

coaches were all that more determined to bring home the title.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that my colleagues join me in thanking the parents, teachers, students and others who have followed this team and offered their support for this squad throughout the entire season. Specifically, I would like to congratulate Head Coach Larry Ginn and the assistant coaches for a job well done.

I commend them all on the spirit, pride, and hard work they have shown to their community, and I wish them the very best of luck in seasons to come.

#### THE "AIRPORT SAFETY ACT"

**HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1998*

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced legislation, H.R. 3463, to require U.S. airports to install enhanced vision technologies to replace or enhance conventional landing light systems over the next ten years. The "Airport Safety Act" will more than pay for itself because of the cost effectiveness of enhanced vision technologies and the reduction in airplane landing accidents and aborted landings. I urge all members to support this important legislation.

H.R. 3463 defines enhanced vision technologies as laser guidance, ultraviolet guidance, and cold cathode technologies. The bill directs the U.S. Department of Transportation to issue regulations requiring airports to install these technologies to replace or enhance conventional landing light systems within ten years of enactment of the legislation. In addition, H.R. 3463 makes the installation of enhanced vision technologies eligible for funding under the airport improvement program.

This bill will make use of a proven new technology to dramatically enhance aviation safety. According to the Flight Safety Foundation, loss of flight crew situational awareness is the primary cause of most airplane accidents. Situational awareness is best defined as an accurate perception of the factors and conditions affecting the safe operation of an aircraft.

Enhanced vision technologies represent a dramatic breakthrough in improving flight crew situational awareness during airplane landings—especially in low visibility situations. The U.S. military has already thoroughly deployed and tested these technologies—with excellent results. Laser guidance systems provide pilots with a visual navigation flight path from as far as 20 miles from the runway, with the precision of an advanced instrument landing system. Best of all, the installation of enhanced vision technologies to replace or enhance conventional landing light systems will require no additional aircraft equipment.

In addition to dramatically improving the ability of commercial pilots to land aircraft during night time, fog and other foul weather conditions, these technologies also will dramatically reduce the likelihood of traffic collisions at airports with parallel runways.

Enhanced vision technologies provide the U.S. aviation system with an unlimited amount of applications. They can be built and installed at high or low density airports, airports located

in mountainous terrain, unprepared and unlit airports, vertical landing zones, confined areas such as hospitals, law enforcement agencies, oil rig platforms and remote islands.

Perhaps the most dramatic aspect of enhanced vision technologies are their ability to penetrate most weather conditions—including dense fog. For example, ultraviolet electro-optical guidance systems (UVEOGS) are specifically designed to penetrate dense fog. In tests structured by the Federal Aviation Administration and the U.S. Air Force, UVEOGS were visible up to a half a mile under 700 feet visibility conditions. These tests indicated that when visibility conditions are 700 feet, an aircraft pilot can detect a UVEOGS cue on the heads-up display and transfer to actual visual approach guidance at a distance of at least 2,400 feet from the runway. UVEOGS technology will allow pilots to acquire runway visibility much earlier than with conventional systems—even under adverse weather conditions. This, in turn, will provide pilots with additional reaction time during landing approaches to make flight path corrections.

UVEOGS is also compatible with the enhance ground proximity warning system (EGPWS). The actual location and image of a runway, anchored to earth, can be displayed in concert with the EGPWS ground contour display. The combination of UVEOGS and EGPWS would mark a significant advance in preventing controlled flight into terrain accidents.

Cold cathode technology produces a more uniform light output than a typical incandescent light. As a result, cold cathode lights leave no after image on the retina, even after looking directly into the light. This is important in aviation applications, especially helicopter operations, because cold cathode lights allow a pilot to see around the light, not just the light itself, thereby increasing the pilot's situational awareness and spatial orientation.

One final note about enhanced vision technologies. Yes, there will be a cost to airports associated with replacing or enhancing conventional landing light system with enhanced vision technologies. However, because enhanced vision technologies generally use less electricity than conventional lighting landing light systems, and are less expensive to maintain, in the long run they will pay for themselves. In addition, the "Airport Safety Act" gives airports ten years to install this technology. Finally, the bill allows airports to use AIP money to finance the installation of the new technology.

There exist today technologies to reduce the threat to aviation safety posed by adverse weather. Enhanced vision technologies have been tested by the U.S. military. They work, and they work well. The time has come for Congress to step up to the plate and require that this proven safety-enhancing technology be installed at all U.S. airports. If Congress is truly concerned about aviation safety, it will pass H.R. 3463.

#### THE FACULTY RETIREMENT INCENTIVE ACT

**HON. HARRIS W. FAWELL**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1998*

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to today join with my colleagues Messrs. GOOD-

LING, MCKEON, ANDREWS, ROEMER, and PETRI in introducing the Faculty Retirement Incentive Act. This bill would amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA) to clarify that it is permissible for colleges and universities to offer voluntary early retirement incentives to tenured faculty that are in part age-based.

I support the principles of the ADEA and note that the Act has already recognized the unique nature of faculty tenure. In 1986, when Congress amended the ADEA to abolish the mandatory retirement age, it included a seven year exemption for tenured faculty. On December 31, 1993, that exemption was allowed to expire as recommended by a congressionally mandated study, by the National Academy of Sciences, on the impact of an uncapped retirement age on higher education. The Academy's report, however, concluded that diminished faculty turnover—particularly at research universities—could increase costs and limit institutional flexibility in responding to changing academic needs, particularly with regard to necessary hires in new and expanding fields and discipline. It thus predicated its recommendation for ending mandatory retirement on the enactment of several proposals to mitigate these negative effects. The legislation I am introducing today is one of those proposals.

Moreover, this past January, the bipartisan National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education included this legislative initiative in its recommendations to check the skyrocketing cost of a college education. The Commission recommended that "Congress enact a clarification to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act to ensure that institutions offering defined contribution retirement programs are able to offer early retirement incentives to tenured faculty members. The Commission endorses pending Senate Bill 153, which would accomplish this purpose." This legislation which I am introducing today is similar to S. 153, introduced by Senators MOYNIHAN and ASHCROFT.

However, unlike the Senate version, this bill does not permit an early retirement incentive open exclusively to faculty in a given age range. Under this legislation, a college or university must allow all faculty who qualify for a retirement incentive at the time a plan is established, but for their having attained too advanced an age, at least 6 months to elect to retire and receive that incentive. Thus, no professor is denied eligibility for any retirement incentive on the basis of age.

This legislation has been endorsed by the union that represents university faculty, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). According to the AAUP, voluntary early retirement incentives are beneficial for both the faculty members who choose to retire and the institutions that need to encourage turnover to make necessary hires. Further, the voluntary nature of the proposed incentives and the double protections available to tenured faculty—the age discrimination laws and the tenure system—insure that this "safe harbor" cannot be used to penalize faculty members who choose not to retire. The AAUP wrote in a January 30, 1998 letter that it supports the legislation because "the retirement incentives under discussion are offered on a voluntary basis . . . [and] the legislation would permit an offer of additional benefits. It would not permit institutions to reduce or eliminate

retirement benefits that would otherwise have been available to faculty after a certain age."

The purposes of voluntary early retirement incentives permitted by this bill are precisely in line with the intent of section 4(f)(2)(B)(ii) of the Older Worker's Benefit Protection Act (OWBPA). That amendment to the ADEA states that it is not unlawful for an employer "to observe the terms of a bona fide employee benefit plan . . . that is a voluntary retirement incentive plan consistent with the relevant purpose or purposes of this Act." These incentives are consistent with the purposes of the ADEA because they merely subsidize or enhance the faculty member's regular retirement income, so that the income does not fall so far short of the retirement income that would be available upon retirement at a later age.

OWBPA explicitly allows for certain age-based early retirement subsidies in the case of defined benefit plans, but makes no reference to defined contribution plans. Of the over 3,400 colleges and universities in this country, over 70 percent offer defined contribution plans, which are very popular with the faculty. Both the professors and the institutions want the flexibility that this legislation insures.

This legislation has been endorsed by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, the American Association of Community Colleges, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the Association of American Universities, the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, the Association of Community College Trustees, the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, the College and University Personnel Association, the Council of Independent Colleges, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

I expect that this provision, along with several other recommendations of the Cost Commission, will be incorporated into H.R. 6, the "Higher Education Amendments of 1998," which will be marked up shortly by the Education and Workforce Committee. Thus, this legislation will contribute to containing the costs of higher education, as well as, in the words of the AAUP, "provide greater flexibility in faculty retirement planning, offer a substantial retirement benefit to those professors who choose to retire under the terms of an incentive plan, and leave other professors whole in their choice to continue their careers."

WORKING TOWARD A COMMON  
U.S.-EUROPEAN UNION POSITION  
ON PROLIFERATION ISSUES—THE  
VIEWS OF UK FOREIGN SEC-  
RETARY ROBIN COOK

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1998*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure to meet with UK Foreign Secretary Robin Cook during his visit to Washington in January, 1998, on the occasion of the UK Presidency of the European Union during the first half of 1998. On March 10, 1998 the Brit-

ish Ambassador sent me the text of a February 20, 1998 letter from Robin Cook, in reply to my short note of January 22nd.

Robin Cook's letter outlines the work of the United States and the European Union toward a common position on proliferation issues, especially with respect to Iran. I commend his letter to you, and the text of our correspondence follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RE-  
LATIONS,

*Washington, DC, January 22, 1998.*

His Excellency Robin Cook,  
*Foreign Secretary, The Foreign and Common-  
wealth Office, London SW1A 2AH, the  
United Kingdom*

DEAR ROBIN: It was a pleasure to meet you last Thursday, January 15, 1998 at your Embassy here in Washington. I enjoyed the opportunity to talk with you, and I benefitted from your comments.

I commend you for your close attention to the recent developments in Iran and Iraq. Continued close contact between the European Union and the United States on these and other issues will allow us to work constructively both to advance our shared interests and to resolve our differences. Your initiative to try to work on a common position toward proliferation issues involving Iran is particularly useful. I hope we can narrow our gap.

Thanks again for being so generous with your time. I wish you and your Government success during your EU Presidency period. I hope you will stay in touch on all matters of mutual interest.

With best regards,  
Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,  
*Ranking Democratic Member.*

FOREIGN & COMMONWEALTH OFFICE,  
*London SW1A 2AH, February 20, 1998.*

DEAR LEE, thank you very much for your letter of 22 January about the need to try to work towards a common European Union/United States position on proliferation issues. I too enjoyed our meeting in Washington.

The gap between the European Union and the United States on proliferation issues is, I believe, much smaller than many people in Congress think. The level of EU/US co-operation over Iran in particular is already very high. As you know, all members of the EU are active members of all the non-proliferation export control regimes: the Missile Technology Control Regime, the Nuclear Suppliers Group, the Zangger Committee, the Australia Group and the Wassenaar Arrangement. As such they apply stringent controls on the export of all dual use goods and missile technology to Iran. In addition to its regular expert level exchanges with the US over proliferation issues, the EU frequently concerts with the US in the margins of the plenary meetings of these regimes to maximise co-operation.

The real problem with transfer of weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missile technology to Iran does not, as the US State Department's own experts acknowledge, originate in the EU, but with third countries. The EU, working with the US, has been particularly active in applying political pressure on Russia, for example, to stop the leakage of ballistic missile technology to Iran. Tony Blair and other European leaders have raised their concern about this problem directly with President Yeltsin. At the EU/Russia Co-operation Council meeting on 26 January, I raised, on behalf of the EU, this question with Yevgeny Primakov. I encouraged him to ensure effective and rigorous

implementation of the recent Russian executive order blocking the leaking of weapons of mass destruction technologies. Our Political Director, in his Presidency capacity, followed up a week later at a meeting of senior EU and Russian officials.

This joint pressure is beginning to have an effect. It is a good example of the way in which transatlantic co-operation over shared areas of real concern about Iran is beginning to bite. EU and US officials are working closely to find other ways of developing transatlantic co-operation over proliferation issues. A meeting of EU/US proliferation experts on 10 February identified a number of other ways in which co-operation might be enhanced. Future meetings of experts as well as senior officials will follow in the coming weeks.

When I was in Washington, I stressed my determination to use our Presidency of the European Union to work for greater convergence of EU/US policy towards Iran in our shared areas of real concern. Iran's attempts to acquire weapons of mass destruction and its support for terrorism. However, I also made clear that the EU did not believe in the economic and political isolation of Iran and opposed US extra-territorial legislation like the Iran Libya Sanctions Act (ILSA), which penalises EU companies engaged in legitimate commercial activity in Iran. We do not believe that economic sanctions against Iran will have a significant impact upon Iran's attempts to acquire weapons of mass destruction. The best way to hinder these is through effective export controls and joint political action with suppliers of technology, areas in which the EU is already extremely active. My concern is that ILSA acts as a major impediment to our joint efforts to enhance transatlantic co-operation in our shared areas of real concern. In the end, countries such as Iran benefit from our differences. I know this was not the intention of the authors of the Act. I hope you will work with your colleagues to try to find a way through these difficulties, so that we will find it easier to achieve our common goal, preventing Iran acquiring weapons of mass destruction.

Our Embassy in Washington would be happy to brief you and your colleagues in more detail on the non-proliferation and counter-terrorism measures the EU takes against Iran.

Yours Sincerely,

ROBIN COOK.

IN HONOR OF CHARLES R.  
JACKSON

**HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1998*

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note for my colleagues the retirement of the President of the Non Commissioned Officers Association of the USA, Force Master Chief Petty Officer Charles R. Jackson US Navy, Retired. On March 30, he will end more than 45 years of public service which began in the Ohio National Guard, included more than 25 years in the United States Navy and culminated in nearly 19 years of service to the military and veterans community as a representative of the Non Commissioned Officers Association.

Chuck's Navy career began with his enlistment in 1955 and his assignment and training as an Aviation photographers Mate. Rather