

and our souls. So this year we celebrate the Republic's independence and our own acknowledgment of the Cape Verdean role in American culture at the 29th annual Festival of American Folklife, which opened last week at the Smithsonian in Washington, DC. In the future, we look forward to participating in the growth of a nation abroad and the celebration of its traditions at home.

REDUCTION IN VIP AIRCRAFT

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1995

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we have spent a great deal of time this week debating the Federal budget. I believe all Members can agree on the need to eliminate unjustifiable spending. At least one item in the Department of Defense budget falls into this category: the Pentagon's huge fleet of VIP aircraft. I have joined with 10 of my colleagues in introducing legislation to sell off some of these "generals' jets," which would result in a budget savings of at least \$130 to \$200 million a year.

The Department of Defense has a fleet of about 600 aircraft that are used to transport senior military personnel and civilian officials. About 500 fixed-wing planes and 100 helicopters perform administrative support missions. These aircraft do not include the Presidential aircraft, the 89th Military Airlift Wing, such as Air Force One, nor are they used for operational transport of troops. Rather, they are used for airlift transportation in support of command, installation, or management functions.

The General Accounting Office found that size of the administrative aircraft fleet—often called Operational Support Aircraft—far exceeds the wartime requirements, even according to the Pentagon's own estimates. Only 48 OSA were used "in theater" during the gulf war. This suggests that OSA aircraft's main role is not wartime, but peacetime. Even in the United States, the gulf war saw the services using much less than one-half of their inventory. The Commission on Roles and Missions also recommended reducing the size of the OSA fleet. In 1993, the Joint Chiefs report concluded that OSA inventories exceed wartime requirements. The Air Force concurred with the Joint Chiefs in 1994.

However, nothing has yet been done to eliminate the excess aircraft.

The public first heard about the aircraft issue last fall when a high-ranking Air Force general made a very expensive flight from Italy to Colorado. Although the flight was made for administrative purposes, and much less expensive commercial flights were available, a single general and his aide spent more than \$100,000 for the trip. The Air Force is even using their OSA planes to fly Air Force cadets to Hawaii to watch football games.

Perks at the Pentagon are no more justifiable than perks in any other agency of the Federal Government. If Congress is to have any hope of balancing the budget during the coming decade, we must focus our attention on reducing budget outlays. This means ending some programs that have little justification. Our bill would offer the American people significant reduction in spending that could either

reduce the Federal debt or fund other, more critical spending priorities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in bringing high-flying generals down to Earth. Let's save taxpayer dollars by paring this Pentagon perk.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ADOPTION INCENTIVES ACT OF 1995

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1995

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Adoption Incentives Act of 1995 in an effort to encourage more adoptions in our country.

This bill will provide a range of tax incentives to adoptive parents to help them build families through adoption. Specifically, the bill will make adoption assistance benefits to military and private sector employees for non-recurring adoption expenses tax-free, and allow penalty-free and tax-free withdrawals from individual retirement accounts [IRA's] for adoption expenses.

There is a desperate need for adoption in our country. Today, almost half a million children are in foster care. Some of these kids languish in the foster care system for more than 5 years, bouncing from one home to another. Between 85,000 and 100,000 of these children are legally free and waiting to be adopted. An additional 3 million children were reported abused or neglected in 1993. Many may need a safe haven—a welcoming home that adoption could provide.

One major obstacle to finding permanent, loving homes for these children is the cost of adoption. The average cost of a private or nonagency adoption is conservatively estimated at \$10,000 and can run as high as \$45,000. Many adoptive families have to mortgage their homes or borrow money from relatives to build a family.

In response, 180 of the Fortune 1,000 companies have established corporate programs that provide financial assistance to employees to help cover adoption expenses. Behind borrowing money and mortgaging homes, reimbursement benefits provided by employers are the third major way in which parents finance adoptions. These benefits average \$2,000 per adoption. In 1993, corporate adoption assistance programs facilitated 2,000 of the 50,000 adoptions that occurred.

The private sector has been especially creative in providing incentives for adoption. We must do more to encourage their efforts—as this bill does.

A similar adoption assistance program was established for military personnel in the defense authorization bill of 1991. Military families are entitled to up to \$2,000 to cover adoption-related expenses. Launching this program sent a positive signal to adoption agencies that were often reluctant to start the adoption process due to frequent relocations of many military families. As a result, almost 2,500 children have been adopted with this assistance.

The Adoption Incentives Act would also permit penalty-free and tax-free withdrawals from IRA's for adoption costs. Many of the tax proposals now pending before Congress would allow penalty-free IRA withdrawals for college

tuition, buying a first home, or caring for an elderly parent, as well as catastrophic medical expenses. Shouldn't adoption be encouraged in this same way? The answer is clear—adoption is also an investment in the future.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we send the message that adoption is a valued way of building a family and a future for our children. It is a goal we should all support.

EDITORIAL ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1995

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I want to share with you the insights of John E. Warren, editor and publisher of the San Diego Voice & Viewpoint, an African-American newspaper published in my hometown.

In a recent editorial, Warren wrote:

As America appears to be gearing up to make affirmative action the new symbol for the age old attack on the idea of equality and fairness for Blacks in this country, first, then all other groups but White males, it is extremely important that the Black response be one of reason, power, and direct results.

While it is fine to pen letters and speeches of response to the Pete Wilsons who would ride the horse of bigotry and racism into the U.S. Presidency if permitted, those letters and speeches must not become substitutes for direct action. The well known question is then asked: "What can African-Americans do to reach the moral conscious of an increasingly White America that appears to think it has done too much for too many who said things were not fair and now think that fairness is becoming an inconvenience as times get harder in a changing economy?"

Perhaps the key can be found in the paraphrase of a very old proverb "he who controls himself is better than he who controls nations."

Blacks continue to spend billions of dollars in every facet of the American economy with no economic demand for returns on our investments. We spend \$300 billion dollars a year collectively and we are begging a nation and its leaders to treat us "morally right" when we have not assumed the "moral responsibility" for ourselves.

African-Americans must remember that this country is now following a contract on America instead of the U.S. Constitution which Wade Henderson of the NAACP rightly called "our contract with America."

Consider that African-Americans have a vote, but most won't bother to use it. We have disposable income for clothes, too many of which are designed for our youth as gang attire, but we don't make these clothes. We buy new cars all over San Diego—many of which are the same as the ones sold by our one Black owned car dealership, but purchased from people who neither care for us or our communities.

We buy liquor, cigarettes, potato chips, butter and toilet tissue in larger numbers than any other ethnic group and make no demands in return. Some of those very people who benefit from our care-free spending habits use those same dollars to buy political votes across this nation that are now focused against our common good—the right to a job based on fairness and merit, the right to social insurance in time of need, the right to food, shelter and education, not based on the