

There is now in India much greater understanding and acceptance of the need for foreign investment and technology collaboration for meeting the vast needs of India's developing economy. All sections are agreed that this is necessary to maintain and increase the growth rate of around 7 per cent that we have been achieving in recent years.

While US aid funds are relatively much smaller than the inflow of capital into business and industry, they do serve the purpose of enabling very important programmes to be implemented in backward areas for the benefit of the disadvantaged in the field of health, family welfare and education. These programmes involving interacting of American experts and officials with NGOs and Indian volunteers is of great help in enhancing people to people understanding between the two countries.

In a month from now we would be celebrating the 50th anniversary of India's independence and democracy. While we have achieved much during this period by way of consolidation of the nation state, providing adequate food security for the people, and setting the base for economic development, there are still many challenges that we have to face and overcome for providing the desirable level of living to large sections of our people. At this time of review and introspection, we are conscious of the benefits that we have derived by way of bilateral cooperation with the US in the important areas of agriculture, education, science and technology. At this time when we are looking for much greater cooperation in these areas, it is unfortunate that we might have to tackle something of a negative nature in the House.

It was gratifying to see in the debate on the House floor that took place in June last year on a similar amendment, that several Congressmen very ably put forth the following points:

(i) India has made a success of its democracy and established powerful institutions like an independent judiciary, a free press and vigorous political parties providing for consultation and participation in Government in accordance with the rule of law.

(ii) India, which like the US has a multi-religious and multi-ethnic society, has resolved conflict situations in a lawful, democratic manner and taken concrete steps to further improve the human rights situation, including the setting up of an effective National Human Rights Commission.

(iii) Indo-US business and trade relations have improved considerably with the US companies taking good advantage of the opportunities emerging in the Indian market, as borne out by the large number of US companies operating successfully in India.

(iv) The situation in Punjab had been resolved and the situation in Jammu & Kashmir has improved.

All the above points continue to be not only valid, but have acquired even greater force. Investment approvals pertaining to US companies are now for the order of \$8.5 billion. The opportunities existing for US companies in infrastructure sectors like telecom, roads, ports and power have a potential for fruitful investment of over \$20 billion per year.

The US Administration has acknowledged the improved situation with regard to human rights and also cited the problems created by the trans-border support for terrorist activities in India; the most recent example of which was the explosion caused in a train in Punjab which killed thirty-four civilian passengers on July 8th with serious injuries to many more. This highlights the need for not doing anything to encourage front organizations created for the sole purpose of mobilizing support and funds for essentially terrorist outfits.

Since last year there have been general elections to the State Assemblies in Punjab with a voter turn-out of over 69% and which brought the Sikh-dominated party, the Akali Dal to power in association with another party, namely, the Bhartiya Janata Party. There could not have been a clearer rejection of the separatist movement in the State of Punjab.

In Jammu & Kashmir too, general elections recorded a good voter turn-out of around 55% and resulted in Dr. Farooq Abdullah gaining majority not only in the Kashmir valley, but also in the regions of Jammu and Ladakh. This democratically-elected State Government has revitalized the Government machinery despite the strains created by terrorist gangs on the law and order machinery with the help of agencies across the border.

Initiatives taken by Prime Minister I K Gujral from the time he was the Minister for External Affairs have greatly helped in improving bilateral relations between India and its neighbors. As part of this policy, special steps have been taken to initiate discussions with Pakistan to tackle all outstanding issues. Agreement has been reached in the talks held so far to set up Working Groups for seeking solution to specific problems including the State of Jammu & Kashmir and terrorism. The House was good enough to applaud these efforts. It is our hope that progress at these talks would help create a better climate for tackling terrorist activity.

This letter has become much longer than I intended, but the subject being very important and your consideration and support of great value to us, I had to put the relevant facts before you. I am confident that with your goodwill and encouragement we shall build upon the strong foundation that has been laid in recent years in our bilateral relations. As always, I and my staff at the Embassy are available to assist you in any way possible. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely,

NARESH CHANDRA.

IN TRIBUTE TO REAR ADM.  
ROBERT ELLIS FRICK

**HON. SAM GEJDENSON**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 22, 1997*

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay special tribute to Rear Adm. Robert Ellis Frick, the U.S. Navy's Program Executive Officer for Submarines. I ask that you and the other Members of this distinguished body join me in acknowledging his extraordinary service to our Nation.

Bob Frick leads some of our Nation's most important and complex weapons acquisition programs—design and construction of *Seawolf* submarines, design of the new attack submarines, and design and development of all submarine combat systems. His contributions to the Navy have spanned an active duty career of almost 36 years.

Mr. Speaker, Bob Frick epitomizes the best in a modern naval officer. The high regard in which he is held marks Bob as one of our most effective and respected Navy leaders. Known for his technical expertise and insightful leadership, Bob has inspired and mentored many naval officers and civilian leaders. Decorated with numerous awards, Bob has been

honored with the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, and the Meritorious Service Medal (with 4 Gold Stars), and the Navy Commendation Medal (with 2 Gold Stars).

A native of Erie, PA, Bob Frick enlisted as a seaman in the U.S. Navy in 1961. After completing basic training, he was assigned to U.S.S. *Sabalo* (SS 302) in Pearl Harbor, HI, where he earned his silver dolphins for completing his initial qualification in submarines. Bob was then selected for and completed enlisted nuclear propulsion training in 1964. His performance resulted in his selection to attend Purdue University under the Navy Enlisted Scientific Education Program. Bob graduated from Purdue University in 1969 with both bachelor and master of science degrees in mechanical engineering.

Commissioned as an ensign in June 1969, Bob completed Nuclear Propulsion Officer Training and reported as a division officer aboard U.S.S. *Will Rogers* (SSBN 659), earning his gold dolphins in December 1971. His assignment included non-nuclear systems coordinator during an 18-month conversion and refueling overhaul at Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. Bob next served as engineer officer on U.S.S. *Haddock* (SSN 621) through a 15-month refueling and combat systems conversion overhaul at Mare Island Naval Shipyard. He then served as executive officer first on U.S.S. *Drum* (SSN 677) and then on U.S.S. *Kamehameha* (SSBN 642) during a strategic weapons conversion overhaul at Portsmouth Naval Shipyard.

From April 1984 until October 1987, Bob served as commanding officer, U.S.S. *Birmingham* (SSN 695), an assignment which included the ship's first major overhaul at Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard. Following command, he served as the deputy commander for Submarine Squadron One in Pearl Harbor and as senior member of the CINCPACFLT Nuclear Propulsion Examining Board. In 1990 Bob elected transition to the Material Professional Program with assignment as the assistant program manager for attack submarines responsible for all SSN 688 class submarine new construction efforts. In July 1992, he was assigned as the Senior Military Assistant to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology. In August 1993 Bob reported to Naval Sea Systems Command and assumed the duties as the deputy commander for submarines.

Mr. Speaker, during the course of his career, Bob Frick has faced tremendous challenges. His leadership and personal fortitude have been central to the operational effectiveness and reliability of submarines, and to our national security strategy which they enable and support. The successful completion and commissioning of U.S.S. *Seawolf*, the most advanced submarine in the world and the first new class of attack submarines to enter the fleet in over 21 years, is but the latest example of Bob Frick's tremendous leadership. Although he will be sorely missed in the Navy, Bob's vision, leadership, and personal style will continue to have a great impact on our Navy and our Nation for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues and the citizens of this great country, I am proud to have the opportunity to honor Rear Adm. Robert Ellis Frick with "Bravo Zulu" for a job well done. I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me to wish Bob and

his wife Susan, and children Jennifer, Sarah, and Kevin, "Fair Winds and Following Seas" as they begin their next voyage.

NEW ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROVISIONS IN THE UNITED STATES-PUERTO RICO POLITICAL STATUS ACT

**HON. ELTON GALLEGLY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I am an original cosponsor of United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act, chairman of the subcommittee which had original jurisdiction over this legislation, and an advocate of English as the official language of the United States. In this capacity I want to clarify statements which are being circulated outside of and within Congress based on incorrect and outdated information that contradicts the English language provisions of the legislation as recently amended.

This remarkable bill sponsored by Resources Committee Chairman BILL YOUNG, Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH, Resident Commissioner CARLOS ROMERO-BARCELÓ of Puerto Rico, and some 90 others, provides a three-stage self-determination process to resolve the United States century-old political status problem with Puerto Rico by the year 2010. The United States citizens of Puerto Rico and all U.S. taxpayers deserve no less.

Since the United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act was first introduced in the 104th Congress, extensive English language provisions and requirements have been added to build upon the 100-year tradition of English as an official language of Puerto Rico. The new and amended English language provisions are directed at the existing status of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico as a territory under United States sovereignty, and alternatively, the transition of Puerto Rico to a State, depending on the outcome of the legislation's congressionally authorized referendum.

Thus, the United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act, H.R. 856, provides an informed self-determination process for the United States citizens of Puerto Rico and clearly addresses the language issue from several vantage points, without violating constitutional limits affecting the people and State government. The language provisions of the bill as amended and approved with virtual unanimity by the Committee on Resources on May 21, 1997, follows:

ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROVISIONS IN H.R. 856, THE UNITED STATES-PUERTO RICO POLITICAL STATUS ACT

Language Policy [Section 3(b)]—

"English shall be the common language of mutual understanding in the United States, and shall apply in all of the States duly and freely admitted to the Union."

"The Congress recognizes that at the present time, Spanish and English are the joint official languages of Puerto Rico, and have been for nearly 100 years."

"English is the official language of Federal courts in Puerto Rico."

"The ability to speak English is a requirement for Federal jury service."

"Congress has the authority to expand existing English language requirements in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

"In the event that the referendum held under this Act result in approval of sovereignty leading to Statehood, English language requirements of the Federal Government shall apply in Puerto Rico to the same extent as Federal law requires throughout the United States."

Statehood Ballot Definition [Section 4(a)(C)(7)]—

"English is the official language of business and communication in Federal courts and Federal agencies as made applicable by Federal law to every other State, and

"Puerto Rico is enabled to expand and build upon existing law establishing English as an official language of the State government, courts, and agencies."

Transition Plan [Section 4(b)(C)(i)]—

"In the event of a vote in favor of Statehood, the president shall include in the transition plan proposals and incentives to:

"Increase the opportunities of the people of Puerto Rico to learn to speak, read, write, and understand English fully, including but not limited to, the teaching of English in public schools, fellowships, and scholarships."

"The transition plan should promote the usage of English by the United States citizens of Puerto Rico, in order to best allow for—

"The enhancement of the century old practice of English as an official language of Puerto Rico,

"The use of language skills necessary to contribute most effectively to the Nation in all aspects, including but not limited to Hemispheric trade,

"The promotion of efficiency and fairness to all people in the conduct of the Federal and State government's official business; and

"The ability of all citizens to take full advantage of the economical, educational, and occupational opportunities through full integration with the United States."

MAKING AIRLINE TAXES PALATABLE

**HON. STEVE C. LATOURETTE**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I call to my colleagues' attention the attached editorial that appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on Thursday, July 17, 1997. As the editorial accurately states, under H.R. 2014, "fees for using the tax-supported airways would be more evenly distributed among the airlines, whatever their size. And the airline's (Continental) numbers support this contention."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker for allowing me this opportunity to raise this important issue which will significantly impact consumers and our Nation's airline industry.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 17, 1997]

MAKING AIRLINE TAXES PALATABLE

U.S. airline passengers can expect to be squeezed to help pay for a range of congressional tax cuts.

New taxes on air travel are inevitable, whether a Senate or House version of a revenue-raising measure is adopted. But the latter offers fliers a better and fairer deal.

The country's major airlines say they are not opposed to such taxes in principle. After all, they should be intended primarily to guarantee a reliable funding source for the Federal Aviation Administration, which operates the national air traffic control system and other support services.

But the big carriers have lobbied vigorously against the Senate's proposal to retain the existing 10 percent excise tax on most domestic tickets—reduced to 7.5 percent on some rural segments—and place a similar charge on the domestic portion of an international flight.

Instead, they have embraced a plan by House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Bill Archer for a 7.5 percent domestic tax with an additional \$2 charge for each segment of a flight.

Both bills call for increased taxes on international travel. The House version is steeper, but is expected to be modified in conference.

Texas Republican Archer's bill is favored by Continental Airlines, the largest operator at Cleveland Hopkins International Airport, among comparable carriers that charge a variety of fares on most of their routes. But Southwest Airlines and other discount carriers prefer the Senate plan.

Continental rightly argues that under the Archer plan, fees for using the tax-supported airways would be more evenly distributed among the airlines, whatever their size. And the airline's numbers support this contention.

Continental also complains that imposing a tax on the domestic portion of a one-stop international flight, as in the Senate version, would put U.S. flag carriers at a disadvantage against foreign airlines that operate nonstop from U.S. gateway cities. Cleveland's case for adding a London flight could be damaged if such a tax is introduced, Continental says.

Airline excise taxes have been around since 1941, when a 5 percent levy was imposed on most means of travel. Before 1978, the government set ticket prices. But with deregulation's variations in ticket prices, different passengers on the same flight can pay different amounts in taxes for the same use of the air traffic control system.

Continental and the other major airlines argue that the Archer plan brings the tax system closer in concept to a user fee, which they believe the public would support. But its bigger appeal, for now, is that it would not make such a dent in the pocketbook.

CONSUMERS' NUTRITION AND HEALTH INFORMATION ACT

**HON. FRED UPTON**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce H.R. 2208—the Consumers' Nutrition and Health Information Act. I am pleased that my colleagues Representatives ED TOWNS, MARTIN FROST, and BOBBY RUSH are joining me in supporting this legislation as original cosponsors.

The Consumers Nutrition and Health Information Act is designed to increase consumers' access to timely, accurate information about the health benefits of foods and nutrients. It is very similar to the language on health claims contained in the Food and Drug Administration [FDA] reform bill reported with bipartisan support by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee last month.

The bill would permit manufacturers to make health claims on food labels without having to go through the long, complex FDA preapproval process when claims were based on authoritative statements published by the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for