

pressing needs of people, particularly the poor, and we must reinforce this commitment by an unequivocal acknowledgement that freedom from poverty is a fundamental human rights of all people.

Fourth, we must learn from past mistakes and ensure the development cooperation supports the polity and not just the economy; that it is country-driven and not donor-driven. The challenges of growing poverty and widening inequity will not be met without democratization and good governance. Development cooperation must be fully committed to these ends. Assistance projects must also be owned by the people they are intended to help, because these projects respond to their actual needs and because, through their participation, they themselves helped design the project. Development assistance must empower the poor—economically, socially and politically—not marginalize them.

Finally, we must have the foresight to increase development assistance, not reduce it. We know much better now—often from sad experience—how to succeed in development cooperation. Yet, right at this confluence of greater need and greater opportunity, we find tragically that resources are declining, not increasing. Development assistance has declined for five years running, and is now at an historic low. This trend that must be reversed, or we will pay dearly later—in missed economic opportunity, with emergency relief, with peacekeeping forces, through the spread of disease, environmental deterioration, illegal migrants, refugees, or terrorism. Certainly, we will pay through the great pall cast on the human spirit by the knowledge that we have not acted to help relieve poverty's suffering when we could so easily have. An enlarged volume of assistance is absolutely critical right now, for example, if we are to avoid the "Sophie's Choice" problem of increasing assistance to Asia without further diminishing assistance to Africa.

We must see development assistance not as an alternative to private investment but, for much of the world, as an essential building block to a vibrant private sector and successful financial markets. We must see development assistance not as a handout but as a solid investment in "global public goods," including peace and a more equitable and habitable world from which we all benefit. And we must seek development assistance not only from traditional sources but also from new and innovative sources of finance.

These are challenging objectives. But let's make no mistake about it: the policies the U.S. adopts today, in the context of the globalizing world, with regard to development cooperation and the United Nations—these are defining decisions for the United States. They will define the values for which our country stands. The world is watching, and expects a lot of America. Let us not disappoint them—or ourselves.

Thank you.

TRIBUTE TO LOUIS P. MARTINI

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 15, 1998

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the New York Times Obituary of Louis P. Martini. Louis Martini was a leading figure in the California business and he will be sadly missed.

"Louis P. Martini, a leading figure in the California wine business and chairman of the

Louis M. Martini Winery in Napa Valley, died Monday at his home in St. Helena, Calif. He was 79.

The cause of death was cancer his family said.

The Martini family has been involved in the California wine industry for more than 70 years. Mr. Martini's father, Louis M. Martini, founded the family winery as the L.M. Martini Grape Products Company in 1922 in Kingsburg, near Fresno. The elder Martini, who never thought of Prohibition as anything more than a temporary aberration, began planning the expansion of his business while other wine companies were closing.

In 1933, he moved to the Napa Valley and changed the company's name to the Louis M. Martini Winery.

Louis Peter Martini was born in Livermore and grew up in Kingsburg, working in the winery and the vineyards as a boy. He graduated from the University of California at Berkeley in 1941 and spent four years in the Army Air Forces during World War II. He joined the winery as vice president in 1946 and became the winemaker in 1954; wines he made in the 1950's and 60's are still prized by collectors.

At 6 feet 4 inches, Mr. Martini was a gentle giant, who worked in the shadow of his flamboyant father until the elder Martini's death in 1974. To an extent, the son's self-effacing nature is reflected in the winery's reputation. While he was a major producer of fine wine and an important behind-the-scenes industry leader, Mr. Martini avoided the well publicized social side of Napa Valley life, and his winery rarely appeared in trendy articles about the wine business.

But his achievements were numerous. In the 50's and 60's, he helped improve grape quality by identifying and propagating superior grape clones. He developed vineyards in the Carenros district of the valley when it was considered useful only for grazing sheep, and he is credited with making the first Carenros varietal pinot noir in 1952. Today many of the best California pinot noirs come from Carenros. Mr. Martini also made the first varietal merlot wine in the United States with his merlot blend in 1968 to 1970. And he was a pioneer in the use of mechanical grape harvesting.

From 1968 to 1985, he was president and general manager of the winery, which remains in family hands. His daughter is president and chief executive.

Mr. Martini was a founder and former chairman of the Wine Institute and a charter member of the American Society of Enologists.

Surviving, besides his daughter, are his wife Elizabeth Martinelli Martini; two sons Michael of St. Helena, the current Martini wine maker, and Peter, of Seattle, another daughter Patricia of San Francisco, and four grandchildren."

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Louis P. Martini. Mr. Martini was a great American businessman and patriot. I ask all my colleagues to join with me in expressing my sincerest condolences to the Martini family.

H.R. 901, THE AMERICAN LAND SOVEREIGNTY PROTECTION ACT

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 15, 1998

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H.R. 901, "The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act," to reestablish Congress as the ultimate decision-maker in managing public lands and maintain sovereign controls of lands in the United States. The bill insists that no land be designated for inclusion in international land use programs, such as World Heritage Sites, without the clear and direct approval of Congress and requires that local citizens and public officials participate in decisions on designating land near their homes for inclusion in these international land programs.

World Heritage Sites are natural areas of cultural monuments recognized by the World Heritage Committee of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), under "The Convention Concerning Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage." Proponents of World Heritage Sites keep saying that they are designated at the request of local communities. They seem to believe that if they keep repeating this mantra often enough, then somehow it will prove true. The Committee on Resources has now held three hearings on this issue and has yet to find one example where a World Heritage Site designation was requested by a broad-based cross-section of either the public or local officials. On the contrary, the Committee has found that World Heritage Site designation efforts are almost always driven by federal agencies, usually the Department of Interior, and often face strong local opposition.

The Department of Interior, in cooperation with the Federal Interagency Panel for World Heritage has identified a shopping list of 94 sites in 31 States and the District of Columbia that they would like to make World Heritage Sites. So far, twenty-two of the sites on this list have been designated World Heritage Sites. I would like to include this list and the detailed descriptions of the natural properties on this list. More information on this important issue can be found on the Committee on Resources website at: <http://www.house.gov/105cong/issues.htm>

WORLD HERITAGE SHOPPING LIST FOR UNITED STATES (BY STATE)

ALABAMA

Moundville Site.

ALASKA

Aleutian Islands Unit of the Alaska Maritime National.
Wildlife Refuge (Fur Seal Rookeries).
Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.
Cape Krusenstern Archaeological District.
Denali National Park.
Gates of the Arctic National Park.
Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve, inscribed 1992.
Katmai National Park.

Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve, inscribed 1979.

ARIZONA

Casa Grande National Monument.
Grand Canyon National Park, inscribed 1979.