

Under her watchful eye, the HIA planted the seed for the nation's first intergenerational day care in an industrial park. She embarked on this venture in 1989, and with a handful of volunteers developed and realized her dream. Today, that day-care program has more than 100 participants.

Concentrating on providing the best she could for the membership, she encouraged and convinced the Suffolk County Police Department to place a defibrillator in the Park's police sector car, and to establish a medical emergency police vehicle to provide immediate assistance to the victims of emergency situations in the Industrial Park.

Marcy is a life-long resident of Long Island, where she lives today with Mark, her husband of 35 years. Her pride and joy are her two daughters: Ilyse, a Physical Therapist at South Side Hospital, and Beth, a health-care consultant for Price Waterhouse.

A person is truly judged successful if she is able to bring about positive change that enhances and broadens the lives of others. Clearly, Marcy fulfills this notable standard.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me now in saluting Marcy Tublisky for her outstanding leadership, creativity and commitment, and to extend our best wishes and congratulations as she is honored by the members of the Hauppauge Industrial Association.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JULIA CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1999

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent yesterday, Tuesday, February 2, 1999, and as a result, missed rollcall votes 7 and 8. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote 7 and "yes" on rollcall 8.

IN MEMORY OF PAUL A. DEFRANCISCO

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a great public servant, Paul A. DeFrancisco. Mr. DeFrancisco served the people of Bedford Heights for nearly three decades.

Mr. DeFrancisco worked for 35 years in radio and television. As an employee Paul was diligent, intelligent, and optimistic. His unfailingly positive nature was infectious, and his technical skill helped "Today in Cleveland" run smoothly.

Mr. Paul DeFrancisco's greatest legacy is that of public service. For 29 years Paul worked on the Bedford Heights City Council. His wit and charm converted former foes into lifelong friends. Political opponents spoke highly of Paul's work. The City of Bedford Heights could not have asked for, nor could have received better representation than the high level of service provided by Mr. DeFrancisco. With graciousness and dignity, Paul served his community with humility and honor.

Following ill health in mid 1998, Mr. DeFrancisco resigned from the city council. After his passing the flags in front of the Bedford Heights City Hall flew at half mast, a symbol of his fellow citizens' respect for his long-time public service. To think of Bedford Heights without Paul DeFrancisco is almost impossible. His work and service to the community will be felt for years to come. To be loved by friends and admired by opponents and to serve both is the goal of all great leaders; it is a goal which Paul admirably attained.

Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in honoring the memory of Paul A. DeFrancisco.

CONTINUE THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

HON. TIM ROEMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1999

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to focus the attention of the House of Representatives on a short-sighted decision by Congress last year to terminate the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, an oversight board of the U.S. Information Agency. The advisory commission expires at the end of this fiscal year as a result of a miscellaneous provision hidden inside the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1999, which was enacted hastily by the 105th Congress before adjournment. Today, I am introducing legislation with the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) to continue the advisory commission.

The U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy is a highly distinguished Presidentially-appointed panel created by Congress to look broadly into the public interest of U.S. government activities intended to inform, understand and influence public groups in foreign countries. The advisory commission is responsible for assessing the public diplomacy policies and related programs of the United States Information Agency, other U.S. foreign affairs organizations, and U.S. missions located overseas. It has an excellent track record for helping the State Department and USIA achieve its foreign policy goals and giving the American people a meaningful return for their tax dollars.

The advisory commission was created by Congress in 1948 and has remained an independent and bipartisan oversight board for more than half a century. The seven commissioners are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. They are all private citizens who represent different professional backgrounds and who volunteer their own time as commissioners with the conviction that public diplomacy is indispensable to the national interest and to U.S. foreign policy. The advisory commission reports its findings and recommendations to the President, the Congress, the Secretary of State, the Director of USIA, and the American people. It meets on a monthly basis and has a full-time staff of four with an average annual budget of less than \$450,000. Over the last three years, the advisory commission has returned an average of \$75,000.

Since its creation, the advisory commission has provided oversight of our international ex-

change programs, international broadcasting, and publicly-funded activities of foreign non-governmental organizations. Over the years, it has been chaired by many distinguished members and published several highly acclaimed reports. Recently, the advisory commission has arrived at serious conclusions regarding the training, promotion and spending policies of the State Department and USIA. Accordingly, it has also recommended insightful and intelligent new approaches to guide U.S. diplomats away from current methods that can render them ill-equipped to relate to foreign citizens, foreign news media and the non-governmental organizations, which are increasingly influential in shaping international policy- and opinion-making. These recommendations are intended to help our diplomats communicate more effectively with people other than just their official counterparts and help them recognize and understand foreign attitudes and thinking.

In 1996, for example, the advisory commission issued a series of recommendations under the publication "A New Diplomacy for the Information Age," which called for the combination of the State Department's expertise in dealing with foreign states and USIA's expertise in dealing with foreign publics to maximize the "edge" we enjoy in information and communications technology. Subsequently, the advisory commission made additional recommendations in the report entitled "Publics and Diplomats in the Global Communications Age," which called for more public diplomacy training for all diplomats and establishing a permanent interagency coordinating body to develop and implement diplomatic communication strategies.

The advisory commission's reports illustrate how the increase in global communications and technology makes foreign publics far more important than ever and why we should use our advanced skills in these areas to inform, understand and influence those foreign publics. Last year's report, for instance, explains how Saddam Hussein used public diplomacy to his advantage when he shifted the focus of the world media from his arsenal of weapons of mass destruction to the tragic suffering of Iraqi children, a campaign that did nothing to help the United States build the same coalition in 1998 as assembled against Saddam's sinister regime in 1991. The advisory commission's report, which can be accessed via USIA's web page, also includes intelligent and thoughtful recommendations on how to deal with such problems in the future. I believe this represents one of the most important advisory functions of the commission, and I encourage my colleagues to read the report.

While the State Department reorganization section of the omnibus appropriations legislation retained the advisory commission to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, it eliminated the advisory commission to USIA—a much larger agency. It is important to indicate that there was no provision for the elimination of the advisory commission in the bill as originally passed by the conference committee deliberating the State Department reorganization bill. However, since the omnibus appropriations legislation was not opened for amendments, it was not in order to vote on the advisory commission's continuance. That was not a fair consideration of its future, and

it certainly does not represent good public policy concerning our diplomatic and foreign policy goals.

Mr. Speaker, the State Department consolidation is an overdue reinvention of the U.S. foreign policy establishment for the information age. This reorganization can help us take advantage of our edge in information and technology by using public diplomacy. During the transition period involving USIA's merger into the State Department, the advisory commission's role would be significant as the two cultures learn to work with one another. The advisory commission has a proven track record in making recommendations to Congress and the Administration in support of this strategy and making it work. It is simply not enough to train our diplomats about the language and culture of a foreign country. Nor should they be trained as narrowly focused and secretive specialists who fail to grasp the extent to which the world has changed around them. Rather, we must help them take advantage of the ever-increasing breadth of information and technology in order to effectively reach out and express our message and principles concerning democracy, human rights, free markets and American traditional values. The advisory commission should be continued, and for these reasons I urge my colleagues to support this important bipartisan legislation.

THE DUMPING OF CHEAP, ILLEGAL STEEL IN U.S. MARKETS BY JAPAN, BRAZIL, AND RUSSIA

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1999

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of legislation to be introduced by Representative VISCLOSKEY, imposing steel import quotas on countries that are dumping steel in our markets, and by Representative TRAFICANT, to impose a short-term ban on steel imports in the foreseeable future. I also support Representative REGULA's bill calling for immediate changes in the Section 201 procedures used to indicate or prove that foreign imports are causing grave injury to industries and workers in the United States.

The jobs of steel workers are at risk: 10,000 have already lost their jobs, and 24 more will be pushed out of the workplace every day the steel dumping continues.

In 1998 alone, 18 million tons of foreign steel poured into the United States—12.4 million in the third quarter alone. This represents 56 percent more than the third quarter in 1997.

By contrast, America exported a mere 5.5 tons of domestic steel in 1998—the same period in which Russia, Brazil, and Japan unloaded the exact same 5.5 tons of hot-rolled steel imports here.

The United States Steel industry adds \$70 billion a year to the gross domestic product—and you can put a face on that \$70 billion if you think about the thousands of steel workers—their spouses and children—who will suffer even more if we continue to allow illegal steel dumping from foreign markets into ours—for there will be no jobs, no house mortgage or car payment, and no hope for their continued quality of life.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for the Administration to take care of Americans—and American jobs.

I do not intend to demean the Banana industry—those workers have to be able to earn a living too—but if the President will do for steel what he has done on behalf of bananas, then all will be well.

There have been times in our history when a resource vital to the United States was threatened by foreign producers, and it could happen again. Steel is a vital resource to our national security—our military complex. If we are forced to rely on foreign producers to provide our steel, the entire industry will fold and we could find ourselves held hostage once again.

Mr. Speaker, somebody needs to tell the Administration that it is steel on which our military depends for its weapons and equipment in times of crisis, not bananas, and he must act to stop steel dumping now.

21ST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA ANTI-SMOKING WRITING CONTEST

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1999

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address an issue of great importance to my constituents in Kern and Tular counties, and indeed, all Americans: teen smoking. Each year, millions of young people begin smoking and become addicted. The question we have to ask ourselves as lawmakers is "why?" Many schools have anti-smoking programs; the health risks are clearly printed on every pack of cigarettes; it is illegal for anyone under the age of 18 to purchase tobacco products. Why, then, if students are told in school not to smoke, if we all understand that smoking is dangerous and addictive, and if it is against the law for young people to smoke, do more than one million of our children choose to begin smoking each year?

I wanted to get an accurate assessment of which anti-smoking programs are working and which are not, so I invited fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students in my district to submit their ideas in an essay contest. I asked them to tell me, in their very best writing, the reasons they might choose not to start smoking, ways in which they, their parents, and their schools could discourage other young people from smoking, and finally, I asked them what, if anything, Congress can do on this issue. I read many good ideas from hundreds of students throughout my district on all three points.

Many students proudly took personal responsibility for this decision, saying that the decision not to begin smoking is ultimately left to individuals. Some suggested the creation of new anti-smoking programs in schools, such as one proposed by Eddie Mota, a fifth grader from Panama Elementary School in Bakersfield. Eddie suggested that schools create a program called "Smoking Detour," so that kids won't make the wrong turn." Another idea came from Ashley Cullins, a sixth grader at James Monroe Middle School in Ridgecrest, California, who thinks that communities should create and support anti-smoking clubs.

A lot of students pointed to their parents as the strongest influences in making the decision not to smoke. Britney Lout, a sixth grader at California City Middle School said that it is parents', and not a school's responsibility to tell children the dangers of smoking. Similarly, George Montoya, a seventh grader at Sequoia Middle School in Bakersfield, said that parents should begin teaching their children not to smoke at an early age.

Students presented several interesting, creative ideas as to what Congress could do to eliminate teen smoking. Christopher Duck, an eighth grader at Visalia Christian Academy, proposed stronger penalties for merchants caught selling cigarettes to minors, and creating a limit on the amount of nicotine in cigarettes. And James Margrave, a sixth grade student at Quailwood Elementary School in Bakersfield, wants smoking in movies and television shows to be banned. These are a small sample of the outstanding ideas I heard from students in my district. This is an issue that young people care about very deeply, and I hope that any action we take will consider such options.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the full text of the essays submitted by the six students mentioned above.

Smoking causes harm to your body. The tobacco in cigarettes can turn your lungs black. Tobacco can cause you to get cancer and heart disease. Tobacco can make you think unclearly and unable to sleep. Smoking can make you sick and make you die. Kids should be taught about the harmful effects of smoking.

Schools should have a class or programs for students on the bad things smoking can do. The classes should show the students examples of a healthy lung and a black lung. Parents should also teach their kids about smoking at an early age, like eleven years. If one of my friends asked me to smoke, I would say no because I am not a stupid person. I would tell an adult that my friend has cigarettes.

I learned about the awful things smoking can do to your body. I've decided I'd rather live a smoke free life and not die young from lung cancer. I think that Congress should raise the price of cigarettes so that kids could not afford them. Then people would not die from smoking.—George Montoya, seventh grade student, Sequoia Middle School, Bakersfield, California.

Smoking is an option and only one person can make the decision to smoke, and that's you. I personally decided not to begin smoking because I plan on going places with my life and if I start smoking, I won't be able to fulfill my plans. Smoking can become a very bad habit and I don't want to make it a personal habit of mine. My grandmother influenced me not to smoke because I saw how addicted she got and I don't want to be like that.

"Home is where the heart is," and that's where parents should be telling their children how bad smoking can be. No matter the age, from the beginning, children should never want to smoke. Parents can be very skeptical about who their children hang around, but they can't control what their children do when they aren't around so they should be sure to let their children know all they should know. Schools can't search every child every day because it's useless, but every child should have to take health classes to show just how unhealthy smoking is. Friends shouldn't smoke around friends, so that they can't influence others. The only thing Congress can do to stop the use of cigarettes is to stop making cigarettes altogether. People shouldn't be smoking, no