

for air tour operators and both would share the fundamental responsibility to ensure that air tours over national parks and tribal lands are conducted in a safe, efficient and unintrusive manner.

Mr. Speaker, during the 105th Congress, there were a number of hearings on this issue both in the House and the Senate. At that time, it appeared that it would be extremely difficult to be able to reach a consensus on how to handle air tours over our national parks.

However, with resolve and determination differences have been worked out, and we crafted legislation acceptable to all concerned.

This is an outstanding bill which will ensure that ground visitors and the elderly, disabled, and time-constrained travelers may continue to enjoy the scenic beauty of our national parks for future generations to come.

COMMEMORATING THE BIRTHDAY
OF SUSAN B. ANTHONY

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1999

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, February 15 marks the 179th birthday of Susan B. Anthony. We all remember Susan B. Anthony as a pioneer in the long struggle for full equality for women. But what many have forgotten, or have chosen to ignore, is that for her, opposition to abortion was an essential part of the cause of women's rights. Far from being the cornerstone of women's rights—as some mistakenly view abortion today—for Anthony, abortion was a great betrayal of all the first feminists' hoped to achieve for women. Anthony was unequivocal in her condemnation of abortion, referring to it as nothing less than "child murder." And she saved her harshest condemnation for those who would lead a woman to abortion, for she correctly viewed this as the greatest exploitation of women.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the birthday of this great American and to reclaim her pro-life legacy as a real and essential component of full equality for women.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE
DUNCANVILLE HIGH SCHOOL
PANTHERS

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1999

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a great school that I am pleased to represent in Congress. I want to recognize the Duncanville High School Panthers of Duncanville, Texas for their state championship in Division 1 (5-A) football. The Panthers defeated Converse-Judson High School of San Antonio by a score of 24 to 21 on December 12, 1998 in the Houston Astrodome. This is Duncanville's first football championship.

As anyone from Texas knows, high school football is not just a game for us—it's a way of life. On Friday nights, life comes to halt in many parts of our state when football fans

pack high school stadiums to watch their local boys play.

High school football teams in Texas are powerhouses not only in the state, but in the entire country. One such powerhouse was Converse-Judson, which was ranked fourth in the nation when they were upset by Duncanville.

Duncanville upset two other favored teams on their route to the championship. It is a tribute to Jaguar Coach Bob Alpert and his squad of dedicated student-athletes that they never backed down in the face of adversity.

I am proud to represent Duncanville High School in Congress and hope this football state championship is the first of many.

TRIBUTE TO AUBURN, MA POLICE
OFFICERS

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1999

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize two brave members of the Auburn, MA Police Department. On a late summer day last September, Officer George Campbell and Officer John Kelleher faced a situation that every officer dreads.

Officer Kelleher was on duty when he observed a vehicle which had earlier been reported as being operated by a suspect—likely armed—in a murder case. Officer Kelleher followed this vehicle into a parking lot and requested back-up. Officer Campbell was one of the officers who arrived on the scene to assist. As they approached the vehicle, they observed the driver reaching into the back seat. As the officers arrived at the car, they witnessed the driver with his hands in a shopping bag. Inside that bag was a gun.

Despite repeated warnings to drop the weapon, the driver continued to turn the gun toward the two officers, forcing Officer Campbell to fire one shot, fatally wounding this individual.

Mr. Speaker, no police officer wants to use his weapon. Every officer would prefer to settle disputes without bloodshed. But there are times when the law enforcement officials who protect our communities are forced to act. This was one of those times. Luckily, these two officers were well-trained, well-equipped and well-protected. We should be thankful that the incident ended without further injury to police personnel or innocent bystanders.

In light of their actions, Officer Campbell received the Auburn Police Department Meritorious Service Medal, and officer Kelleher received the Auburn Police Department Exceptional Duty Medal.

On behalf of the citizens of Auburn, I would like to recognize Officer Campbell and Officer Kelleher for their service to our community. I know the rest of this House joins me in that recognition.

INSIGHTFUL COMMENTS AND
OBSERVATIONS ON DIPLOMACY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1999

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to enter the remarks of former Congressman Lee H. Hamilton, at the Conference on Preventive Diplomacy and Preventive Disease on January 15, 1999, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As my colleague in Congress I had great respect for Mr. Hamilton, and I continue to hold him in high regard as the director of the Woodrow Wilson Program. I feel Mr. Hamilton has always offered insightful comments and observations on diplomacy, and it is my wish to share his comments with other members of Congress.

PREVENTIVE DIPLOMACY/PREVENTIVE DEFENSE—CONFERENCE ON PREVENTIVE DIPLOMACY AND PREVENTIVE DEFENSE JANUARY 15, 1999

(By Hon. Lee H. Hamilton)

I. INTRODUCTION

It is a high privilege for me to participate in this timely and noteworthy conference on Preventive Diplomacy and Preventive Defense. I am especially delighted to join three highly esteemed statesmen—Warren Christopher, David Hamburg, and Bill Perry—at this conference. If I were to name a Hall of Fame of distinguished public officials, based on my 34 years in elective office, I would name each of them to it. Suffice it to say, they are among the preeminent public officials of our generation.

Most of what I say tonight about preventive diplomacy and preventive defense, I have learned from them.

They have made me believe that there are concrete steps we can take to prevent or contain the spread of conflict.

Similarly, the folks associated with the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict and the Stanford-Harvard Preventive Defense Project merit our gratitude and our praise for their important contributions to the cause of conflict prevention.

I commend their enterprise in arranging and staging this conference. I can tell you what goes on here will have a profound impact on policy makers and policy over time.

II. THE PROBLEM

I speak to you this evening about a great and worthy mission—how to prevent conflict, both within nation-states, and between them.

This issue is important, perhaps even transcendent. Today, there are more than two dozen deadly conflicts underway around the world. These conflicts have caused over 9.3 million casualties since 1990, and increased the number of refugees from 12 to 25 million.

So conflict prevention is critical. No other issue facing the world today more deserves your attention.

What do you want to do for your children and grandchildren? Many things, of course, but I hope among them will be a legacy of having tried in your own way to bequeath to them a less violent world, a world of concord, not conflict. Our task is to try to develop practical steps and a renewed commitment to preventive diplomacy and preventive defense. What more important task engages our attention than this great mission?

Many of us had hoped that the end of the Cold War would mean a more peaceful international order. We had thought that much of the conflict in the world had its origins in

the rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union. With the end of that rivalry, we had believed that the prospects for peace were improved, and that countries could be brought closer together. As it turns out, we were too optimistic.

We find ourselves still residents in a dangerous world. Wherever we turn, there are unstable nations, disgruntled groups, and terrorists. Sadly, warfare and strife have not lessened. Human beings, it turns out, have a virtuoso capacity for violence.

We were, in short, unprepared for the fragmented, disorderly world of the post-Cold War era.

What we need now is a new strategy, a strategy similar to the Marshall Plan after World War II, which sought to prevent the conditions that would lead to another war—and it succeeded.

During the Cold War we succeeded again, with policies of deterrence and containment.

But today we live in a new world. It is a world where the United States exercises an influence far beyond anything it has ever had before. It is a world where we are indeed the indispensable nation. But alas, it is also a world that still has far too much conflict and violence.

In such an era, what do we do? How do we lead? How can we keep these good times of peace and unprecedented influence going? What should our world strategy be? As I understand it, that is what this conference is all about.

All of us recognize that deterrence must not be abandoned. After all, the North Koreans and the Iraqis are not going to magically disappear. Bosnia, Haiti, and other conflicts are still too much with us.

But what about the really big challenges—a Russia on the brink of chaos, possibly losing control of its nuclear arsenal? A China that could grow hostile and uncooperative? A planet overrunning with weapons of mass destruction? A world where terrorism may be the number one threat to our national security?

We continue to need deterrence, and military forces able to deter aggressors, and able to win wars quickly and decisively. But we need more. We need a broad strategy, using all the instruments of national power—political, economic, and military—to prevent conflict, to influence the world away from violence as a means of settling conflict, and to deal with a parade of challenges that threaten our survival and cause great disruption, pain and bloodshed.

And so, we think tonight about preventive diplomacy and preventive defense. What do we really mean by these phrases? How practical are they? What capacities and tools do they require? What are the barriers to effective conflict prevention?

Several features of conflict prevention impress me. We know more about it than you might initially think.

A. SOURCES OF CONFLICT

First, we know what causes conflict.

The sources of the conflicts that have marred the 1990s are diverse.

Weak, internally divided states, in Yugoslavia, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Colombia, Algeria, Tajikistan, Cambodia, the Sudan. Unfortunately, the list goes on and on.

Religious, political, or ethnic fanaticism and intolerance of every stripe—in the Middle East, Northern Ireland, Bosnia, the Indian subcontinent, and throughout Africa.

Repression of racial, ethnic, or religious groups, in areas as diverse as Guatemala, Kosovo, Kashmir, and East Timor.

Other conflicts have economic causes. Gross disparities in living standards, even economic growth and reform, so often the building blocks of stability, can contribute

to strife. For example, growth has bypassed indigenous populations in many parts of Latin America, and the resulting inequality has contributed to armed revolt in Mexico and Peru.

Competition for control of or access to resources. Scarce supplies of oil and water continue to be a source of contention—and bloodshed—in the Middle East. Population pressures and the accompanying environmental degradation can create a serious strain on limited resources as well. So can refugees. Most of the world's 15 million refugees today are the result of conflict, but massive refugee movements can also spread instability and strife.

Deep-seated historical animosities, as we see in the Balkans, the Middle East, and elsewhere.

Then there is the human element. We must always expect that a Hitler, a Stalin, a Pol Pot, or some other charismatic, inflammatory leader lurks just off stage, eager to take advantage of the social stresses in society in ways that almost guarantee new conflict.

B. IMPORTANCE OF CONFLICT PREVENTION TO THE UNITED STATES

Second, we know how important conflict prevention is to the United States. We know that if we succeed at it, we will not have to expend blood and treasure tomorrow. We will pay fewer taxes and risk the lives of our offspring less often.

Whenever or whatever a crisis erupts, the international community looks to the United States, as the world's indispensable nation, for help in resolving it.

You and I resist a U.S. role as the world's policeman. We always want to know: What are the alternatives to sending in the Marines?

But unless a better system of conflict prevention is developed, the burden on the United States in the coming years to respond to instability and conflict will be progressively greater, both financially and militarily.

Americans often ask the question: Why should we care? It is a fair question. We should care because sometimes our vital national interests are at stake, as in the Persian Gulf, because we care about human values and human life (as in Somalia, where we could not tolerate those horrible pictures of starving children); and because waiting will only make the cost go up—in terms of death, the scale of relief efforts, and the damage to international standards.

In other words, Preventive action can save money—and lives. It can also promote American interests—political, diplomatic, security, and economic.

C. ROLE OF AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

Third, we know that American leadership is essential to make conflict prevention work.

When we sit on the sidelines, the world is a more dangerous place. No other country can take our place.

Only when the United States acted did the killing stop in Bosnia. U.S. leadership restored political stability in Haiti and economic stability in Mexico. We pushed reform in Russia, and achieved remarkable progress toward peace in the Middle East. U.S. leadership helped broker a permanent extension of the Non-proliferation Treaty, the removal of all nuclear weapons from Ukraine, and a freeze on North Korea's nuclear weapons facilities at Yongbyon.

Leadership is inherent in our power and our values. We have a talent for it. We cannot evade it.

WE CAN PREDICT CONFLICT

Fourth, we can even predict conflict.

Where there is no democracy, where there is alienation of major groups in society, gross economic imbalances, exclusion or discrimination of groups or historical grievances, the risks of conflict are very high. Conflicts occur in states which are undergoing major transition, or they spring from strong perceptions of inequity, uneven distribution of the good things in life, disputes over resources, repression, corruption, or a decline in the legitimacy of government.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONFLICT PREVENTION

Fifth, we know that the primary responsibility for conflict prevention within countries lies with the government and the people of that country.

The next responsibility lies with the international community, with the region assuming greater responsibility, and, when necessary, outside groups.

Sovereignty always figures prominently here. Nations do not take lightly to outside intervention. But even here things are changing. Today the international community believes that with sovereignty comes responsibility. When nations cannot manage conflict, or do not show a respect for international standards and commitments, the international community sometimes steps in—as has been the case in Iraq.

PREVENTION OF CONFLICT

Sixth, we even know what must be done to prevent conflict.

1. A CHANGE IN ATTITUDES

First, we must change attitudes.

We must foster the belief that the prevention of conflict is possible. We must not accept the view that violence is inevitable.

Of course, prevention will often fail. We must be realistic. But the knowledge that we will not always succeed in staving off conflict is not an argument for not trying.

There are even reasons for cautious optimism. From time to time the international community has intervened in a timely and decisive fashion either to prevent conflict or to stop it from spreading.

It happened in Bosnia. In Haiti. In Sierra Leone. In the Middle East. Even the UN intervention in Cambodia in the early 1990s, as imperfect as the results have been, almost surely prevented bloodshed and saved lives.

Violence usually results from human decision, not blind fate. Recognizing this reality is a necessary precondition for preventing conflict.

In addition, busy policy makers, even as they are consumed with today's troubles, must learn to take time to look at tomorrow's problems.

A domestic challenge is illustrative. Today we spend one percent of the American health care budget on prevention. And yet the experts are virtually unanimous in their judgment that we could save many lives and much money if we devoted a greater percentage of our total health care costs to prevention. The same is true of conflict prevention.

I do not suggest it is easy to focus on a problem before it becomes a crisis, or to build into the decision making process a set of rewards and inducements that will encourage the harried policy maker to look beyond today's problems.

And so, we need to foster a sense of urgency, a new way of thinking that gives precedence to the prevention, and not simply the management, of conflict, to avoid disaster, rather than dealing with the consequences after it hits.

To do this requires that we get our facts straight, analyze situations objectively, keep an open mind, learn from one another, persist, and respect the importance and the difficulty of the task we have set out for ourselves.

2. DIPLOMACY

We know what tools of diplomacy can work to prevent conflict.

In many cases, the traditional tools of diplomacy—dialogue, mediation, political and economic sticks and carrots, diplomatic pressure from the regional and international communities, sanctions—can, if utilized skillfully, prevent or minimize conflict.

Economic measures, with both inducements and punishments, can be used to prevent conflict. Sustainable growth and the removal of economic inequities in a country can do amazing things toward the prevention of conflict. The absence of growth is an early warning signal of potential violence. Economic aid has to be directed toward achieving growth, and aid should be conditioned on good governance.

If people's basic needs are met, conflict can usually be prevented.

Economic aid can help correct the underlying causes of conflict and provide incentives and hope for improvement. Sanctions can serve as deterrents to unacceptable action.

The promotion of the *rule of law* can help diffuse tensions within a country and reduce the incidence of conflict.

Countries lacking good governance and equitable legal systems will be susceptible to internal violence. If, on the other hand, a country has effective political, economic, and legal mechanisms, tensions can be addressed before violence erupts.

The political conditions needed to prevent conflict are not mysteries. They amount to good governance—managing diversity, building the infrastructure of democratic institutions, a robust civil society, and the active participation of women (who are increasingly playing the role we should expect from them—peacemakers), business leaders, the media (which can inform and highlight and not distort), and religious leaders, who can often play a positive role of reconciliation.

The aim of all this is to put in place a strong system of values, reinforced by international norms. At the heart of conflict prevention must be a strong system of justice, legal systems available to all, that operate fairly and produce a sense of justice.

Dispute resolution mechanisms and the promotion of *confidence-building measures* are other common diplomatic tools that can prevent conflict.

The establishment of confidence building measures in central Europe in the 1970s and 1980s played a key role in convincing the Soviet Union that it could safely call an end to the cold war. CBMs build trust between countries. Openness about military budgets, plans, and policies may be an unusual concept in defense circles, but peace requires transparency and trust.

U.S. training and education programs for foreign military establishments (IMET) bring nations together to learn how military establishments function in a democracy. It is striking to see officers from the former Soviet Union or from Latin American countries learning about the primacy of civilian authority, respect for human rights, the role of law, and the role of a parliament. To watch American military officers teach officers from newly democratic countries about professional military establishments under civilian control is prevention of conflict in action.

It is good American policy to encourage contacts of our military with the militaries of our allies and other nations to help enlarge the community of free market democracies.

Formal treaties and other accords can also help prevent conflicts.

Although it is still very much a work in progress, the Wye River agreement may

usher in a new era of reconciliation in the Middle East.

The U.S. must also lead the way for the worldwide acceptance of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, bring into force the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention, and the strengthening of the Biological Weapons Convention and the Missile Technology Control Regime.

We know we can reduce the risks of violence and conflict if we prevent proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, not alone by dismantling Cold War nuclear arsenals, but also by reducing danger through arms control treaties.

Arms control treaties of various sorts—from the SALT and START treaties to the biological and chemical weapons conventions to the limitations on conventional weapons in central Europe—have played a major role in reducing the interstate tensions that foment violence.

Do not overlook the potential to prevent conflict by limitations on the transfer of small arms. After all, most violence is inflicted by small, not large, weapons.

Regional organizations—the Organization of American States, the Organization of African Unity, the ASEAN Regional Forum, and others—can play a part in preventing conflict as well.

These organizations should assume more responsibility for economic development and integration, the promotion of good governance, and the prevention of conflict within their specific regions.

The problems within a particular region should be handled by states within that region, if possible. It is better, for example, if Africans deal with African problems, and Latin Americans with Latin American problems.

Regional organizations should support confidence-building measures to increase military transparency, communication, and cooperation. They should develop the capability to apply pressure, offer assistance, and deploy regional forces to prevent conflict.

Multilateral organizations, such as the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank, can help prevent conflict.

To help these international institutions be effective in preventing conflict, the international community needs to develop a better system of early warning and response. The genocides of Bosnia, Cambodia, and Rwanda caught us unaware and unprepared. Yet conflict seldom arises without warning. Persons knowledgeable about countries are rarely surprised when long-simmering problems escalate into full-scale conflict.

President Clinton recently announced the creation of a Genocide Early Warning Center. This is an initiative to be cheered and encouraged.

But early warning must be followed by timely action. The international community needs a capability for preventive action. This means the ability to deploy civilian personnel—to mediate problems, to provide emergency economic relief, and to address the long-term issues that give rise to conflict.

The United Nations can play a key role here. But this will require that the nations which make up the UN give a higher priority to conflict prevention. And this is unlikely to occur unless the United States takes the lead.

Most fundamentally, the international community, using these and other multilateral institutions, must address the underlying political and economic causes of conflict.

That means the world community must support political reform and the development of responsive and accountable govern-

ment. Helping to establish and promote institutions of civil society such as political parties, trade unions, independent media, and the rule of law provides important safeguards for protecting human rights, fighting corruption, and fending off political demagoguery.

The United States should work with the international community, especially the international financial institutions, to support long-term development assistance to achieve economic growth and promote economic opportunity and equality. Working through institutions such as the World Bank, the IMF, and the World Trade Organization, the U.S. should support market reform and regional economic integration to bolster growth.

3. MILITARY INTERVENTION

Military intervention is another tool in our prevention arsenal.

We know that traditional diplomacy sometimes fails to prevent conflict, and that military intervention, if skillfully employed, can prevent conflict.

There are, of course, many problems in developing the appropriate mechanisms for an international military capability to intervene in areas of potential or actual conflict. Answers to the difficult questions of "when," "how," "who," "how long," and "for what purposes" are often elusive.

So the international community must improve its ability to respond militarily to conflicts once they reach the crisis stage.

There is no inherent contradiction between the prevention of violence and the use of military force. To the contrary, the use of armed personnel has played a constructive role in Haiti, Bosnia, Macedonia, Western Sahara, Cyprus, and elsewhere.

Military intervention can be either: 1) peacekeeping (after violence occurs and an agreement has been reached by the parties), or 2) preventative—as in Macedonia where American troops and others were introduced to prevent the spread of conflict from Bosnia.

A multinational "fire brigade" is a well-tested idea with a demonstrated record of success. Used with discretion, it can be a highly effective tool for the prevention of conflict.

The UN coordinates efforts by governments to train military forces and set aside necessary resources for future peacekeeping missions. The U.S. should support these efforts, so that the international community can act rapidly and effectively if a military response is required.

I have come to the view that the international community needs some means of responding militarily to deteriorating situations in order to prevent conflicts, some kind of multinational, multi-functional rapid reaction standby capability, probably within the U.N. I do not underestimate the difficulties of this task, but I believe we must begin to explore ways and means to achieve that capacity. If we do not, the U.S. will be called on again and again as the power with the most developed intervention capabilities.

Sometimes the threat of the use of force can be an effective deterrent—though it may be a gamble and must be managed with great skill.

4. PRIVATE SECTOR

The private sector can also play a key role in conflict prevention.

Just think for a moment about the helpful and talented contributions made toward peace and the prevention of violence by private groups from non-governmental organizations such as the Carter Center, or human rights groups around the world. From our religious and moral leaders. From schools. From the scholarly and intellectual communities. From the media. From the business

community. And from influential non-governmental opinion leaders such as those here this evening.

In recent years, this so-called Track II diplomacy has flourished. These efforts should be further encouraged.

Unless the private sector engages itself in the business of conflict prevention and resolution, the task of moderating strife and violence will become infinitely more difficult.

III. CONGRESS AND PREVENTIVE DIPLOMACY/ DEFENSE

Let me conclude with a few remarks about the role of the U.S. Congress in matters of preventive diplomacy and preventive defense.

I have been struck by how little of the literature—at least that which I have seen—mentions the American Congress. And yet, if the United States is to take a leading part in international efforts at conflict prevention, then the Congress is going to have to be brought in as a full-fledged partner in this effort.

It seems to me that Congress might usefully take action in three areas:

First, Congress must support the infrastructure of preventive action. This means that the Hill must be prepared to provide adequate funding for the State Department and the other agencies that promote American interest overseas. It also requires that Congress be willing to pay for the programs that are most likely to prevent conflict. This means money for economic development, for programs promoting the rule of law, for the creation and nourishment of the political, economic, and legal institution through which tensions can be addressed in ways short of conflict.

Second, Congress must overcome its resistance to participation in multinational organizations, both civilian and military. When military force is called for, the presidents and the secretaries of state and defense who seek to persuade Congress to support preventive defense must emphasize the U.S. national interest that dictates such use of our armed forces.

Members of Congress are above all hard-headed pragmatists. Show them how a military intervention serves the national interest and you are much closer to persuading them of the wisdom of such action.

Third, and perhaps most fundamentally, Members of Congress are going to have to do better in adapting their mindsets to changed circumstances.

There are Members of Congress today who are unable to utter the word "China" without preceding it with the adjective "communist" or "Red." This inability to move beyond old Cold War views that have more to do with Stalinist Russia than with the China of the late 1990s have frequently led to congressional action that makes conflict with China more rather than less likely.

Unless Members of Congress are prepared to look at old problems from a fresh perspective, the legislative branch is unlikely to be of much assistance in fostering a new ethos of preventive action.

And without congressional participation, the United States will not play the leading role in conflict resolution that its strength and position in the global community demands.

IV. CONCLUSION

Where does all this leave us?

We know the odds. We cannot eliminate all war and violence, any more than we can eliminate human folly.

We know the United States cannot and should not be responsible for addressing all the ills of the world.

We know that devoting more resources and greater attention to conflict prevention is a

long-term investment that serves the U.S. national interest. Conflict prevention saves lives, saves money, and forestalls the human misery that lead to conflict.

We know that conflict prevention requires the participation of the entire international community. No one leader, no one country, no one institution can carry the load. Conflict prevention responses must be tailored to fit each situation, with a plan, close coordination of the tools of response from among all the actors, internal and external, regional and international, civilian and military, public and private, official and non-official.

The prevention of conflict is a great and worthy challenge.

In our bones we know that it deserves a far higher priority from U.S. policy makers and from international organization, especially the U.N., than it has historically received. The problem is not so much in our lack of knowledge of what to do, but in our political will and commitment to do those things we know can and have prevented conflict.

As I close, let me express my concern that the U.S. leadership needed to strengthen our conflict prevention capabilities is being eroded by budget cuts from the U.S. Congress and a general tendency among the American public to draw back from international responsibilities. It is a situation that demands political leadership of the highest order from the President and the Congress.

Every president, every Cabinet official, every member of Congress should insist that conflict prevention constitute a central component of U.S. diplomatic and defense strategy—and moreover, do a better job of educating the American people about this.

We soon complete the 20th Century. It is a century of wars—the first in which world wars were fought. It is the first century also in which men and women of good will, drawing on the impact of world wars, have wrestled with the idea of conflict prevention and world peace. We have glimpsed that peace is possible because it is necessary. We have not won the day, but we have begun the understanding of what peace and conflict prevention can mean—quite simply it can change the course of history and the life of man more than anything we know or can do.

We may not be able to rid the world of conflict. We *can* make it more livable.

What more important task do you have on your agenda?

Thank you.

INTRODUCING THE DAVIS-BACON REPEAL ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1999

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Davis-Bacon Repeal Act of 1999. The Davis-Bacon Act of 1931 forces contractors on all federally-funded construction projects to pay the "local prevailing wage," defined as "the wage paid to the majority of the laborers or mechanics in the classification on similar projects in the area." In practice, this usually means the wages paid by unionized contractors. For more than sixty years, this congressionally-created monstrosity has penalized taxpayers and the most efficient companies while crushing the dreams of the most willing workers. Mr. Speaker, Congress must act now to repeal this 61-year-old relic of an era during

which people actually believed Congress could legislate prosperity. Americans pay a huge price in lost jobs, lost opportunities and tax-boosting cost overruns on federal construction projects every day Congress allows Davis-Bacon to remain on the books.

Davis-Bacon artificially inflates construction costs through a series of costly work rules and requirements. For instance, under Davis-Bacon, workers who perform a variety of tasks must be paid at the highest applicable skilled journeyman rate. Thus, a general laborer who hammers a nail must now be classified as a "carpenter," and paid as much as three times the company's regular rate. As a result of this, unskilled workers can be employed only if the company can afford to pay the government-determined "prevailing wages" and training can be provided only through a highly regulated apprenticeship program. Some experts have estimated the costs of complying with the paperwork imposed on contractors by Davis-Bacon regulations at nearly \$200 million a year. Of course, this doesn't measure the costs in lost job opportunities because firms could not afford to hire an inexperienced worker.

Most small construction firms cannot afford to operate under Davis-Bacon's rigid job classifications or hire the staff of lawyers and accountants needed to fill out the extensive paperwork required to bid on a federal contract. Therefore, Davis-Bacon prevents small firms from bidding on federal construction projects, which, unfortunately, constitute 20 percent of all construction projects in the United States.

Because most minority-owned construction firms are small companies, Davis-Bacon keeps minority-owned firms from competing for federal construction contracts. The resulting disparities in employment create a demand for affirmative action, another ill-suited and ill-advised big government program.

The racist effects of Davis-Bacon are no mere coincidence. In fact, many original supporters of Davis-Bacon, such as Representative Clayton Allgood, bragged about supporting Davis-Bacon as a means of keeping "cheap colored labor" out of the construction industry.

In addition to opening up new opportunities in the construction industry for smaller construction firms and their employees, repeal of Davis-Bacon would also return common sense and sound budgeting to federal contracting which is now rife with political favoritism and cronyism. An audit conducted earlier this year by the Labor Department's Office of the Inspector General found that inaccurate data were frequently used in Davis-Bacon wage determination. Although the Inspector General's report found no evidence of deliberate fraud, it did uncover material errors in five states' wage determinations, causing wages or fringe benefits for certain crafts to be overstated by as much as \$1.08 per hour!

The most compelling reason to repeal Davis-Bacon is to benefit to the American taxpayer. The Davis-Bacon Act drives up the cost of federal construction costs by as much as 50 percent. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office has reported that repealing Davis-Bacon would save the American taxpayer almost three billion dollars in four years!

Mr. Speaker, it is time to finally end this patently unfair, wildly inefficient and grossly discriminatory system of bidding on federal construction contracts. Repealing the Davis-Bacon