to our NAFTA partners.

Among the other achievements of the 103rd Congress were several education initiatives, including renewal of elementary and secondary education aid and expansion of Head Start, the Goals 2000 reform to set achievement standards, a school-to-work transition program, and an overhaul of the college student loan program. Two separate banking laws passed, one the remove restrictions on bank branches across state lines and another to put money for economic development into distressed areas via community development banks. The new crime package means more police on the street, more prisons, and tougher punishment for federal crimes.

The reinventing government effort had some distinct successes; procurement reform to streamline government buying of goods and services and to allow more products to be purchased off the shelf, and buyouts to cut the federal payroll by almost 280,000 jobs over six years. Government reorganization advanced with the creation of a separate Social Security Administration and reorganization of the Agriculture Department. Congress renewed the independent counsel to investigate allegations against high ranking government officials. The most significant piece of environmental legislation passed was the California Desert Protection Act creating the largest wilderness area outside Alaska.

DISAPPOINTMENTS

A Congress, of course, is always measured against expectations. Looking just at what the 103rd Congress achieved, quite a lot was done. But looking at it against expectations and opportunities, it does not measure up very well. One standard by which Congress clearly failed was in gaining public confidence.

As I wrote earlier, this Congress was a reform Congress and we learned once again that those who seek reform and change run into many obstacles and risk failure.

I was disappointed that congressional reform, which included modest proposals for change made by the bi-partisan committee I co-chaired, died in both houses. These reform proposals will certainly be on the agenda for the 104th Congress.

The most significant failure of the Congress was on health care reform. It died when consensus failed to develop among supporters of various plans. Welfare reform did not get out of committee. A campaign finance reform plan with voluntary spending limits and curbs on special interest money was killed by filibuster, as was a bill to ban lawmakers from accepting any gifts from lobbyists.

I was disappointed that welfare reform was not enacted, but encouraged that in 1995 it will be high on the agenda of the 104th Congress. I was also disappointed that we could not strengthen the Clean Water Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act.

It is especially difficult to move on reform when public confidence in government is waning and suspicion of its every act is rising. The public sees Congress as a do-nothing assembly of quarrelsome partisans more attuned to the special interests than to the voters. The large number of filibusters in the Senate certainly slowed the agenda.

Many members of Congress believe the news media contributed to the very tough environment within which we do our work. The media tend to be more destructive than constructive, criticizing even those who are striving to make things better. One of my colleagues said that nothing about government is done as incompetently as the reporting of it. That may be an overstatement, but it is frustrating to see the failures of Congress celebrated while the very real successes are ignored.

CONCLUSION

Overall the 103rd Congress came out of the starting gate fast but it collapsed at the finish line. Some of the critics say that this was perhaps the worst Congress in 50 years. I simply do not agree. Those critics were too focused on the final days of the Congress and have not looked at the overall record. Certainly the final record could and should, have been better, but the 103rd Congress did manage to put together a list of significant accomplishments.

INTRODUCTION OF CAPITAL GAINS TAX PROPOSAL

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, the Middle Class Income Tax Relief Act of 1995, which provides a capital gains tax cut for working class Americans. This legislation provides a lifetime capital gains bank of $200,000. Any taxpayer throughout the person's lifetime would have a capital gains bank of $200,000. Under this legislation, a taxpayer could exclude up to 50 percent of the gain on the sale of a capital asset, up to the limit in the maximum tax rate of 19.8 percent.

The benefit of lifetime capital gains tax bank would phase out as a taxpayer's income increases above $200,000. Under this legislation individuals who sold stocks saved for retirement or a second home, or elderly individuals, who have a large gain in the sale of their principal residence, would benefit. The proposal includes a 3-year holding period for the capital asset. Short-term stock speculators would not be able to qualify for the benefit.

In addition, the bill allows taxpayers to index the cost of real estate for inflation. An inflation-induced gain is not a capital gain and should not be subject to tax.

Lately, there has been much said about the necessity and benefits of a capital gain tax cut. A capital gains tax cut is a valid measure, but a capital gains tax needs to be economically feasible and to benefit the middle-class. A capital gains tax cut needs to be responsible. I believe the Middle Income Tax Relief Act of 1995 is an appropriate capital gains tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a summary for the RECORD.

SUMMARY OF MIDDLE INCOME TAX RELIEF ACT OF 1995

Individuals would have a lifetime capital gains ''bank''.

Bank limit would be $200,000 per person.

All individuals would be entitled to the $200,000 bank: for example each spouse of a married couple would each have a separate limit.

Any individual who sold a qualified asset could exclude up to 50% of the gain on the sale, up to the $200,000 limit.

Qualified assets would include all capital assets under the present law, except collectibles.

Under the bill, the maximum tax rate on capital gains income would be 19.8% (i.e. ½ of the maximum 39.6% rate).

The full benefit would be available in any year that a taxpayer had adjusted gross income in excess of $200,000.

In the case of a sale or exchange of real property, taxpayers would be able to index their basis in the asset to the rate of inflation. Thus, no tax on inflation-induced gains.

Example: taxpayer buys a house for $100,000 and sells it 9 years later for $200,000. Inflation was 5% per year over the 9-year period. Basis for measuring gain is $145,000 so gain is $55,000.

A 3-year holding period would apply so that the deduction would not be available to any taxpayer who held the asset for less than 3 years.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ANAKTUVUK PASS LAND EXCHANGE AND WILDERNESS REDESIGNATION ACT OF 1994

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce the Anaktuvuk Pass Land Exchange and Wilderness Redesignation Act of 1994. When enacted, this legislation will ratify an agreement to settle a longstanding and difficult dispute between the National Park Service and Alaska Native landowners over the use of all-terrain vehicles—or ATV's for access for subsistence purposes in Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve.

The residents of Anaktuvuk Pass and the National Park Service have had a longstanding dispute over the use by village residents, of certain ATV's for substance purposes on national park and wilderness lands adjacent to the village. In an effort to resolve this conflict, Arctic Slope Regional Corp.—the regional corporation established by the Inupiat Eskimo people of Alaska's North Slope under the provisions of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act [ANCSA], Nunamuit Corp.—the Anaktuvuk Pass ANCSA Village Corp.—the city of Anaktuvuk Pass and the National Park Service have entered into an innovative agreement both guaranteeing dispersed ATV access on specific tracts of park land and limiting development of Native land in the area. The agreement will limit the types of ATV's allowed and will also lead to enhanced recreational opportunities by improving public access across Native lands.

The village of Anaktuvuk Pass is located on the North Slope of Alaska in the remote Brooks Mountain Range, completely within the boundary of and surrounded by the Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve. Village residents have long relied upon the use of ATV's for summer access to subsistence resources, primarily caribou, on certain of these nearby park, and park wilderness lands. As there are no rivers near the community for motorboat access to park lands, ATC's provide the primary means by which to reach and transport game in the summer. The only alternative to ATV use is to walk which is not feasible in these remote areas. Snowmobiles are the primary mode of transportation for subsistence activities in the winter.

With the passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act [ANILCA] in 1980, Congress expressly reserved the rights of rural Alaska residents to continued, reasonable access to subsistence resources on public lands, by providing in section 811(a) of that act, ''rural residents engaged in subsistence

uses shall have reasonable access to subsistence resources on public lands.'' Section 811(b) of ANILCA provides further that ''the Secretary shall permit on the public lands appropriate use for subsistence purposes of snowmobiles, motorboats, and other means of surface transportation traditionally employed for such purposes by local residents, subject to reasonable regulation.'' The National Park Service and the Native landowners disagree about whether ATV's are other means of surface transportation traditionally employed for subsistence purposes in Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve. But there is no dispute that ATV's are necessary for the summertime subsistence activities of the residents of Anaktuvuk Pass.

Following several years of discussions, the Native landowners and the National Park Service have reached an agreement which will finally resolve the ATV controversy on the public lands surrounding Anaktuvuk Pass. In April 1992, the Park Service issued a final legislative environmental impact statement embracing the proposed agreement, and in November 1992, the Secretary of the Interior endorsed the agreement in a Record of Decision. The parties executed the agreement on December 17, 1992.

The parties have since executed two technical amendments to the original agreement.

The agreement involves an exchange of land and interests in lands between the Native landowners and the Park Service. Specifically, the Federal Government will convey in fee approximately 30,642 acres of park land to Arctic Slop Regional Corp. and Nunamuit Corp. On the Federal land conveyed to the Native corporations, the National Park Service will reserve surface and subsurface access and development rights as well as broad public access easements. In addition, certain nonwilderness areas of federally owned park land will be opened to dispersed ATV use. In return, the Native landowners will convey to the Federal Government approximately 38,840 acres in fee for inclusion in both the national park and national wilderness systems. Native landowners will also convey to the Park Service additional surface and subsurface development rights on 86,307 acres as well as a series of conservation, scenic, and public access easements on other Native-owned lands within the boundaries of Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve. Finally, the city of Anaktuvuk Pass will convey a city lot to the National Park Service for administrative purposes.

Congressional ratification of this agreement will be required in order to remove 73,993 acres of Federal land from the National Wilderness Preservation System, as well as to designate approximately 56,825 acres of other park and presently Native-owned lands as new national wilderness. If ratified by Congress, the agreement will expressly authorize dispersed ATV use on certain lands within the park boundary. Without congressional approval, the agreement will become null and void, and none of the conveyances or creation of easements proposed by the agreement will occur.

It is intended that this agreement will resolve the longstanding dispute over subsistence use of ATV's only on public lands in and around Anaktuvuk Pass. It is important to note that neither this agreement nor the accompanying Federal legislation will diminish, or otherwise affect in any way, anyone's rights and privileges to access public lands in Alaska for subsistence purposes. This agreement does not conform or deny that ATV access to public lands for subsistence use is a statutorily protected traditional access right under ANILCA, and consequently, this agreement does not purport to resolve this issue.

As discussed previously, this legislation would remove 73,993 acres of wilderness from the park and designate 56,825 acres of new wilderness. Consistent with agreements reached during the 103d session, 13,168 acres of wilderness will be designated along the Nigu River, adjacent to the park, hence, a no-net-loss, no-net-gain of wilderness in the area.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT AND LINE-ITEM VETO

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing two bills today to amend the Constitution to provide some budgetary common sense—one will require a balanced Federal budget; the other will provide line-item veto power for the President.

I have long been a staunch supporter of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. I have cosponsored the balanced budget amendment since I came to Congress, but until recently, the amendment was blocked by its opponents.

In 1992, the balanced budget amendment fell just nine votes short of the two-thirds majority needed for passage. In the 103d Congress, I was disappointed to see that both the House and the Senate rejected the balanced budget amendment. Some Members of the Congress continue to oppose the balanced budget amendment, claiming that Congress needs fiscal discipline now instead of in the future. I agree with part of that statement wholeheartedly: Congress does need fiscal discipline now. It should be obvious to all, however, that with deficits for 30 of the last 31 years, Congress simply has not had that discipline.

I will continue to push for passage of the balanced budget amendment. A constitutional amendment is no substitute for direct action on the part of Congress. However, we have seen time and time again that Congress does not have the ability to provide that action, and we need this enforcement mechanism. While I share individuals' concerns about social security and other vital programs, I believe Congress needs this fiscal tool to ensure budget discipline. It is time to just say no—and mean it—to the tax-and-spend policies that have gotten the Federal Government into this mess to begin with.

My rationale for introducing a line-item veto resolution is similar. As long as Congress continues to send the President jam-packed, all-encompassing spending bills, the President must often choose between signing unnecessary spending into law on one hand and shutting down the Federal Government on the other. A General Accounting Office [GAO] report estimated that if the President had line-item veto authority from 1984 through 1989, the savings would have ranged anywhere from $7 billion to $17 billion per year.

In the 103d Congress, the House passed an expedited rescission bill which would force an up-or-down vote on a presidential rescissions package. I voted for this bill—it's a far cry from the true line-item veto, but it is a step in the right direction. We need to encourage fiscal responsibility in the Congress.

I urge support and passage of both of these important fiscal accountability bills early in the 104th Congress. The time is right for this legislation to finally come to fruition.

LIMIT CONGRESSIONAL TERMS

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, last November, citizens across the country sent a strong message to the Congress that they will no longer tolerate business-as-usual on Capitol Hill. This resulted in a new Congress that has already begun to demonstrate that it will deliver the reforms Americans have asked for and justly deserve. I am proud to be a part of this new, reform-minded body.

One of the reforms that is foremost on the minds of Americans is congressional term limits. They are tired, and rightly so, of career politicians who are more concerned with their reelection campaigns than advancing a legislative agenda that is in the Nation's best interests.

Under the current system of unlimited 2-year terms, no sooner are lawmakers elected to office before they are gearing up for the next campaign. This is no way to promote good government, and only contributes to the malfunctioning legislative process. Moreover, it is fiscally unsound. There is compelling evidence that the longer Congressmen stay in Washington, the more likely they are to support big spending programs, regardless of the public desire for budget cuts.

In an effort to reverse this damaging trend, I am today introducing a resolution proposing that our Constitution be amended to limit Members of Congress to three 4-year terms. Under the system of limited terms I am offering, we would have a body of noncareer legislators who know that their stay in Washington is temporary. They would not be constantly dogged by reelection concerns and would be able to devote more time and attention to their legislative responsibilities and make the tough budget-cutting decisions that are desperately needed. This would go a long way toward restoring integrity and fiscal responsibility to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, when the Constitution was drafted, the Framers did not contemplate people making a career of politics, and history shows that they anticipated a good deal of turnover in Congress. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to return the House to the body of citizen legislators that our Founding Fathers envisioned.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL WEATHER INFORMATION SYSTEMS ACT IMPROVEMENTS

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced legislation H.R. 1016, which would amend the National Agriculture Weather Information Systems Act of 1990 to improve the collection and distribution of weather information to assist agricultural producers. Today, I am again introducing this bill, and I urge all Members to cosponsor this important legislation.

The 1990 farm bill established the National Agricultural Weather Information System under the U.S. Department of Agriculture to meet the weather and climate information needs of agricultural producers. I believe that the program is vital because it collects and organizes weather information from universities, State programs, Federal agencies and the private weather consulting sector. Moreover, it provides funding for weather research programs.

However, it provides for the establishment of only 10 State agricultural weather information systems that are responsible for disseminating information to agricultural producers in those States. That leaves a large portion of this Nation's agricultural producers without any assistance.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation fills the gaps left by present law by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Commerce to use Weather Service offices and Weather Service forecast offices to collect, organize, and distribute information aimed at meeting the short-term and long-term weather and climate information needs of agricultural producers. Each field office of the National Weather Service will be responsible for collecting and organizing information that will impact the region that it covers.

H.R. 1016 will provide agricultural producers throughout the Nation with comprehensive and timely information. Weather information is central to agricultural producers across the Nation because variations in weather conditions can cause huge losses in production. My legislation will reduce the risk of profit loss.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to cosponsor this important legislation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE STATE MARITIME ACADEMY LICENSING RELIEF ACT

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today a bill to provide relief to the young men and women who attend our State maritime academies: Texas A&M University at Galveston, the California Maritime Academy, the Great Lakes Regional Maritime Academy, the Maine Maritime Academy, the Massachusetts Maritime Academy, and the New York Maritime Academy.

These academies educate and train licensed officers for service during war and peace in the maritime industry, the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Unlike students enrolled at the national service academies, cadets at our six State maritime academies pay their own tuition and fees for their education, including training cruises and naval science courses. In addition, their academic year lasts 11 months, which deprives them of the opportunity for summer employment. In order to get a maritime job, graduates have to take and pass examinations for a license as an engine or deck officer.

Regrettably, in 1990, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act—Public Law 101–508—removed longstanding prohibitions against the collection of fees or charges for these examinations and licenses. While I oppose any fee or charge for the issuance of a maritime license, I am particularly distressed that there are no exemptions from these fees, and that they even apply to cadets graduating from our State maritime academies. In response to that act, the Coast Guard has imposed a number of new fees requiring these fine young men and women to pay up to $500 to obtain their licenses and merchant mariner documents.

Mr. Speaker, State maritime academy cadets, who normally take a licensing examination within 3 months of graduation, do not have the financial resources to pay these fees. They have just completed 4 years of college, have spent thousands of dollars on college expenses, and have yet to earn a penny in their chosen profession. The fees place a heavy burden on cadets at a time when they can least afford it. These fees are a disincentive to those contemplating a career in the U.S. maritime industry and they are patently unfair, in that other transportation professionals, like airline pilots and railroad engineers, are not required to pay licensing or examination fees.

These fees will do little to reduce our Federal deficit; they will cause tremendous pain for our State maritime academy graduates; and they will further strain the U.S. merchant marine industry, which is struggling for its survival.

Superintendents at the State academies strongly recommend that the user fees for licenses be repealed for all cadets taking an entry level examination. These superintendents have previously testified during congressional hearings that "it is unconscionable to mandate to young men and women who pay for an education which clearly supports our national security to take and pass a licensing exam, and then charge them a fee to take it. In essence, the user fee is a graduation tax which is exorbitant in relation to an entry level cadet's income history."

While my preference would be to either repeal these onerous fees or waive them for first-time recipients, unfortunately, the Congressional Budget Office has indicated that either approach would create a pay-as-you-go [PAYGO] budget problem. Since I am not interested in increasing anyone's tax burden, I have decided to solve this problem in a different way.

Under my bill, our six State maritime academies would each receive a portion of a $300,000 authorization to pay any Cost Guard user fees associated with the cost of a cadet obtaining an original license and merchant mariner document. Furthermore, this reimbursement system would only be activated when Congress appropriates the additional money required to satisfy this purpose. Until that occurs, State maritime cadets will have to pay their own fees. In this way, Congress can ease the financial burden on these maritime cadets without forcing their academies to reduce funding for vital training or educational programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the State Maritime Academy Licensing Relief Act.

JOB TRAINING

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, January 4, 1995 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

JOB TRAINING

An important challenge for the nation is to equip American workers with the skills and training necessary to find jobs in today's labor force. In talking with employers in Indiana, I am constantly impressed with the mismatch between the skills Hoosiers have and the skills managers require. Many workers have skills, but not the right skills that high technology companies require to compete globally. The problem is how you move a work force suited to one type of economy into a world that demands different skills.

PRIVATE SECTOR TRAINING

The private sector has taken the lead on training and retraining the work force. Such efforts vary from firm to firm, but tend to predominate in larger companies. Corporate restructuring has reassigned responsibility from upper management to workers and supervisors, increasing the need for management and team-based skills at these levels. Companies have recognized that survival in the global marketplace requires a flexible work force with diverse skills and adaptability to new work routines and environments. On average, employers spend about 2% of their payroll on training.

The skills that are needed in the workplace are fairly well agreed upon. Workers need the ability to develop work schedules, budget money and assign staff. They require interpersonal skills. They need to know how to use computers to gather and process information. They must understand how their own work fits into the work around them so that they can solve problems. They also need to deal with new technologies in an everchanging workplace.

None of these skills replaces the needed proficiency in the basics: reading, writing and arithmetic. Without those basic skills, the other skills would be of little value. The important thing is that the education system produce learners, not knowers. Workers need to demonstrate a mastery of skills more than the accumulation of a body of knowledge.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS

The federal government runs a number of training programs to help complement private sector efforts, but many of those programs have had a mixed record of success. The federal government spent about $25 billion last year on more than 150 employment and training programs administered by 14 agencies. Many of these programs are small and receive limited funding, and most are managed in cooperation with state governments. In Indiana, for example, the Indiana

Department of Workplace Development runs many retraining programs through local private industry councils.

Federal education and training programs concentrate on two types of persons. Disadvantaged workers lack the basic skills to function in the labor force or to acquire education and training. Programs for these persons concentrate on providing skills and education that will enable them to participate in the work force and become self-sufficient. Some programs provide remedial training; others, adult literacy and vocational training.

Dislocated workers have the skills to participate in the work force, but have become temporarily unemployed. These workers may require retraining to find new jobs. Workers who become dislocated through federal policies, such as trade agreements, environmental regulation or defense downsizing are eligible for federally funded job training.

REFORMS

Congress has already taken some steps to improve the current system. It has funded local ''one stop'' career centers where workers can obtain information on training programs and employment opportunities. It has also created School-to-Work transition programs that will assist young persons in making the transition from school to full-time employment.

However, more dramatic reforms are likely to be considered this year. We need to consolidate our present array of federal job training programs in a manner that enhances worker participation and productivity. These programs should be structured to make information and resources more available to the intended recipients. One approach would be to consolidate existing programs into a single federal program and give state governments more flexibility in administering retraining efforts. A second approach involves providing ''skill scholarships'', student loans, and tax credits to those who are in need of training and education. Financial resources would be placed directly in the hands of those who seek to improve their skills.

CONCLUSION

Most studies show that the benefits of federal retraining efforts are modest, especially in the programs for severely disadvantaged workers. It has become very clear that you cannot make up for the deficits of a lifetime in a few months of training. We may get better results from programs with one or two years of intense training.

I am inclined to think that the main focus of our efforts should be on mainstream young people who are not going on to four year college. The approach would direct such youth into community colleges and technical programs to upgrade their basic skills and to learn other skills needed in growing areas. Our country does a lot for people who go to college. We do considerably less for people who do not. They are the forgotten half. They are also largely the people who build homes, fix appliances, repair roads, answer telephones and work in factories.

Of course, the great flaw in the training programs is simple: many trainees cannot find jobs. One approach to alleviate this program may be for government to provide training funds to employers who have jobs but cannot find suitable workers. This approach sidesteps expensive and fruitless job searches. Employers, under this approach, would guarantee jobs to those who complete training successfully.

The nation's challenge is to create a system of worker training that will train a highly skilled and educated work force, boost our nation's productivity, and meet the economic challenges from abroad. Our society must adopt a philosophy of life-long learning and training for workers. Without well-trained workers, this country will become a second-rate economy.

INTRODUCTION OF THE EQUAL REMEDIES ACT

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to correct a serious inequity in civil rights legislation, created by the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1991. While that bill represented significant progress in the ongoing battle to overcome discrimination, it also created a two-tiered system of justice.

Under the current law, victims of intentional racial discrimination are entitled to unlimited damages. However, victims of discrimination based on disability, sex or religion can receive damages only up to a statutory maximum. Just as I strongly support the right to seek unlimited damages for racial discrimination, I also support this redress for victims of other types of discrimination as well.

That is why I am introducing the Equal Remedies Act of 1995. This bill would eliminate caps on damages set by the Civil Rights Act of 1991 and send the strong message that discrimination of any kind cannot be tolerated by our society. It is time to make all victims of discrimination equal under the law—second-class remedies have no place in anti-discrimination law.

I urge all my colleagues to support this important legislation.

CAPITAL GAINS—CREATING JOBS AND TREASURY REVENUE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, when I first ran for Congress in a 1969 special election, the overriding theme of my candidacy at that time and the theme of my candidacy ever since, centered on fiscal responsibility—less spending and lower taxes. Although I was not initially able to serve on a committee directly dealing with tax or budget issues, in the 94th Congress, 1975–1976, I was honored with an appointment to the Committee on Ways and Means, the committee with jurisdiction over all tax matters that came before Congress. I have served on that committee ever since.

In the years prior to my service in Congress, it had become clear to me that lower taxes stimulate economic growth, and this was certainly the case with regard to the taxation of capital gains. From the day I began serving in Congress I have pushed to reduce the rate of tax on capital. In the time I have served on the committee, we have reduced the capital gains rate twice, only to see the rate hiked back up through the enactment of the Tax Reform Act of 1986. In 1989, we came close to again bringing the rate back down, actually passing a reduction in the House, only to see the legislation die in the Senate. Now, with a new Republican majority in Congress and the Republican Contract With America, we have another opportunity to reduce the capital gains rate.

Over the years I have sponsored, cosponsored, and supported many different capital gains proposals. Indeed, I am an original cosponsor of the contract's capital gains proposal offered by my long-time colleague and good friend, the new chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, BILL ARCHER. In addition, to cosponsoring Chairman ARCHER's legislation, however, I wanted to again introduce my own legislation to this Congress, not only to highlight my long-standing commitment to this issue, but to raise the matter of the appropriate rate of taxation for capital gains.

In the next months, the Ways and Means Committee will be holding a series of hearings that will include debate and discussion of a capital gains rate reduction. We will discuss indexation of capital gains—something I believe is absolutely critical—the period of time which capital must be held to qualify, and we will discuss the rate at which capital gains ought to be taxed.

Frankly, I would love to see capital gains taxes eliminated altogether. Moreover, I believe any reduction in the rate will be beneficial to all Americans. However, if your intention is to greatly stimulate capital investment while at the same time maximize revenues to the Treasury, experts suggest that the capital gains rate should be set somewhat between 12–15 percent. The legislation I am introducing today would provide for a maximum capital gains rate of 15 percent for all brackets except for those in the lowest bracket, where the rate would be 7.5 percent.

I would be remiss in closing this statement without making some additional comments with regard to the benefits of reducing the capital gains rate. First, all Americans will benefit from a reduction in capital gains tax, not just the rich. It is flat out wrong to state that only rich people will benefit from such a tax cut. Indeed, the last time we seriously debated the issue in 1989, Treasury Department statistics showed that almost 75 percent of those families/individuals filing tax returns which reported capital gains had incomes of less than $50,000, hardly the rich.

Moreover, when the capital gains rate is reduced, not only does money flow more freely between capital investments but more money is invested in capital. Both of these consequences are highly beneficial, and the net result of more investment is more jobs. The small businessman who is taking a risk starting a new business will find it easier to attract investors to share that risk because the penalty for success has been reduced. Moreover, because a larger pool of money will become available for capital investment due to a reduced capital gains tax rate, the cost of that capital to businesses will go down.

Another point that must be mentioned concerns how the change in the capital gains rate affects revenues to the Treasury—not a small issue in our dire budgetary circumstances. Critics of capital gains rate reductions have always tried to suggest that a reduction in the capital gains rate will mean a reduction in revenue to the Treasury. Nothing could be further from the truth. In reality, the past two times we have reduced the capital gains rate, revenues to the Treasury attributed to capital gains have actually increased. This happens because of

the consequences I just mentioned. When the rate is lower, more money flows to capital and between capital assets. Thus, you have more capital gain transactions and it is the transaction which triggers the tax. Moreover, the economic growth generated by more available and cheaper capital creates jobs, which means more taxpayers.

The vast majority of major industrialized countries in this world already know these benefits and their capital gains rates are significantly lower than the current rate in the United States. It is time that the United States got smart and caught up with the rest of the world. I look forward to a productive debate on the capital gains issue in the Ways and Means Committee and hope that our committee's capital gains initiative, in whatever final form it takes, passes both the House and the Senate and is signed into law by the President.

ROCKLAND COUNTY MEDIAN INCOME BILL, H.R. 21

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce H.R. 21, legislation to correct the median income calculation for Rockland County, NY.

Currently, Rockland County's median income is calculated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] as part of the primary metropolitan statistical area [PMSA], which includes all of the income data for New York City. For this reason, HUD lists Rockland County's median income for a family of four as $40,500. The 1990 census shows that the county's true median income to be $60,479, a difference of approximately $20,000.

Since HUD's income levels are used in calculating eligibility for almost all State and Federal housing programs, these inaccurate statistics severely limit the access of Rockland County residents to many beneficial programs. Income caps for the State of New York mortgage agency, Fanny Mae/Freddie Mac, HUD's section 8, and a myriad of other beneficial programs are artificially low, thus most of Rockland's residents, financial institutions, sellers, and home builders are at a severe disadvantage compared to their counterparts in neighboring counties, whose statistics accurately reflect their population.

During the 103d Congress I was successful in gaining the inclusion of this important bill's language in H.R. 3838, the Housing and Community Development Act. Unfortunately, though this legislation was approved by the House of Representatives the Senate chose not to act.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this median income bill as well as the 104th Congress' attempt to enact a major housing bill.

At this point in the RECORD, I request that the full text of my bill be inserted in the RECORD:

H.R. 21

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

SECTION 1. DETERMINATION OF INCOME LIMITS.

That section 3(b)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the 4th sentence—

(A) by striking ''County'' and inserting ''and Rockland Counties''; and

(B) by inserting ''each'' before ''such county''; and

(2) in the last sentence—

(A) by striking ''County'' the 1st place it appears and inserting ''or Rockland Counties''; and

(B) by striking ''County'' the 2d place it appears and inserting ''and Rockland Counties''.

SEC. 2. REGULATIONS AND EFFECTIVE DATE.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall issue regulations implementing the amendments made by section 1 not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act. The regulations may not take effect until after September 30, 1994.

HEALTH INSURANCE EQUITY ACT OF 1995

HON. BLANCHE LAMBERT LINCOLN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to re-introduce a bill that will make health insurance premiums more affordable for farmers and self-employed individuals. The Health Insurance Equity Act of 1995 simply changes the tax code to permanently provide the self-employed with a 100-percent tax deduction for costs incurred while purchasing health insurance. This legislation will also be retroactive to the previous tax year beginning January 1, 1994, when the 25-percent deduction expired. Let me be clear, this legislation gives the self-employed the 100-percent deduction now, and extends it to last year.

It is time to face the facts about purchasing health coverage today. Many of the 37 million uninsured are small business owners. Health care costs averaged $3,160 per person in 1992, with current increases projected to run in double digits through the end of the century. Prescription drug costs in many cases have risen more than 60 percent since 1985. My constituents are asking for relief.

This bill achieves our goals of health care cost reduction and better access for the uninsured while reducing costs for those currently insured through lowering fees passed onto consumers from hospitals for care of the uninsured. Adoption of this proposal may even encourage employers to purchase better health care plans for their employees.

Our actions must show our constituents that we understand the problems they are facing. This legislation achieves 100-percent deductibility immediately without any phasein. Tax relief and tax fairness are what this legislation is all about, and tax relief and tax fairness are what the Health Insurance Equity Act of 1995 is promoting. While this legislation is not the final solution to our health care ills, it is a necessary first step in providing assistance to the small businessmen and farmers who are the economic backbone of my district, my State, and our economy.

DOD ASSISTANCE IN BORDER PROTECTION FUNCTION

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce legislation that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to assign up to 10,000 full-time Department of Defense [DOD] personnel to assist the Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS] and the U.S. Customs Service in performing their border protection functions. This legislation is identical to H.R. 1017, which I introduced in the 103d Congress. I am urging my colleagues to become co-sponsors of this legislation.

The Border Patrol has the strength of only 3,800, yet its mission is to guard the two longest borders of one of the largest countries of the world. Reports indicate that, at any given time, only 800 patrolmen are available to protect our 2,000-mile southern border.

The people of this country have shown that they are becoming increasingly impatient with Congress's inaction toward illegal immigration. In California alone, voters in November approved a State referendum that would discontinue nearly all State social benefits for illegal immigrants. While there is heated debate on both sides of this issue concerning its constitutional and moral grounds, the problem would not even exist if a stronger Border Patrol existed to monitor illegal crossings. Yet Congress has failed to provide funding necessary to enlarge the Border Patrol. Until Congress can find the money, this military option is the best short-term way to address this shortage of Border Patrol personnel. Until our borders are fully protected, illegal immigrants, drug traffickers, and possible terrorists will have an open invitation to cross into the United States undetected.

DOD personnel are already involved in some border protection work. Yet, in terms of numbers, their involvement is virtually insignificant. My new bill would permit the Secretary of Defense to beef up the border with DOD personnel so that our borders are fully protected.

We have hundreds of thousands of U.S. troops deployed throughout the world protecting European, Asian, and Latin American nations. At the same time, we have approximately three million illegal aliens crossing our border annually, carrying drugs into our Nation and taking jobs away from Americans that need them. If the DOD can bestow hundreds of thousands of U.S. troops on foreign nations for their defense, it should be able to spare about 10,000 military personnel to protect our Nation.

Once again, I urge all Members to become cosponsors of this important legislation.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOL PRAYER

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a constitutional amendment to allow

for voluntary school prayer. The Founding Fathers intended religion to provide a moral anchor for our democracy. Wouldn't they be puzzled to return to modern-day America and find, among elite circles in academia and the media, a scorn for the public expression of religious values. I find it ironic that while taxpayer's dollars are being used by bureaucrats to distribute condoms in our public schools across America, our children are prohibited from reading the Bible or offering voluntary prayer in public schools. This sends a powerful message to our children—and it is the wrong message.

One of the many liberties our forefathers founded this great Nation upon was freedom of religion; a freedom to pray to the God we want, when we want, and where we want. Unfortunately, this freedom has been eroded by the Supreme Court over the last few decades. I firmly believe that no one should be forced to pray, especially if a certain prayer is contrary to an individual's beliefs. But, there can be no question that every American citizen has the right to pray voluntarily whenever and wherever he or she chooses, and that includes children in public schools. This is protected under the first amendment; "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." It is that second part that I ask you to pay special attention to today.

As President Reagan so eloquently stated in 1982, "the First Amendment of the Constitution was not written to protect the people of this country from religious values; it was written to protect religious values from government tyranny."

SOURCE TAX LEGISLATION

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduce legislation to prohibit State governments from taxing the pension income of people who reside in other States.

The so-called source tax has become a major cause of anger and concern among retirees in Arizona and other States. Many of these retirees are being forced to pay income tax to States in which they no longer live, nor have lived for many years.

In my opinion, the authority of California and other source tax States to tax Arizona residents merely because those residents may at one time have lived in those States and were covered by a pension plan, is dubious at best. The legislation I am introducing today would make clear that one State cannot tax the pensions of people who live in another. It is my belief and the belief of my constituents, that if source tax States need to raise revenue, they should do so from their own residents—not from people who cannot respond at the ballot box.

REFORMING THE HOUSE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, December 28, 1994 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REFORMING THE HOUSE

In early January, the House of Representatives will consider and likely pass the most significant reforms of its internal operations in decades. These changes were proposed by the new leadership, but many are drawn from the reform plan of last session's Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

More generally, the reforms continue a tradition of institutional renewal, dating from the mid-1970s, which aims to open up congressional deliberations, increase the authority of party leaders, and make the House leadership more accountable to rank-and-file Members of Congress and the public. My sense is that most of the new reforms are constructive, and will lead to meaningful improvements in the way business is conducted in the House.

JOINT COMMITTEE REFORMS

Many of the reforms in this package were derived from the work of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, a bicameral and bipartisan panel which I cochaired. The Joint Committee made its recommendations for reform in November 1993, and last year the House did pass one of its major recommendations—requiring Congress to live under the same laws it applies to the private sector.

Unfortunately, the remainder of the Joint Committee's reform plan was not considered by the full House during the 103rd Congress. But the new House leadership has adopted or built on many of the key reform recommendations: First, again require the application of private sector laws to Congress. It is critical that Members of Congress follow the laws they pass for private citizens. Second, streamline the bloated congressional committee system, by reducing the total number of committees and restricting the number of committee assignments Members can have. The leadership also adopted a Joint Committee proposal to significantly reduce the number of subcommittees. Third, cut congressional staff. The leadership has proposed a one-third reduction in committee staff. It recommended no reduction in Members' personal staff or in large congressional support agencies such as the General Accounting Office. The Joint Committee recommended a reduction in the entire legislative branch of up to 12%. Fourth, open up Congress to enhanced public scrutiny by publishing committee attendance and roll call votes, requiring that the Congressional Record be a verbatim account of congressional proceedings, and requiring that special interest projects included in spending bills be publicized, thus providing additional barriers to wasteful spending.

ADDITIONAL REFORMS

The new leadership has also proposed changes that were not included in the Joint Committee package, some of which are constructive, others of which are problematic. For example, to streamline the House it has proposed that three standing committees be abolished. The Joint Committee adopted a more flexible, "attrition" approach to committee abolition, providing incentives for Members to leave less important committees through strict assignment limitations and a requirement that committees losing one half of their members be considered for abolition. The basic approach of the leadership proposal should modestly improve the committee system, but it does not address the fundamental problem of several committees having huge jurisdictions.

Drawing on the proposals of an earlier reform commission, the leadership would create a new chief administrative officer for the House who would be responsible for managing its non-legislative functions. I support this attempt to reduce patronage. But the leadership has made the chief administrative officer a partisan position, appointed and supervised by the Speaker. Instead, the administrative functions of Congress should be handled in a bipartisan fashion, with the chief administrative officer reporting to leaders from both parties.

Another proposal would require a three-fifths "supermajority" in the House to increase income tax rates. However, almost all substantive issues in the House are now settled by majority rule, and it is unclear why a three-fifths vote is appropriate for revenue matters but not for other legislation. If such supermajorities proliferate in the House, the result would be more legislative gridlock in Washington. In addition, the constitutionality of this proposal is in question.

REFORM OMISSIONS

From my viewpoint, a number of important reform recommendations in the Joint Committee plan are not included in the proposals made by the new leadership. I intend to work for the passage of these reforms during the 104th Congress. Among the omitted recommendations are proposals to: First, include private citizens in the ethics process in a meaningful way. The Joint Committee proposed that private citizens investigate ethics complaints against Members of the House, but major ethics reforms are not included in the package under consideration.

Second, publicize the special interest tax breaks included in revenue bills and the budget resolution. My sense is that special interest loopholes should be treated the same as special interest spending projects. Such items should not be hidden from the public in huge bills. Third, streamline the budget process by shifting if from an annual to a biennial cycle, reducing redundant decisions and allowing more time for oversight.

CONCLUSION

The new House leadership has made a good start toward the passage of meaningful congressional reform. Their efforts have been assisted by the work of prior reform commissions, as well as the public demand for change and the transition to a new leadership with less invested in the institutional status quo. I intend to introduce and push for additional reforms aimed at making the House more efficient and publicly accountable. Reform is an on-going process. And reform is no panacea—many difficult issues are on the agenda. But sustained and meaningful institutional change is crucial for the restoration of public confidence in Congress.

INTRODUCTION OF POLICE AND FIREFIGHTERS TAX CLARIFICATION

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that is of vital interest to police and firefighters in Connecticut.

This legislation would simply clear up a situation where erroneous State law has caused benefits that were intended to be treated as workmen's compensation to be brought into income on audit. In several States, including Connecticut, the State law providing these benefits for police and firefighters included an irrebuttable presumption that heart and hypertension conditions were the result of hazardous work conditions.

In Connecticut the State law has been corrected so that while there is a presumption that such conditions are the result of hazardous work, the State or municipality involved could require medical proof. This change satisfies the IRS definition of workmen's compensation. Therefore, all this legislation would do is exempt from income those payments received by these individuals as a result of faulty State law but only for the past 3 years—1989, 1990 and 1991. From January 1, 1992 forward those already receiving these benefits would have to meet the standard IRS test.

The importance of this legislation is that these individuals believed that they followed State law. The cities and towns involved believed that they followed State law and therefore all parties involved believed that these benefits were not subject to tax. However, the IRS currently has an audit project ongoing in Connecticut and has deemed these benefits taxable. All this legislation says is that all parties involved made a good faith effort to comply with what they thought the law was. The State was in error. That error has been rectified but those individuals on disability should not be required to pay 3 years back taxes plus interest and penalties.

This legislation has passed the House previously. It was included in H.R. 11, the Revenue Act of 1992 which was subsequently vetoed by President Bush. I hope that the 104th Congress can act expeditiously on this important legislation.

BASE AND CANAL RIGHTS IN PANAMA POST 2000

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, 80 years ago, the United States completed construction of one of the engineering marvels of its or any age, a multilock, 51-mile-long interoceanic ship canal across the Isthmus of Panama. Since then, this manmade waterway has served the maritime nations of the world almost without interruption, enabling them to ship their goods from the Atlantic to the Pacific and vice versa much faster and cheaper than would have otherwise been possible. Even with the advent of the supertanker and large container ships, the Panama Canal remains a vital link in world commerce through which 15 percent of America's trade, and 5 percent of the world's, passes. In fact, a number of ships today—Panamax vessels they are called—are being built to specifications that will enable them to just clear the canal when fully loaded.

Credit for this outstanding operating record should go not only to those who have run the canal all these years but also to those who have provided security for it. For the 63 years prior to the signing of the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 and during the 17 years since, the Armed Forces of the United States have stood watch over the canal from a series of military bases located in a 10-mile-wide strip of territory adjacent to the canal. From those bases, they have been in a position to deal effectively not only with immediate threats to the canal itself, but also with other problems that could have eroded hemispheric peace and security if left untended. An excellent example of the two combined came just a few weeks ago when Cuban refugees sent to Panama pending a determination of their status went on a rampage that had to be quelled by United States military personnel.

The collapse of communism and the rise of the supertanker notwithstanding, there is good reason to believe that a smoothly operating, properly protected canal will be even more significant to the United States, Panama, Latin America and the rest of the world in the future. Several good reasons in fact. The conclusion of the NAFTA and the GATT agreements, not to mention the recent decision by the Summit of the Americas Conference in Miami to strive for an inter-American free trade zone by the year 2005, signal clearly a reduction in tariff and nontariff barriers throughout the region and the world. As they fall, the shipment of goods will inevitably rise as will the utility of the only vessel shortcut from the Atlantic to the Pacific and back. That being the case, the strategic significance of the Panama Canal, as one of the world's great maritime chokepoints, will continue to grow, a fact that will not be lost on terrorist groups or renegade nations determined to achieve their objectives by whatever means necessary. With the weapons they have, or can acquire, either might exert, or try to exert, leverage if there is even the slightest perception that the Canal is open to mischief as well as commerce.

So long as United States military personnel can be stationed in Panama and respond to any attacks on, or threats against, the canal, no such perception should exist. But, under the terms of the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977, which is still in effect, the United States is scheduled to remove all its military personnel from Panama and turn over their bases to Panama by December 31, 1999. After that date, Panama will have the sole responsibility for not only operating but also defending the canal, a big task for a small nation. Unless, of course, an agreement is reached between the United States and Panama that will first, allow the United States to lease its military bases in Panama past the turn of the century, second, permit United States military forces to operate out of those bases, and third, enable the United States to guarantee the regular operation of the canal.

The successful negotiation of such an agreement would be of particular benefit to Panama, as well as being of considerable assistance to the United States and the rest of the hemisphere. At present, some 6,000 jobs and $200–600 million in additional income for Panama are tied directly to the United States military establishment in what was formerly known as the Canal Zone. Remove that establishment and most of that money and those jobs will disappear, as will the prospect of lease payments that would otherwise result from the continued American use of its bases in the zone. Also lost would be an opportunity for Panama to forgo the cost of a military establishment, something it could safely do if the agreement provided that the United States would view an attack upon Panama in the same light as an attack upon itself. Compromised as well would be the possibility of a broader business understanding, under which the United States might lease the canal as well as its current military bases in exchange for such considerations as additional lease and/or dividend payments, trade concessions and/or an acceleration of prior U.S. treaty commitments. In short, Panama has even more to gain, relatively speaking, from a base rights/canal defense arrangement than does either the United States or its hemispheric neighbors, which may explain why public opinion polls taken there the past 2 years have consistently shown that at least two-thirds of those polled favor such an arrangement.

Significantly, strong support for a 21st century base rights/canal defense agreement also exists in the United States. In fact, a nationwide poll taken last March demonstrated a level of support nearly as high in this country as has been evidenced in Panama. That being the case, one would think that serious negotiations to reach such an agreement would have gotten underway by now, especially since the time by which it should take effect is fast approaching. But, instead of moving forward to start these negotiations, governments in both the United States and Panama have been more inclined to hold back, preferring the other to take the lead. Understandable as that may be from the standpoint of national pride, the problem is time is of the essence if an agreement is to be reached before the impending United States withdrawal of its remaining military forces from Panama is, for all practical purposes, irreversible. Under terms of the 1977 Panama Canal Treaty, the United States departure from Panama must be complete by December 31, 1999 which means that, absent an understanding well before then, we must proceed with the systematic removal of our military forces and equipment before that time. Put simply, any further delay in opening negotiations, however well intended, not only dims their prospects but also the prospects for the continued safe and dependable operation of the canal itself.

Under those circumstances, it seems to me that Congress is in a particularly good position—a unique position in fact—to address their problem and help get these important negotiations started. If it were to pass a resolution advising the President to enter into such negotiations, then the question of whether the President or the Government of Panama should be the first to call for talks would be moot. Neither would be in the position of having initiated the request for negotiations, meaning that the latter should then be able to proceed with dispatch. Inaction by Congress, on the other hand, promises no such advantages. At best, it is likely to mean opportunity delayed or diminished. At worst, it could result in opportunity denied.

Not wishing to share responsibility for either outcome, I am introducing today a sense-of-Congress resolution calling upon the President to enter into negotiations for a base rights/canal defense agreement with Panama. Specifically, the resolution calls for an agreement that would allow our military forces to be stationed in Panama after the turn of the century and would give those forces the right to act independently in order to guarantee the security and assure the regular operation of the

Panama Canal. In almost every respect, this resolution is identical to House Concurrent Resolution 17, which I introduced in the 103d Congress and which was cosponsored by no less than 85 of my colleagues. The only significant differences is that the passage of time has made its enactment all the more imperative. That being the case, I urge my colleagues join me as soon as possible as cosponsors of this resolution. Without being too specific, it provides the direction necessary to bring about a canal security arrangement that is not only needed but in the best interests of all concerned.

TRIBUTE TO JANET PARKER BECK

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Janet Parker Beck—an award-winning journalist for the San Mateo Times, book author, devoted mother, and caring wife—who passed away last month after an 11-week battle with cancer. Having been a friend and admirer of Ms. Beck for many years, I know that her untimely death at the young age of 41 is a tremendous loss for her family, the San Mateo County community, and our country.

Ms. Beck was born and raised in San Mateo and began her journalism career at Crestmoor High School in San Bruno. After graduating from college—having served as editor for student publications at Skyline Community College and San Jose State University—she was hired by the Times. During her career at the newspaper, Ms. Beck covered medical issues and legal affairs, including a dozen death-penalty cases and more than 40 murder trials. Her writing was widely respected by both the subjects of her stories and her readers for its intellectual contents, integrity, compassion, and ability to convey complex situations in a simple manner. She also used her writing talents to author the book, ''Too good to Be True: The Story of Denise Redlick's Murder,'' which sold 70,000 copies.

Ms. Beck earned over 50 awards for her journalistic achievements. Among the many accolades she received, Ms. Beck was named the California Press Women's Communicator of Achievement for 1994 and the National Federation of Press Women's first-runner-up for Communicator of Achievement for 1994. She also received the National Federation of Press Women's first place news writing award in 1986, 1987, and 1988. It was with a great source of pride that her award-filled career was capped off by being chosen to take her well earned place in the San Mateo County Women's Hall of Fame.

In addition to her considerable professional accomplishments, Ms. Beck took tremendous pleasure from her family, especially her husband of 16 years, Jim, and their five-year-old daughter, Mandy. Her desk was a well-known gallery for her daughter Mandy's artwork and photographs, while Jim was her constant companion since they met at a YMCA dance in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, Janet Parker Beck was one of the most remarkable individuals I have ever had the privilege to know and work with. Her passing is a great loss for her family and our community. I ask my colleagues to join me at this time in paying tribute to her and the life of purpose she led, and extend our deepest of sympathies to Jim and Mandy, to her colleagues and to her community. She made us a better people with her all-too-brief 41 years of life.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MERCHANT MARINERS FAIRNESS ACT OF 1995

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to reintroduce, along with our distinguished colleague LANE EVANS, on this first day of the new 104th Congress, the Merchant Mariners Fairness Act.

During the last Congress, this bill received extensive consideration but, regrettably, it was not enacted into law. In fact, it was cosponsored by 241 Members and it was adopted by the House of Representatives on three separate occasions.

The bill I am reintroducing today is the product of that careful consideration. It has been endorsed by many diverse groups, including the largest American Legion post in the United States, the Disabled American Veterans, and the AFL–CIO. It deserves the support of every Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, by way of background, my colleagues should know that during World War II, some 17.9 million men and women were inducted into our Armed Forces. Of that figure, 6.3 million volunteered and the remaining 11.6 million were drafted. Of this total, some 6.4 million or 35.8 percent were rejected for active duty because of various physical or mental disabilities.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that of the nearly 12 million Americans who served in active duty status, 73 percent served overseas and, of these, 38.8 percent had rear echelon assignments. I have presented these figures only to illustrate that millions of uniformed men and women never served outside of the United States. In no way does this denigrate or negate their vital service to this country. It simply means that these individuals were needed here in the United States to train those who did go overseas.

Furthermore, some 270,000 men volunteered for service in the U.S. merchant marine. Many of these men joined the merchant marine because they had physical impairities, such as poor eyesight, or because they were too young to serve in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps. Many of them could have avoided service but instead they chose to serve their country by enlisting in the U.S. merchant marine.

Of the 270,000 that volunteered, 37 died as prisoners of war, 6,507 were killed in action and 4,780 are missing and presumed dead. In addition, some 733 U.S. merchant ships were destroyed. In fact, the casualty rate for the merchant marine was only one-tenth of 1 percent lower than the Marine Corps, which had the highest casualty rate of any branch of service during the war.

In order to man our growing merchant fleet during World War II, the U.S. Maritime Commission established various training camps around the country under the direct supervision of the Coast Guard. After completing basic training, which included both small arms and cannon proficiency, a seaman became an active member of the U.S. merchant marine.

These seamen helped deliver troops and war material to every Allied invasion site from Guadalcanal to Omaha Beach. They also transported troops back home to the United States and, when that task was completed, they carried food and medicine to millions of the world's starving people.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 49 years since the end of World War II. Nevertheless, there are still some Americans who served in that war who have not received the honors, benefits, or rights they deserve. H.R. 44 will correct that injustice by providing veterans status to some 2,500 merchant mariners who have become the forgotten patriots of World War II.

Unlike their brothers in uniform, America's merchant seamen came home to no ticker-tape parades or celebrations. Little, if anything, was said about the contributions they made to defeating the Axis powers or to preserving the freedoms that all Europeans and all Americans cherish. Worse, these merchant seamen came home to none of the veterans benefits enjoyed by other Americans who served their country during the World War II period.

In 1987, after years of litigation and delay, U.S. District Judge Louis S. Oberdorfer ruled that previous decisions by the Air Force rejecting veterans status for World War II merchant seamen were ''arbitrary and capricious and not supported * * * by substantial evidence.''

Despite the results of this landmark court case, then Air Force Secretary Edward Aldridge unilaterally decided that World War II ended on August 15, 1945, for those who served in the U.S. merchant marine.

Mr. Speaker, clearly, that was a most unfair and unsupportable decision. By establishing this date, the Secretary made a determination that has no basis in law. The August 15, 1945, date does not appear anywhere in the Federal court decision mandating veterans status and, according to the Air Force, there is no documentation, no precedent, and no justification for choosing V–J Day.

Let me briefly describe why the August 15, 1945, date is wrong and why these 2,500 Americans have earned the right to be given veterans status.

First, the Federal War Shipping Administration [WSA] was in control of all ship movements far beyond the date of August 15, 1945. In fact, the WSA did not go out of existence until August 31, 1946. Until that time, merchant mariners traveled under sealed orders on ships which were under the direct military control of the U.S. Navy.

During the hearings on this legislation, we learned that at least 13 U.S. merchant vessels were damaged or sunk after August 15, 1945—a greater number than were lost at Pearl Harbor. One of them was the S/S *Jesse Billingsley,* which was hit by a mine off the coast of Trieste, Yugoslavia, on November 19, 1945. One U.S. merchant mariner lost his life in that explosion.

In addition, we must remember that for the U.S. merchant marine, the war did not end on

August 15, 1945. Defense shipping actually increased after that date to 1,200 sailings in December 1945, as compared to the World War II monthly peak of 800.

Second, while the Japanese indicated their desire to surrender on August 15, 1945, the situation facing the U.S. merchant marine did not radically change on that date. In fact, I have a copy of a telegram sent on August 15, 1945, by the U.S. Naval Pacific Command which states that "for all merchant vessels in the Pacific Ocean areas, Japan has surrendered. Pending further orders, all existing instructions regarding defense, security, and control of merchant shipping are to remain in force. Merchant ships at sea, whether in convoy or sailing independently, are to continue their voyages."

Third, it wasn't until December 31, 1946, that President Harry Truman declared in a press conference that he was issuing Proclamation 2714, which states that "although a state of war still exists, it is at this time possible to declare, and I find it in the public interest to declare, that hostilities have terminated."

And, finally and most importantly, all of our Federal laws that affect those who served during the World War II period use the date December 31, 1946.

There is no arbitrary cutoff date for the Male Civilian Ferry Pilots, the Wake Island Defenders, the Guam Combat Patrol, or the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps and there shouldn't be any for our Nation's merchant mariners.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 44 will correct Secretary Aldridge's unfair decision by eliminating the unsupportable date of August 15, 1945. It is a fair solution to this problem because it treats all those who served during the World War II period in exactly the same manner. If an individual was in a Navy boot camp or Army basic training on December 31, 1946, then they have been considered a World War II veteran for the past 49 years.

While the 2,500 Americans affected by H.R. 44 would be eligible for a variety of veterans benefits, in reality the only benefits they are likely to obtain are recognition, the right to have a flag on their coffin, and a headstone.

After all, education benefits have long since expired, people in their late-60's do not buy new homes, and all of these individuals are already eligible for Medicare benefits. In short, it is highly unlikely that any of these individuals will ever obtain care at a VA hospital. In fact, we know that 76,000 merchant mariners have been given veterans status because of the 1988 decision and, of that number, only a handful have received VA hospital benefits.

Mr. Speaker, it is for this reason that the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that H.R. 44 would result in negligible outlays to the Federal Government in fiscal year 1995.

I have been contacted by hundreds of people affected by Secretary Aldridge's unfair decision. Each of these Americans share the common characteristic of love of country and the commitment to serve during one of the most difficult periods in our Nation's history.

Because of their young age or physical impairments, most of these men could have simply chosen to avoid service during World War II. However, they chose not to do so, and we must not, even at this late hour, forget them.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we resolve this problem legislatively because the Department of the Air Force seems unwilling to correct it administratively.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the outstanding leadership of Congressman LANE EVANS. We have stood together on this legislation for a number of years and LANE EVANS is a champion for our Nation's veterans.

I urge the House of Representatives to move H.R. 44 so that we can finally provide these Americans with the recognition which they have long deserved. In my 15 years in Congress, I have never seen an issue, which affects so few people, attract the support of so many Americans. It is time we finally enacted this important legislation into law. These men have waited a lifetime to tell their grandchildren that they are World War II veterans.

SOCIAL SECURITY EARNING TEST REPEAL

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing legislation today to repeal the Social Security earnings test. As many of my colleagues know, the earnings test is one of the most unfair features of the Social Security law—limiting what Social Security recipients may earn and subjecting such recipients to what amounts to effective marginal tax rates of 50 percent or higher.

The earnings test affects only recipients who must work. Those who rely upon investment income to supplement their Social Security are not affected. Only those who choose or are forced to return to the work force face reduction or loss of their benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the work ethic should not end at age 62. Older people who wish to remain self sufficient through their own labors should not have to face a loss of their benefits. Nor should the Nation face the loss of the immeasurable talent and experience older workers bring to the work force. It is past time to repeal the Social Security earnings test.

FOREIGN SUBSIDIARY TAX EQUITY ACT

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced H.R. 1374, the Foreign Subsidiary Tax Equity Act, to discourage domestic corporations from establishing foreign manufacturing subsidiaries in order to avoid Federal taxes. Today, I am reintroducing this bill. American manufacturers for too long have abused the good faith of the American workers by developing manufacturing processes in this country before moving production facilities overseas and handing out pink slips back home. Despite the fact that America possesses the most productive and talented labor force in the world, many United States manufacturers, lured by cheap labor costs and tax holidays, have closed down plants and moved operations to countries like Mexico, Taiwan, and South Korea.

Under my bill, foreign subsidiaries of U.S. companies that ship a significant portion of their products into the United States would be taxed as if that subsidiary were located in the United States. Simply, the intent of my bill is to discourage tax-motivated foreign investment while protecting the jobs of your constituents.

Mr. Speaker, my bill is similar to legislation proposed by President Nixon in 1973, but the issue has been controversial since the inception of the corporate income tax in 1909. In 1962, President John F. Kennedy proposed repeal the deferral of overseas investment in developed countries, but Congress did nothing.

My bill would forbid foreign subsidiaries of U.S. companies from relocating manufacturing jobs in countries that provide tax holidays and other tax breaks and shipping a significant portion of their products into the United States. A current tax loophole allows these companies to avoid being taxed as if that subsidiary were located in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to losing millions of dollars in income taxes due to this anomaly in our tax code, the United States is losing a major portion of its manufacturing base. Once the manufacturing base is gone, it will be very difficult to get back. Germany and Japan have clearly taken the lead in maintaining a strong and viable manufacturing sector as their economies have continued to outperform ours. Overall, maintaining a productive manufacturing base is the lifeline to a modern, high income, competitive economy.

I have always believed the root of America's social decay is the ill advised trade and tax policies Congress has advocated for the past 25 years. Mr. Speaker, I urge all members to take a closer look at the problem of runaway manufacturing plants and co-sponsor this important legislation. My bill would be the first step in putting an end to this practice and make these companies pay their fair share.

FARM PRICES

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, November 9, 1994, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FARM PRICES

The United States is in the middle of the greatest harvest ever. The corn crop could be 50% higher than last year, and soybean production will exceed the historic 1979 crop with excellent weather across the farm belt. The yields this year are simply phenomenal, as farmers continue to astound us with their productive capacity.

The downside to this record production is lower prices. Steps are being taken, and others are under consideration, to help the farmer. In the long run, exports are the remedy, as consumers around the world demand high-quality American agricultural products. Ultimately, net farm income is projected to grow from $43 billion in 1993 to as much as $51 billion this year.

PRICES

Corn prices declined from a nationwide average of $2.61 per bushel in June to $2.09 per bushel in September. Some local elevators are currently reporting prices of less than

$2.00 per bushel. Prices normally decline at harvest time, but they are unusually low this year because of the record 1994 crop, projected at 9.6 billion bushels. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) has been criticized in some corners for setting the 1994 Acreage Reduction Program (ARP) at zero percent.

Soybean prices have also declined, from an average of $6.72 per bushel in June to $5.31 per bushel in September—and less than $5.00 per bushel at some local elevators. This decrease was fueled by the highest-ever national soybean yields, producing a record crop of between 2.3 billion and 2.5 billion bushels. Demand is expected to increase next year from greater exports and more livestock feeding, but not enough to compensate for the record crop. Low soybean prices are particularly damaging for Hoosier farmers because Indiana is the only major soybean state where the crop is projected to be lower than 1993.

OPTIONS FOR RAISING PRICES

I have urged the Department of Agriculture to consider a number of options to boost corn and soybean prices. Possibilities include:

Increase corn ARP: USDA recently announced a preliminary 1995 corn Acreage Reduction Program of 7.5% below the established base. This would take land out of production and improve corn prices for the coming year.

Raise corn support loan rate: Some farm groups have called for an increase in the 1994 Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) loan rate from the current. $1.89/bushel to as high as $2.40/bushel. They claim this would have a direct impact on prices in the near future. USDA is considering an increase in the loan rate for 1995.

Allow 1994 corn crop entry into Farmer—Owned Reserve: The President has allowed farmers to place 1994 corn in the Reserve when their CCC loans mature after 9 months. It is unclear what impact this would have on short-term prices.

Soybeans on ''flex'' acres: If USDA determines that the price of soybeans next year will be below 105% of the loan level, it can prohibit program participants from planting soybeans on their optional flex acres. This would reduce production and increase prices.

Export Enhancement Program (EEP): EEP has been used in the past to help export soybean oil. If world prices continue to fall, USDA could increase EEP support of soybean oil to maintain America's competitive position.

Ethanol and other alternative products: As of January 1, about 30% of the U.S. gasoline market will be required to use ethanol in reformulated gasoline. Over time, corn prices may rise as much as 20 cents per bushel because of this rule. Congress is also examining ways to encourage the use of soy ink and other non-food uses for American agricultural products.

THE 1995 FARM BILL

The effectiveness of these measures to support prices will also be addressed in the 1995 farm bill. Government commodity support programs must be reauthorized next year. The 1990 farm act made farm programs more market-oriented, giving farmers more flexibility in choosing which crops to plant. A provision known as the Madigan amendment gave the Secretary of Agriculture more flexibility in setting loan rates and set-asides to maintain competitiveness in world markets. I expect this trend towards market flexibility to continue in the 1995 farm bill. Program flexibility puts more decisions in the hands of farmers rather than government bureaucrats, but it can also lead to greater price fluctuations for farmers.

The farm bill should also address the hidden costs of farming. First, participating in crop support programs should be less complicated. The paperwork for program participation should not be a burden to farmers. Second, government regulations should be flexible at the local level. It is not possible to set detailed and comprehensive guidelines from the top, and major regulations should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, using risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis.

Some of the biggest issues in the 1995 farm bill will be environmental issues, including wetlands policy, and renewing the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP). Current wetlands policy that restricts farming on wetlands makes no distinction between wetlands that are environmentally important and those that are not. I am supportive of efforts to narrow the definition of wetlands.

CRP has been successful at boosting prices and preserving valuable resources. Because of our terrain, the average Southern Indiana farmer receives even more in CRP payments than in deficiency payments, and I support the full reauthorization of CRP. In addition, the 1995 farm bill should make CRP flexible enough to distinguish between more and less environmentally important lands. The program should remain completely voluntary.

CONCLUSION

I recognize the great risks in the farming business. The risks involved in farming are greater than in most industries, and Congress should continue to provide some stability to agriculture and assure that farmers can maintain a decent living and have a reasonable return on their investments. The 1995 farm bill is an opportunity to improve farm support programs and reduce the regulatory burden on farmers.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TAX CREDIT

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce an important piece of legislation that I believe to be an integral part of the official English movement. As you may know, I am the author of H.R. 123, the Language of Government Act which seeks to make English the official language of the United States Government. This legislation is the perfect complement to the Language of Government Act. It recognizes the need for a highly skilled labor force and provides a tax credit to employers for the cost of providing English language instruction to their limited-English-proficient employees.

Many Americans lack the language skills and literacy necessary to take full advantage of roles as responsible citizens and productive workers. While many employers acknowledge the need to educate their workers and have demonstrated an interest in establishing on-site training programs for their employees, the high cost of doing so often prevents them from taking any concrete action. This legislation will provide them with an incentive to offer this crucial instruction to their employees and make the workplace a friendlier, and less daunting environment for non-English-proficient employees.

NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this historic Congress, I take great pleasure in introducing the National Security Revitalization Act which implements the foreign affairs and the national defense provisions in the Contract With America.

It is a great honor and privilege for me to serve as the chairman of the newly named International Relations Committee and I intend to ensure that our highest priority will be the consideration of this important and long overdue legislation which will ensure that we maintain a strong defense capability around the world and imposes serious limitations on the subordination of American troops to foreign command in United Nations peacekeeping operations.

In addition, the bill will strengthen critically important regional institutions, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and will ensure that our participation in any future U.N. mission directly serves our national interests.

Together with my good friend and colleague, FLOYD SPENCE, the chairman of the National Security Committee, we will bring the National Security Revitalization Act back to the House floor to restore American credibility around the world and to ensure that Congress plays an enhanced role in the foreign policy making process.

In the second session of the 103d Congress, Republican members of the Foreign Affairs Committee laid a solid foundation for the attainment of these objectives by championing key provisions in the Foreign Relations Act for fiscal year 1994 and fiscal year 1995 and the NATO Participation Act which I introduced in March of last year.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this vitally important legislation.

INTRODUCTION OF RAPID DEPLOYMENT FORCE LEGISLATION

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to establish a Rapid Deployment Force as an added resource of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This force would be temporarily deployed by the FBI, to assist local authorities in investigating an increasing of crime in a particular municipality, due to an increase of drug or gang related activity. The Rapid Deployment Force would represent a partnership between the Federal, State, and local crime fighting entities.

This past weekend in my hometown of Hartford, CT, a rash of crime broke out leaving four dead, another critically wounded, and three others injured from gunshot wounds. This final criminal outbreak of 1994 brought the number of homicides in the city to 58, an increase of over 400 percent in the past 2 years. As the spread of drugs, and the city's

gang problem continues to grow, the need for additional resources is evident. I am thankful that the recently enacted crime bill is bringing more cops on the beat into our Nation's cities and towns. I commend the Attorney General and the Department of Justice for their work in ensuring the rapid appropriation of funds for the Cops on the Beat Program.

However, it is not enough to just deploy more police officers on the street. A Federal Rapid Response team would bring with it resources and expertise that State and local governments cannot be expected to supply. I believe that a Rapid Deployment Force is essential in investigating and combating crime in towns and cities when drug and gang related activities escalate. And I urge my colleagues to support this important crime fighting legislation.

THE STUTTGART FISH FARMING EXPERIMENTAL LABORATORY

HON. BLANCHE LAMBERT LINCOLN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to transfer the Stuttgart Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory to the Department of Agriculture.

The lab was established in 1958 under the Interior Department and charged with conducting research and experimentation to solve problems relating to the commercial production of warmwater fish. Located in the heart of the Nation's catfish and baitfish production region, the lab and its staff have become nationally renowned for their work on behalf of the aquaculture industry.

In the years since the laboratory was established aquaculture has progressed rapidly, becoming the fastest growing segment of U.S. agriculture, accounting for nearly 300,000 domestic jobs. My home State is the largest producer of commercial baitfish and the second largest producer of catifsh—accounting for nearly $100 billion in annual revenue.

Mr. Speaker this simple bill will transfer the laboratory from the Interior Department to USDA. I believe that this move makes sense because the people who do business with this laboratory are farmers, and are best served by USDA. The bill also changes the laboratory's name to the Stuttgart National Aquaculture Research Center to better reflect the excellent work that the lab produces. I look forward to passage of this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO SADIE HARVEY ODOM

HON. THOMAS C. SAWYER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, every so often in life, if we are fortunate enough, someone comes along whose grace and wisdom enriches our own experience. Someone whose capacity to serve others inspires us to move beyond the limits we impose on ourselves, even as we wonder if we can ever match such a gift for giving.

Sadie Harvey Odom, a 41-year resident of Akron, OH, was such a human being. Every person whose life she touched—from her family, to her friends, to the broader community in which she lived—marveled at her generosity of spirit, force of intellect, and strength of character.

Born in Atlanta in 1924, Sadie Harvey completed high school at the age of 15. She went on to graduate cum laude 4 years later from Morris Brown College, where she was a founding member of the school's Alpha Kappa Alpha sorority chapter. She had hoped to study medicine at the University of Georgia, but was denied admission because the school would not educate African-Americans. Always determined to forge ahead, Sadie Harvey worked in the aeronautical engineering lab at a U.S. Air Force base in Hampton, VA, during World War II. Upon returning to Atlanta after the war, she met and married Vernon Odom, with whom she would share the next 47 years of her life. The Odoms moved to Akron in 1953, intending to stay only for 3 years. Instead, they spent the rest of their lives together in Akron, raising a family and devoting themselves to community service and the betterment of African-Americans.

Vernon Odom headed the Akron Urban League and the Akron Community Service Center for nearly three decades. His beloved wife, Sadie, was beside him every step of the way. She was a guiding force behind local Urban League programs and volunteered with many other civic organizations, including the American Cancer Society, the United Negro College Fund, and the NAACP.

Even as she gave selflessly of her time and herself in support of her community, Mrs. Odom raised a superb family of her own and worked as a medical technologist at St. Thomas Hospital. She applied her biology training to her volunteer work, as well, helping to test Akron's schoolchildren for sickle cell anemia and elderly residents for diabetes.

Mr. Speaker, there are many people in this world who live full, honest, and caring lives. And then there are the Sadie Odoms, whose integrity and selflessness leave a mark that is indelible.

Sadie Harvey Odom passed away on October 20, 1994, after a long illness. An entire community mourns as it contemplates this loss. But we also share the gratitude that comes from knowing a person with a heart of grace and a soul of love—from knowing Sadie Odom.

THE DEFENSE BUDGET AND MILITARY READINESS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, November 23, 1994, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE DEFENSE BUDGET AND MILITARY READINESS

The commitment of U.S. forces to Haiti and Kuwait has raised concerns about the ''thinning out'' of the U.S. military since the end of the Cold War. Defense spending has declined by 11% since the 1989 peak of $303 billion, following a decade of massive increases. The defense budget edged up this year to $264 billion, and is projected to stay near current levels over the next four years. The question now is whether defense spending is sufficient to meet the new and emerging threats to our interests here and abroad.

NEW GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT

There is no doubt that the United States is more secure today than it was when thousands of Soviet nuclear warheads targeted American cities. Today there is no comparable direct military threat to the United States. The U.S. is the strongest military power in the world today, and has the best trained and equipped fighting force.

Yet, the world remains a dangerous place. The collapse of the Soviet empire has resulted in increasing instability in many parts of the world. Despite the desire of Americans to pay more attention to solving our own problems, we continue to have global interests that we must defend. Much of the world is threatened with chaos—full of civil wars, escalating ethnic and religious conflicts, and massive surges of refugees. Such instability can hurt the U.S. economy, limit our access to vital resources, including oil, and produce an international environment hostile to our interests and values.

The post Cold-War world is not peaceful, but the U.S. cannot afford to intervene everywhere. The challenge today is to identify the interests we are prepared to defend by force and ensure that our armed forces have the tools they need to do the job we ask of them. This challenge becomes even more critical as we plan for an uncertain future, since defense budget decisions we make today will determine the kind of armed forces we will have several years down the road.

THREAT-BASED DEFENSE

Our defense spending should be based on threats to our national security. During the Cold War, the threat was the Soviet Union, and our spending on defense was designed to meet that threat. Our task is to reorient our defense to respond to new threats in the post-Cold War world. Those threats include: the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction; the threat of large-scale aggression by major regional powers such as Iraq; the threats to democracy and reform movements in the former Soviet Union, particularly Russia; and economic dangers to our security if we fail to build a competitive and growing economy here at home. The bottom line is that it will cost the U.S. less to respond to these new threats than it cost us to meet the Soviet threat.

The Pentagon has developed a defense plan that responds to the changed international environment. The so-called bottom-up review concludes that the U.S. must maintain a force capable of fighting and winning two nearly simultaneous regional wars, such as another Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and a North Korean invasion of South Korea. The Administration says that it has fully budgeted for its planned force structure, but that changes in inflation rates could change future funding needs. Others argue the budget crunch will be more severe as new procurement programs swell funding requirements. The Pentagon acknowledges it cannot fund all the new weapons programs now in development, and is assessing which programs to fund and which to cancel.

READINESS

After the end of the Vietnam War in the mid-1970s, rapid cuts in the defense budget and the loss of skilled personnel eroded the U.S. military's combat readiness. Some critics say that we are now facing a similar problem of a ''hollow military.'' They say the costs of operations in Somalia, Rwanda and now in Haiti are placing an excessive

burden on the defense budget. They say these costs detract from our ability to respond effectively to more serious potential threats from Iraq and North Korea. Some even suggest the U.S. no longer has the capability to face down another Iraqi invasion of Kuwait.

While I believe the combat readiness of our armed forces needs improvement, I think comments about a ''hollow military'' are overstated. Military operations abroad have led to low readiness ratings in three of the Army's 12 divisions and placed strains on other elements of the force, such as airlift. These trends must be promptly reversed. Even so, we still have by far the best-equipped and best-trained military in the world. The transition to a more mobile force is involving painful adjustments in personnel, base closings and cancellations of new weapons systems. Yet, a recent report authored by a former Army Chief of Staff concluded that readiness is acceptable in most areas.

Improving the readiness of U.S. forces should be the top budget priority for defense spending. Congress, with my support, has taken several steps this year toward this objective. These steps include: protecting military pay raises to ensure retention of high quality personnel; increasing overall spending on operations and maintenance, the key Pentagon account for readiness; increasing spending on airlift and sealift capabilities, which allow our forces to respond quickly to overseas threats in the Persian Gulf and elsewhere; boosting training support for battalion-sized units; promoting ''interservice'' cooperation in combat and other missions, as evidenced by the joint Army-Navy effort in Haiti; and enhancing battlefield weapons systems. I will continue to support efforts to maintain our readiness. I think the military's humanitarian and peacekeeping operations must not be permitted to bleed the Pentagon's budget.

CONCLUSION

The U.S. must be careful about picking and choosing its military missions, so that U.S. forces do not become overextended. We cannot and should not commit U.S. forces to every trouble spot in the world. The key test is whether U.S. interests are threatened. Maintaining the readiness and morale of our military requires that we identify the interests we are prepared to defend by force, while using other means, including coalitions with our friends and allies, to deal with lesser threats to the U.S. national interest. A combat ready American military is essential to our national security.

RETIRED DISABLED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS' COUNSELING NETWORK

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce an important piece of legislation that I sponsored in the 103d Congress that would establish a national retired disabled law enforcement officers' counseling network, and I urge my colleagues to become cosponsors.

We call on police officers in emergencies. We trust them with our lives, families, and homes. Day in and day out most of us take them for granted to ensure our safety. Yet few of us truly appreciate the overwhelming stress, both mental and physical, that they endure in order to serve us. But there has never been a national proposal to give disabled retired police officers the psychological counseling they may need. Until now.

Too often, retired disabled police officers suffer from depression, feelings of isolation, uncertainty of their futures, and worsening medical conditions. With appropriate counseling, many of these officers will learn to cope with their new lives and some will be able to obtain meaningful employment.

My legislation would establish up to eight officer counseling centers throughout the United States to provide counseling to retired disabled officers and members of their immediate families. Any retired disabled Federal, State, county, city law enforcement officer, or special agent would be eligible to participate in this innovative and necessary program.

I ask all Members to help those who have helped us. Please cosponsor this important legislative initiative.

THE RESCISSION OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS USER FEES

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to prevent the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from collecting so-called user fees at certain facilities maintained and operated by the Corps. Specifically, this bill will repeal section 5001, Title V, of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 [OBRA] which authorized the Secretary of the Army to establish and collect fees for the use of developed recreation sites and facilities.

These fees have been part of budget fiction for years. The White House has always proposed these onerous taxes and Congress has always rejected them. Unfortunately, these fees became a reality with the passage of OBRA. Furthermore, there are no guarantees that the revenue from these fees will be used by the Corps of Engineers for the maintenance of its facilities. I believe that with these fees going into general revenue—not the Corps budget—people who want to enjoy the great outdoors actually will end up paying twice, once as a taxpayer and once as a user of Corps facilities.

While these fees, ranging from $3 per vehicle to $25 for a yearly pass, may not seem like a lot, the fact of the matter is that the American public has already paid once for these facilities and their continued upkeep. This, in my opinion, is double-dipping by the Federal Government. My legislation would seek to rescind the fee now required as outlined in OBRA for the use of public recreation areas at certain lakes and reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers.

It's also important to note that the cost of installing boxes at the collection sites, in some instances, can exceed $25,000 depending on the location of the facility. So we are using operating and maintenance funds from the Corps to build the collection boxes in order to hit up the public for more funds that won't necessarily go to the Corps. It's reprehensible that an agency like the Corps of Engineers will spend its own funds so that it can collect money for the general treasury.

This fee structure, as modest as it may be, sets a dire precedent. Americans who want to go boating, camping, or swimming should not be singled out to foot the bill for more Federal spending. Tourism and other recreational activities throughout the country could be negatively impacted with these fees. Folks simply do not want to pay over and over again for something that is already paid for; nor should they.

REFORM OF THE MINING LAW OF 1872

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing into the 104th Congress legislation to reform the mining law of 1872. Joining me in sponsoring this measure are GEORGE MILLER of California, CHRISTOPHER SHAYS of Connecticut, BRUCE VENTO of Minnesota, NEIL ABERCROMBIE of Hawaii, PETER DEFAZIO of Oregon and JERRY KLECZKA of Wisconsin.

This bill, the Mineral Exploration and Development Act of 1995, is identical to the version of H.R. 322 which passed the House during the last Congress on November 18, 1993, by a bipartisan vote of 316 to 108. In fact, our new Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [NEWT GINGRICH], voted for this bill at that time. Unfortunately, last year the House-Senate conference committee on mining law reform was unable to reach an agreement.

Today, with the introduction of this measure, we begin where that historical debate left off. In my view, the advent of a new Congress with a Republican majority does not change the fundamental and bipartisan support that continues to be displayed for reforming the mining law of 1872. Indeed, the fiscal austerity being advanced by the Republican leadership may very well enhance our prospects for gaining enactment of this legislation, which has enjoyed the support of the National Taxpayers Union, during this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, many of whom may be new to this issue, in order to explain this measure perhaps it is best to briefly go back to the year 1872. At the time, Ulysses S. Grant resided in the White House. Union troops still occupied the South. The invention of the telephone and Custer's stand at the Little Bighorn were still 4 years away. And in 1872 Congress passed a law that allowed people to go onto public lands in the West, stake mining claims, and, if any gold or silver were found, produce it for free.

In an effort to promote the settlement of the West, Congress said that these folks could also buy the land from the Federal Government for $2.50 an acre.

That was 1872. This is 1995, Yet, today, the mining law of 1872 is still in force.

In 1995, however, for the most part it is not the lone prospector of old, pick in hand, accompanied by his trusty pack mule, who is staking those mining claims. It is large corporations, many of them foreign controlled, who are mining gold owned by the people of the United States for free, and snapping up valuable Federal land at fast-food hamburger prices.

Remaining as the last vestige of frontier-era legislation, the mining law of 1872 played a role in the development of the West. But it also left a staggering legacy of poisoned streams, abandoned waste dumps, and maimed landscapes.

Obviously, at the public's expense, the western mining interests have had a good thing going all of these years. But the question has to be asked: Is it right to continue to allow this speculation with Federal lands, not to require that the lands be reclaimed, and to permit the public's mineral wealth to be mined for free?

Today, anybody can still go onto Federal lands in States like Nevada and Montana and stake any number of mining claims, each averaging about 20 acres. In order to maintain the mining claim, until very recently all that was required was that the claimholder spend $100 per year to the benefit of the claim. In the event hardrock minerals such as gold or silver are found on the claim, they are mined for free. There are no requirements that a production royalty be paid to the Federal Government.

It is incredible, but true, that an estimated 1.8 billion dollars' worth of hardrock minerals are annually mined from Federal lands in the Western States in this fashion. Yet, the Federal Government does not collect one penny in royalty from any of this mineral production.

Under the mining law of 1872, claimholders can also choose to purchase the Federal land being claimed. They can do this by first showing that the lands have valuable minerals, and then by paying the Federal Government a mere $2.50 or $5.00 an acre depending on the type of claim. This is called obtaining a mining claim patent. Perhaps a good feature in 1872, when the Nation was trying to settle the West. But today there is hardly a need to promote the additional settlement of L.A., San Francisco, or Denver.

Recently, for example, a mining company received preliminary approval to obtain 25 of these patents covering about 2,000 acres of public land in Montana. This company will pay the Federal Government little more than $10,000 for land estimated to contain 32 billion dollars' worth of platinum and palladium.

Moreover, once the mining claim is patented, nothing in this so-called mining law says that it has to be actually mined. The land is now in private ownership. People are free to build condos or ski slopes on it.

For example, a couple of years ago the Arizona Republic carried a story about a gentleman who paid the Federal Government $155 for 61 acres' worth of mining claims. Today, these mining claims are the site of a Hilton hotel. This gentleman now estimates that his share of the resort is worth about $6 million.

Claimholders can also mine these Federal lands with minimal reclamation requirements. The only Federal requirement is that when operating on these lands they do not cause "unnecessary or undue degradation." What does this term mean? It means that they can do whatever they want as long as it's pretty much what all of the other miners are doing. And who will pay the bill for this abuse? Check over the Superfund National Priority List and you will learn the answer.

I might add that the issue of mining law reform does not deal with coal, or that matter, oil and gas. These energy minerals, if located on Federal lands, are leased by the Government, and a royalty is charged. Further, mining law reform does not deal with private lands. The scope of the mining law of 1872 is limited to hardrock minerals such as gold, silver, lead, and zinc on Federal lands in the Western States. That is also the scope of this reform bill.

In brief, the legislation we are introducing today would prohibit the continued give-away of public lands. It would require that mining claims be diligently developed. It would impose a royalty on the production of valuable minerals extracted from Federal lands. And, it would require industry to comply with some basic reclamation standards.

Again, this legislation is identical to the bill which passed the House last year by a bipartisan 3-to-1 margin.

Mr. Speaker, I receive many calls in my office on the issue of mining law reform. When people learn that today, in 1995, gold and silver is still mined off public lands for free, they are, naturally, incredulous. The question is often asked: How come Congress has not done anything to reform the mining law yet?

Frankly, as the Member who commenced this current effort to reform the mining law back in 1987, I, too, am incredulous that this law continues in force in a manner basically unchanged from its 1872 origins. Historically, the western hardrock mining industry has been successful in blocking any and all congressional reform initiatives. Lately, however, I have noticed an increasing sentiment within the more progressive element of the industry to settle this matter once and for all. Perhaps 1995 will be the year in which the voice of this element of the industry will become the dominating voice of the industry overall.

For the benefit of my colleagues, following I offer a brief history on the effort to reform the mining law of 1872:

HISTORY OF MINING LAW REFORM

The genesis of mining law reform dates back to 1879, seven years after the enactment of the Mining Law of 1872. At that time, Congress created the first major Public Land Commission to investigate land policy in the West. One of its major recommendations included a thorough rewrite of the 1872 law which even then was believed by many to undermine efficient mineral development.

Several decades later, in 1908, President Roosevelt created the National Conservation Commission to study Federal land policy in the West, and it, too, made a number of recommendations for reform of the Mining Law. Again, in 1921, a committee appointed by the Director of the Bureau of Mines recommended a series of reforms, developed in concert with mining industry representatives interested in improving the mechanics of the law. These recommendations were embodied in legislation introduced in both houses of Congress and hearings were held in 1922, however, no action was taken at that time.

Following this effort, the next call for reform came at the onset of World War II, when then Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes endorsed a leasing system for hardrock mining. In 1949, the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, like the first Public Land Commission, recommended a series of changes to the Mining Law. This effort was succeeded by the President's Materials Policy Commission (the Paley Commission) in 1952 which also recommended revisions, including placing hardrock minerals under a leasing system. Once again, the criticism centered on inefficiencies in mineral development caused by the law.

Between 1964 and 1977 Congress went through another period of debate on mining law reform. The debate became more complex during that time as issues related to abuse and the need for environmental protections were added to the mix. The Public Land Law Review Commission, created by Congress in 1964, made the Mining Law a prominent issue on its agenda. Following issuance of the Commission's report in 1970, Congress debated the issue until 1977, when efforts to reform the mining law collapsed.

After a decade-long hiatus, on June 23, 1987, what was then known as the Subcommittee on Mining and Natural Resources held an oversight hearing on the Mining Law of 1872, initiating the current round of Congressional debate on reform. Subsequently, the Subcommittee held a number of hearings on specific issue areas related to hardrock mining on public lands, such as: hardrock mine reclamation and bonding requirements, abandoned mine land problems, mining claims on Stock Raising Homestead Act lands, uncommon varieties of hardrock minerals, regulation of hardrock mining wastes, and oil shale claims. On September 6, 1990, the Subcommittee on Mining and Natural Resources conducted a hearing on the first reform measure introduced into the House in over a decade, H.R. 3866, sponsored by then Subcommittee Chairman Rahall. This hearing was augmented by several reports produced by the U.S. General Accounting Office at the Subcommittee's request: An Assessment of Hardrock Mining Damage (1988); The Mining Law Needs Revision (1989); Unauthorized Activities Occurring on Hardrock Mining Claims (1990); Patenting of Mining Claims Complies with Law (Oregon Dunes) (1990); and, Increased Attention Being Given to Cyanide Operations (1991).

At the commencement of the 102nd Congress, on February 6, 1991, H.R. 918 was introduced by Rep. Nick Rahall. During the first session of that Congress, the Subcommittee on Mining and Natural Resources held four field hearings on the bill in Denver, Colorado (April 12, 1991); Reno, Nevada (April 13, 1991); Sante Fe, New Mexico (May 3, 1991); and Fairbanks, Alaska (May 25, 1991). Two additional days of hearings were held on the bill in Washington, D.C. on June 18, 1991, and June 20, 1991. On June 24, 1992, H.R. 918 was favorably considered by what was then known as the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which reported the bill with amendments by a roll call vote of 26 to 19. The House began floor consideration of the bill, but did not complete action on the measure prior to the adjournment of the 102nd Congress.

At the beginning of the 103rd Congress, on January 5, 1993, Rep. Rahall introduced H.R. 322, which closely mirrored the version of H.R. 918 previously considered on the House Floor. On March 11, 1993, the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing on the bill and on October 28, 1993, the Subcommittee favorably reported the bill as amended. On November 3, 1993, the Committee on Natural Resources favorably reported the bill as amended by a vote of 28 to 14. H.R. 322 was passed by the House on November 18, 1993, by a vote of 316 to 108. Unfortunately, during the 103rd Congress a House-Senate conference committee on mining law reform was unable to reach an agreement.

ANTITRUST AND COMMUNICATIONS REFORM ACT OF 1995

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as an original cosponsor of legislation introduced today which proposes to update our Nation's communications laws for the information age.

Introduced by my colleague JOHN DINGELL, this legislation embodies measures—H.R. 3626 and H.R. 3636—which were approved in overwhelming fashion by the House in the previous Congress. Together, these bills represented the Nation's roadmap for the information superhighway. I want to commend my distinguished colleague, Mr. DINGELL, for quickly bringing these issues to the attention of the House by introducing this legislation on the opening day of the 104th Congress.

Although approved by impressive margins in the House, the Senate was unable to complete work on a similar measure due to a number of factors, including the lack of sufficient days remaining in the legislative calendar.

Titles III, IV, V, and VI of the bill introduced today consist of the language of H.R. 3636, which I introduced in the 103d Congress with Representative JACK FIELDS. Working closely in bipartisan fashion with our other subcommittee colleagues, we were able to propose radical changes and needed reforms to our Nation's communications laws. This bill passed the House by a vote of 423 to 4 last year.

It is my hope to again work closely with now-Chairman FIELDS and other committee members, in a nonpartisan way, to repeat our legislative success in the new Congress.

The purpose of this legislation is to help consumers by promoting a national communications and information infrastructure. This legislation seeks to accomplish that goal by encouraging the deployment of advanced communications services and technologies through competition, by safeguarding ratepayers and competitors from potential anticompetitive abuses, by preserving and enhancing universal service, and by addressing longstanding legal and regulatory issues posed by the Modification of Final Judgment [MFJ], which broke up Ma Bell a decade ago.

The bill will preserve and enhance the goal of providing to all Americans high-quality phone service at just and reasonable rates. This goal of universal service is one of the proudest achievements of our Nation during the 20th century, and this legislation will ensure it endures beyond the year 2000.

Second, the legislation will promote and accelerate competition to the cable television industry by permitting telephone companies to compete in offering video programming. Specifically, the bill would rescind the statutory ban on telephone company ownership and delivery of video programming. Telephone companies would be permitted, through a separate subsidiary, to provide video programming to their subscribers so long as they establish an open system to permit others to use their video platforms. But they must enter the business the old fashioned way: by building a new system and not just through buying up an existing system.

In addition, the legislation will promote competition in the local telephone market. This market is one of the last monopoly markets in the entire telecommunications universe. We all have witnessed how the long distance market and the telecommunications equipment market has benefited tremendously from competition. Just 10 years ago, you had one choice in long distance—AT&T—and one choice for a phone—black rotary dialed.

Through Federal policies, hundreds of equipment makers and long distance companies now exist, providing rigorous competition. We can see those same benefits in the local telephone market, and thereby benefit consumers by giving them more choice at lower prices.

Moreover, the legislation addresses issues related to the breakup of AT&T. The bill lays the foundation to resolve issues with respect to the line of business restrictions placed upon the Bell operating companies at the time of the breakup. It sets the stage for determining how and when a Bell company may participate in the long distance marketplace.

In addition, this legislation stipulates the terms and conditions for Bell company participation in the information services, alarm, and equipment manufacturing markets. This legislation will effectively take these issues out of the courts and will provide a blueprint to the Federal Communications Commission, the Department of Justice, and State regulators as to how to move the industry toward greater competition while protecting consumers and competitors from the potential for monopoly abuses. This bill will also provide a modicum of certainty to participants in the marketplace, allowing CEO's, investors, and entrepreneurs to effectively plan for the future.

Again, I want to commend Mr. DINGELL for introducing this legislation. I look forward to working with him, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. BLILEY, and other committee colleagues, on legislation to overhaul the 1934 Communications Act for the 1990's.

TRIBUTE TO JOE PATERNO AND THE NITTANY LIONS

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, on this historic first day of the 104th Congress, I would like to publicly extend my warmest congratulations to Joe Paterno and the Nittany Lions of Penn State on their Rose Bowl victory.

As the winner of the Big Ten Conference, the Nittany Lions went to Pasadena to meet a worthy adversary, and the Oregon Ducks proved to be just that. In the end, however, Penn State triumphed, 38 to 20, after displaying fine teamwork and unrelenting determination.

With this Rose Bowl victory, Joe Paterno passes Bear Bryant as the coach with the most bowl game victories to his credit. This win completes the fifth undefeated season in his 29 years of coaching at Penn State.

The Associated Press and CNN/USA Today have awarded the national championship to another undefeated team, but in my mind Penn State has earned the right to be called a national champion.

While my colleagues from Nebraska may disagree with my assessment of Penn State's ranking, the only way to settle, once and for all, the question of which team is the national champion can only be decided in a head-to-head competition. As USA Today indicated in a cover story headline yesterday, without a match between these two undefeated teams, the question of which team is better is still open to debate.

One thing is certain, Pennsylvanians and Penn State alumni across the country can take pride in the performance of this team and the football program at Penn State. With many of the players returning next year, we may see this open question settled after all.

PROGRESS ON THE ECONOMY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, October 26, 1994, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PROGRESS ON THE ECONOMY

One of the top concerns of Hoosiers remains the economy and the economic outlook. Hoosiers are concerned about the budget deficit, our international competitiveness, and especially jobs and job security. At the same time, most recognize that progress is being made and that the economy is doing better now than it has for years. Over the last two years we have made major progress on the budget deficit. That in turn has given a significant boost to the economy. We need to build on these successes and continue the basic policies that have helped turn things around. Certainly there is still much room for improvement in the economy, but there is little evidence that our economic policy needs a major change in direction.

PROGRESS ON THE ECONOMY

In January 1993, both the federal deficit and federal spending as a share of the economy were spiraling upward, while the economy was in the slowest recovery of the postwar era. The President and Congress passed the deficit reduction package last year which led to a dramatic drop in the deficit, and also has sparked a steady, sustainable economic recovery. Critics were saying that the package would cause a recession and higher unemployment. It has had just the opposite effect, boosting the economy in several key ways.

Deficit reduction: The $430 billion deficit reduction package means that the deficit will decline for three years in a row—the first time that has happened since the Truman Administration. We are finally getting a handle on the deficit—bringing it down from $290 billion in 1992 to a projected $160 billion next year. That will make the deficit as a share of the economy the lowest since 1979, and one of the lowest of all the major industrialized countries.

By 1998 the national debt will be $650 billion lower than was projected before the passage of the deficit reduction plan. (Two-thirds of this comes directly from the deficit reduction package, the rest from the strengthened economy.) That's $10,800 of reduced federal debt for each family of four in Indiana. We need to continue these deficit reduction efforts rather than reverse course.

Growth: The U.S. economy is growing at a solid, sustainable pace. The rate of economic

growth, which averaged 1.5% in the Bush Administration, has more than doubled to 3.3% in the Clinton Administration. The U.S. economy is growing faster than any other major industrialized country. Our projected growth rate of around 3% is about where we want it—much slower and it would lead to rising unemployment, much faster and it would reignite inflation.

Unemployment: The unemployment rate has come down from 7.1% in January 1993 to 5.9% today. Some 4.6 million new jobs have been created since January 1993, compared to 2.4 million over the previous four years. 92% of these jobs have been in the private sector, compared to 54% during the Bush Administration. American job growth this year will exceed job growth of all the other major industrialized countries combined.

In Indiana, the unemployment rate has dropped from 5.9% in January 1993 to 5.1%. The number of Hoosier jobs has grown by 155,000 in the last two years, after declining by almost 100,000 in the three previous years.

This is solid progress on the jobs front, and we need to continue the deficit reduction lower interest rates, and strong economic growth that have helped bring it about.

Productivity: Higher productivity is key to an increased standard of living for American workers. Productivity has increased at an annual rate of 2.2% since the beginning of 1993—a significant improvement over the record of the 1980s. The lower interest rates resulting from deficit reduction have boosted investment and productivity.

Inflation: It has been a significant accomplishment that we have done so well in boosting economic growth and lowering unemployment without reigniting inflation. Inflation since January 1993 has averaged 2.8%—the lowest level in 30 years.

Income growth: Income growth is one aspect of the recovery that remains disappointing. Median family income has not kept up with inflation in recent years. It grew slightly last year, but after adjusting for inflation actually declined by about 1%. This is a slight improvement over the previous four years, but still disappointing. Family incomes in Indiana did not decline like the rest of the country, but they did not grow either.

This has made many people skeptical about overall progress on the economy since they have not felt it much in their paychecks. Although most workers saw a modest increase in their total compensation—wages plus benefits—during the past decade, it was much less than in earlier decades and most of the increase recently has gone for higher employee health insurance premiums. So workers have not seen much increase in their paychecks. Making real progress on takehome pay will require continued strong economic growth, increased investment, as well as meaningful health care reform that reins in escalating health care costs.

Trade deficit: A second disappointment is the trade deficit. Since the mid-1970s, the U.S. has been importing more goods and services than it has exported. The trade deficit in goods and services, which peaked at $150 billion in 1987, fell to $30 billion in 1991. Since then, severe recessions in Europe and Japan have reduced their ability to buy U.S. products, driving our trade deficit up to the $80–90 billion range. This should turn around as Europe and Japan recover.

CONCLUSION

Certainly we need to continue to focus on improving our country's economic future, but we have made significant progress in shoring up the economy during the past two years. An independent study recently found that the U.S. now has the world's most competitive economy, overtaking Japan for the first time since 1985. Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan said earlier this year that because of the deficit reduction effort, ''. . . the foundations of the economic expansion are looking increasingly well-entrenched''. We need to continue the policies that have made the difference—meaningful deficit reduction, moderate interest rates, and an emphasis on productive investment. These policies are working and we should stick with them.

TRIBUTE TO THE DWIGHT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. THOMAS W. EWING

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, as we convene the 104th Congress, and welcome each of the new Members to this assembly of the people, I am reminded not only of our duty to preserve, protect, and uphold the U.S. Constitution, but of the vital role an educated citizenry plays in the effective governing of our country. As Members of Congress we have a responsibility to promote civic education and to recognize those who excell in their studies.

This is why I am proud to enter into the permanent RECORD of the 104th Congress the names of the following distinguished students from Dwight Elementary School in the 15th District of Illinois who have been awarded a Certificate of Achievement from the Center of Civic Education, for their study of the history and principles of the Constitution of the United States of America. The honorees are: Joseph Brassard, Robert Breese, Timothy Brown, Lori Eggenberger, Nathan Hoegger, Pamela Maeder, Bryan Neville, Anita Nourie, Curtis Price, Falynne Price, Amber Riegel, Dennis Robisky, Andrea Scott, Jennifer Small, Jason Spandet, Joey Stevenson, Kathleen Stewart, Joann Weller, and Rhea Ann Wilson.

Who knows, Mr. Speaker? Some of these students may serve in the U.S. House of Representatives one day. Most important, however, is that these students help to educate other citizens about the importance of public participation and the virtues of good government.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my congratulations to these fine students.

PROTECT LIFE: NOW AND FOREVER

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation which will begin the process of amending the Constitution to protect human life in all its stages.

Over the past 2 years, the administration has touted its pro-abortion policies. In fact, States across the Nation are being notified that they breaking the law if they continue to refuse to provide abortions under the Medicaid Program. This must stop, and an amendment to the Constitution will do just that.

The U.S. Congress has been quick to defend the interests of the poor and the homeless, who have no effective advocate for their cause—and indeed those are worthy efforts. Yet Congress has, for too long, ignored the most silent voice of all, that of an unborn child.

The U.S. legal system is firmly based on morals. Is it right or wrong to steal? Is it right or wrong to hurt another person? Is it right or wrong to drive an automobile carelessly, thus endangering the lives of others? The answer to all of these questions is, of course, it is wrong.

The fact remains that abortion is the taking of an innocent human life—a killing that is morally wrong. The solution is to amend the Constitution and clarify that basic human rights extend to all—including the unborn.

I urge my colleagues in the House to put this scandalous chapter in our Nation's history to an end by starting the process which would amend the Constitution to protect all life.

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, January 5, 1995, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 6

9:30 a.m.
Joint Economic
To hold hearings on the employment-unemployment situation for December.
SD–538

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue hearings to examine issues involving municipal, corporate and individual investors in derivative products and the use of highly leveraged investment strategies.
SD–106

JANUARY 10

9:00 a.m.
Budget
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on the Budget to review congressional budget cost estimating.
345 Cannon Building

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings to examine Federal job training programs.
SD–430

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
Organizational meeting to consider committee business.
SR–222

Select on Intelligence
To hold hearings to examine world threat issues.
SH–216

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Organizational meeting to consider committee business.
SD–226

JANUARY 11

9:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To continue hearings to examine Federal job training programs.
SD–430

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Organizational meeting to consider subcommittee membership, committee rules of procedure, and committee budget for the 104th Congress.
S–128, Capitol

JANUARY 12

9:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To continue hearings to examine Federal job training programs.
SD–430

JANUARY 19

9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to review structure and funding issues of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.
SR–485