

their leaders are clearly rankled by what they see as a lack of American economic support.

"We've surrendered our sovereignty," James Mitchell, Prime Minister of St. Vincent and the Grenadines, said at a recent meeting of the Caribbean Americas Business Network in Miami. "We've given the U.S. all the cooperation in the world. What else do they want?"

American officials acknowledge some of the complaints, but they also say that eastern Caribbean nations have passed up opportunities through membership in regional lending institutions to ease their economic dependence on Washington.

For their part, leaders of the 14 nations making up the Caribbean Community, a regional economic association known as Caricom, have been urging the Clinton Administration to grant them trade parity with Mexico and Canada, the United States' partners in the North American Free Trade Agreement.

But Congress adjourned this month without taking action on the measure, which was intended to supplement the largely moribund Caribbean Basin Initiative created by the Reagan Administration.

In a report last month, the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, a Washington-based research group, attributed the delay in action to "partisan and special interest opposition" in Congress. The council said American legislators were wary of offending fruit lobbyists.

Caricom leaders say they need access to free trade to help compensate for a drop of nearly 90 percent in American economic assistance to the region over the last decade, from \$225 million to \$26 million. In August, a provision in the new minimum-wage law ended tax breaks for American corporations doing business in Puerto Rico.

At the same time, Washington is challenging the traditional system of trade preferences that allows many Caricom nations to export their products to European nations either duty free or at vastly reduced tariff rates. One such proposal, which Caribbean leaders say could cripple the region's banana industry, is now before the World Trade Organization.

"It seems shortsighted and baffling," said Frank Alleyne of the Institute for Social and Economic Research at the University of the West Indies. "What about the cost in social unrest? If they succeed, drug cultivation will increase, mark my word. Farmers must find another crop, and that crop is marijuana."

RECOGNIZING JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. J.C. WATTS, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation recognizing the Juneteenth holiday as the day of celebrating the end of slavery in the United States. Although slavery was officially abolished by the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863, it took over 2 years for news of freedom to reach all the slaves. On June 19, 1865, Gen. Gordon Granger rode into Galveston, TX, and announced that the State's 200,000 slaves were free. Vowing never to forget the date, the former slaves coined a nickname for their celebration—a blend of the words "June" and "Nineteenth." Though Juneteenth celebrations originated in the Southwest, they soon spread

throughout the South and are now celebrated throughout the Nation.

As we celebrate Black History Month, it is appropriate to recognize this significant moment in American history. Juneteenth Independence Day is an important and enriching part of our Nation's history and heritage and provides an opportunity for all Americans to learn more about our common past.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. BILLY J. BOLES

HON. RICHARD BURR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gen. Billy J. Boles for his long and distinguished service to his country in the U.S. Air Force. I always consider it a great privilege to have the opportunity to recognize the achievements of a member of the U.S. armed services. These Americans dedicate their lives to the protection and preservation of our freedom, and all too often, we neglect to adequately express our gratitude to them for the sacrifices they and their families gladly make for the sake of our Nation. I take particular joy in this occasion because General Boles is a native son of King, NC in my district.

On April 1 of this year, General Boles ends a 35-year career replete with honors and distinctions that took him through posts in Mississippi, Texas, Washington, DC, and Vietnam. During the majority of his tenure, the Air Force assigned to him one of the most challenging and important duties in the armed services—recruiting and accessing Air Force personnel and training them to become the best pilots in the world. In a very real sense, the Air Force entrusted General Boles with its future.

After receiving his Bachelor of Science degree at N.C. State University in 1961, General Boles completed his military training at the Squadron Officer School at Maxwell AFB in Alabama, the Armed Forces Staff College in Norfolk, VA, and the National War College at Fort Lesley J. McNair here in Washington DC. He then went to his first post at Keesler AFB in Mississippi. In September 1962, he began his career as a military educator when he became an instructor and assistant course supervisor in the Personnel Officer Course at Greenville AFB in Mississippi. General Boles' service also includes two assignments in Vietnam. First, from July 1965 through October 1965 he served with the 6250th Combat Support Group and from October 1966 through June 1967 he served at the 7th Air Force Headquarters both at Tan Son Nhut Air Base in South Vietnam. General Boles' career then took him through several important positions including Director of Personnel Programs at the U.S. Air Force Headquarters here in Washington, DC from June 1987 through June 1988 and Vice Commander of the Air Education and Training Command Headquarters at Randolph AFB in Texas from April 1995 through June 1995.

On July 1, 1995, the Air Force promoted Billy Boles to general and made him Commander of the Air Education and Training Command Headquarters where he has served ever since. His command consists of 13

bases, 43,000 active duty members, and 14,000 civilians and includes two numbered Air Forces, Air University, Air Force Recruiting Service, and Wilford Hall Medical Center. In addition to the tremendous responsibilities General Boles fulfilled over his career, he also found time for his family which includes his wife, Kay, and their son, David, who also serves in the Air Force as a lieutenant.

Over his 35 years in the Air Force, General Boles earned many major awards and decorations including the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit with oak leaf cluster, the Bronze Star Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters, the Air Force Commendation Medal, the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, the Air Force Organizational Excellence Award with four oak leaf clusters, the National Defense Service Medal with service star, and the Vietnam Service Medal with four service stars.

All of his life, General Boles dedicated himself to excellence in every task he undertook. Born to a tobacco farming family in the Mount Olive Church community of King, NC in Stokes County on July 27, 1938, young Billy Boles grew up in an environment that stressed hard work and dedication. By age 14, he grew his first tobacco crop on his own. While working hard on the farm, he also found time to participate in scouting through his membership in Boy Scout Troop 102. Religion also played an important role in his career, and he became a member of Mount Olive Baptist Church by baptism on October 10, 1948.

During his school years, Billy Boles never rejected an opportunity to work or to learn. He attended North Carolina Boys State at UNC Chapel Hill in 1955, and in addition to going to school and farming, he worked for the U.S. Department of Agriculture as a tobacco acreage measurer. At King High School, Bill Boles' activities included Glee Club, Junior Marshall, Vice President junior and senior year, and salutatorian. Originally planning to work for R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. after graduation, encouragement from teachers and friends prompted him to apply to and attend N.C. State University where he enrolled in the ROTC program that launched him on his distinguished military career.

While I feel a small amount of sorrow that the young men and women in our Armed Forces will lose a great leader like General Boles, I also feel confident that his great accomplishments as an educator and trainer have helped ensure the future of the Air Force for years to come. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my personal gratitude to Gen. Billy Boles for the great sacrifices and service he gave to his country over his long and distinguished career. Finally, on behalf of my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives as well as a grateful nation, General Boles, we say thank you.

CONGRESSIONAL TERM LIMITS AMENDMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1997

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under

consideration the bill joint resolution (H.J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the number of terms of office of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to the rule on House Joint Resolution 2, reported out of the Rules Committee on yesterday. There were a total of 19 amendments that were considered by the Rules Committee: 14 by Republicans and 5 by Democrats. This unequivocally points out the division in the House on this issue; not just between Republicans and Democrats, but between Republicans who support term limits and a good number of those who do not.

I must point out that even the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Congressman HYDE, does not support this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in favor of Members of Congress deciding who the American people should and should not vote for.

However, it is my position that if we are to have a constitutional amendment on term limits, it should be the people who make that individual choice. It will be the people who are most affected by this amendment to the Constitution, so why not let the people decide if they want term limits.

Mr. Speaker, the two amendments that I proposed would have done just that. The first would have given the States the power to prescribe the maximum number of terms for a particular State. This would have allowed a State to tailor its limits to the needs and the will of the people of that State.

It was a compromise amendment which allowed the States that wanted term limits to have them and the States that did not want term limits to reject them.

It is evident that we can not adopt different versions of an amendment to the Constitution. But we can allow the States to adopt their own versions of term limits.

The Supreme Court, in *U.S. Term Limits versus Thornton*, has made it clear that, without an amendment to the Constitution, the States do not have the authority to impose term limits on Members of Congress.

Consequently, now that we are in the amendment phase of creating a solution for the issue of term limits, the argument can be made that this is a power that should be given to the States. The legislatures of each State have an inherent local interest in developing a term limits solution for their particular State.

The States are now prepared to make a decision of term limits. Twenty three States have passed proposals affecting Members' terms of office. These States legislatures are now poised to take action. Why not let them take action on an amendment that would give them the power to decide the maximum number of terms for their Members.

My second amendment went one step further than State action empowerment. It gave the power of ratifying a term-limits amendment to the people of the individual States.

It allowed the individual voters of each State to come together using the convention process to vote on whether they wanted to ratify this constitutional amendment.

In keeping with the spirit of the Founding Fathers of our great country, this amendment lets the American people decide who will represent them in the Congress of the United States and for exactly how long.

Article V. of the U.S. constitution prescribes the ratification methods that may be used in ratifying an amendment to the Constitution. It may either be by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States or by conventions in three-fourth thereof.

The Founding Fathers granted Congress the power to decide which mode of ratification of an amendment to the Constitution may be used.

Mr. Speaker, there is a time such as this, in deciding an issue which will fundamentally change the nature of the Congress, that it would behoove us to consult with and defer to the American people.

The convention process allows us this opportunity. It allows for the American people to speak to an issue and to participate in the shaping and defining of that issue.

There is no doubt that in this democracy, the ratification of an amendment to the U.S. Constitution, utilizing the convention method, is by far the most democratic. The people of the United States would have the opportunity to participate in a process that is fundamental to the American way of openness and inclusion. The voters of America would have the opportunity to unquestionably validate this amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

In doing so, this will not be the first time that an amendment to the Constitution was ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States. The 21st amendment to the U.S. Constitution, in section 3, provides for ratification by conventions in the several States. Section 3 of the 21st amendment states:

This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

This 21st amendment, which repealed the 18 amendment prohibition of intoxicating liquors was ratified on December 5, 1933. Delegates in 25 States were elected in statewide at-large elections, delegates in 14 States were elected by congressional districts and 4 States used a combination of the two.

Laws providing for ratifying conventions were passed in 43 States and 16 of these States passed permanent statutes for future referrals of amendments. Clearly, this was a democratic effort by the people of the United States.

I must note that the very Constitution by which we have authority to sit and do the business of the American people was ratified by the convention method. Article VII, of the U.S. Constitution states:

The ratification of the conventions of nine States shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same.

If the convention method of ratification was good enough for the ratification of our great Constitution, then the convention method of ratification must be good enough for amending this same Constitution.

If the supporters of term limits were genuine about the concerns of the American people, they would have voted for these two amendments.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that they are not genuine. The rejection of these two amendments, each of which would have given the decisionmaking authority to the States and

to the voters, reveals that the people who are trying to push term limits down the throats of the American people only are genuine about taking power away from the voters of America.

Consequently, I urge my colleagues not to vote in favor of this rule.

FLAG PROTECTION AMENDMENT REINTRODUCED TODAY

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, along with the other sponsors of the constitutional amendment to prohibit the burning and desecration of the American flag, I am so proud that today we are reintroducing the flag protection amendment. This continues the grassroots effort to once and for all put an end to the disrespect and desecration of the symbol of our country—Old Glory.

With the support of fellow Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, the dedicated members of the Citizens Flag Alliance—consisting of over 100 veterans and civic organizations, many of whom are represented here today—and 49 State legislatures, we are confident we will finally be able to restore the long overdue protection to Old Glory we see flying above us today.

Ever since that tragic day in 1989 when 5 men in black robes said it was OK to burn and destroy our blessed flag, we have attempted to amend the U.S. Constitution to prohibit such desecration but have fallen short of the necessary two-thirds vote in both the House and Senate. But now we are within reach of that goal, and today marks the beginning of the grassroots push to get at least 290 Representatives and 67 Senators to sponsor our legislation which will guarantee its passage.

There are still those who will maintain that burning the very symbol of our Nation is simply an expression of speech. I for one, as well as all of you, take such an expression much more seriously. Such an act is purely a denunciation of the very spirit, principles, and system of government under which we enjoy our freedoms and opportunities. After all, the flag, being the very symbol of American freedoms and ideals, ought to be protected with the same vigor with which we protect the very freedoms and rights it represents. To that end, burning this blessed symbol is purely a crime against the State.

In our opinion, we ought to view the flag as a national monument and treat it with the same degree of reverence. As we look around ourselves today, we are surrounded by symbols of our freedom and the system of government so many have fought to protect. Standing here we gaze upon the Washington Monument, a beacon honoring the wisdom and dedication of our Founding Fathers. Beyond that lies the Lincoln Memorial and behind me, the U.S. Capitol, recognized throughout the world as the very symbol of democracy. In fact, throughout this city there are countless representations of our culture and ideals. However, no single one embodies America, or what it is to be an American, like this glorious symbol. Yet, vandalizing these monuments would be unconscionable and considered a disgraceful crime, as well it should.