

rough spots will be made straight and the glory of the Lord will fill the earth, and all flesh will see it and experience it." On that day, Lord, your name will truly be one and your children will be one.

Amen. (Applause.)

Representative LARGENT. Thank you, Senator Lieberman.

Ladies and gentlemen, this concludes the 47th National Prayer Breakfast.

Thank you all for being with us here this morning. Let's leave today and live out the principles Jesus taught about loving one another, loving our God with all our heart, soul and mind. Thank you, and have a good morning.

ACCREDITATION OF THE OAK PARK FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on August 26, 1999 the Village of Oak Park Fire Department was awarded the title "Accredited Fire Department" by the Commission on Fire Accreditation International (C.F.A.I.).

The Oak Park Fire Department is only the third fire department in the State of Illinois and one of only 21 departments in the United States and Canada to achieve such accreditation.

Fire Chief Gerald Beeson and the other members of the department worked to complete their application for over 2 years.

Chief Beeson told the Wednesday Journal, "Those who review applications—members of the International Association of Fire Chiefs and the International Association of City and County Managers—look at all facets of fire service, including departmental aspects like training and response time and on the village side like finances and codes."

The accreditation is a benchmark, a set of standards, Oak Park can use to judge the quality of their fire protection service. The departmental achievement is a credit to all of Oak Park's fire fighters and we salute them for their outstanding accomplishment.

THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FALL OF THE BERLIN WALL, THE PEOPLE OF BELARUS ARE STILL BEING OPPRESSED BY AUTHORITARIAN DICTATOR

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a resolution on the gravity of the political and economic situation in Belarus. I believe it's time for U.S. Congress to express strong opposition to the continued egregious violations of human rights and the lack of progress toward the establishment of democracy and the rule of law in Belarus and call on President Alexandr Lukashenka to engage in negotiations with the representatives of the opposition and to restore the constitutional rights of the Belarusian people.

While the U.S. and Europe are marking the 10 year anniversary of the fall of the Berlin

Wall, President Lukashenka is building a new wall between Belarus and democracy and trying to isolate Belarus by using old Soviet and Stalinist tactics of misinformation and intimidation. The people of Belarus have experienced a great deal of suffering over the years—as the victims of the Nazis, of Stalin, and of the Chernobyl disaster. I visited Belarus several months ago and it is clear to see that the people of Belarus are still getting a bad deal—again at the hands of their leadership.

In the fall of 1996, President Lukashenka used bogus tactics to impose a new constitution on Belarus, to abolish the existing parliament and replace it with a rubber-stamp legislature, and to illegally extend his presidential term. Although Lukashenka says that his government is willing to enter into negotiations with the opposition, his actions indicate the opposite. Lukashenka has created a climate of fear in Belarus, along the lines of Stalin's and Hitler's regimes, which he admires. He has targeted the opposition, non-governmental organizations, and the independent media. Opposition figures have disappeared; independent newspapers are fighting for survival; and those Belarusians who are brave enough to publicly protest Lukashenka's rule, get thrown into prison on trumped up charges.

Lukashenka is pushing his country deeper and deeper into an economic abyss. Prices remain under state control, and there has been no privatization to speak of. The average monthly wage is somewhere around \$30 a month, and many people rely on subsistence farming in a backyard plot to feed their families.

We in the U.S. Congress have a moral responsibility to promote democracy and support economic development in Belarus. This resolution condemns the current Belarusian regime and calls for immediate dialogue between President Lukashenka and the Consultative Council of Belarusian opposition and the restoration of a civilian, democratically-elected government in Belarus, based on the rule of law, and an independent judiciary. The resolution urges President Lukashenka to respect the human rights of all Belarusian citizens, including those members of the opposition who are currently being illegally detained in violation of their constitutional rights.

President Lukashenka must make good on his promise to hold free parliamentary elections in 2000 and presidential elections in 2001. Please join me in supporting this resolution.

H.R. 3116, THE FAIR COMPETITION IN FOREIGN COMMERCE ACT

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, for decades the United States has carried the standard in promoting democracy, market liberalization, and economic development abroad. To further those goals, we have spent literally billions of dollars in developing countries. And we have made progress. Nations have made economic progress over the past few decades and democracy is taking root in some of the rockiest soil in the globe. Thanks to the creation of the World Trade Organization a few years ago,

the vast majority of international trade is now governed by clear and transparent rules.

But, as the Asian financial crisis and the theft of billions of dollars of IMF money in Russia shows, we still have a long way to go. Too many places in the world continue to be held in the grip of corruption and cronyism. The obvious impact of these two evils are the loss of untold millions, even billions, of dollars. But the corrosive effects of corruption and cronyism are worse; they are all too often hidden and ignored.

Government corruption undermines the rule of law—the very cornerstone of democracy. Government corruption undermines economic development, squandering billions of dollars of investment capital on enrichment of the few rather than the benefit of many. Government corruption undermines the ability of U.S. business to compete freely and fairly for foreign government contracts, costing U.S. corporations millions of dollars in lost sales. Government corruption undermines the integrity of public service and erodes the confidence of the public in their own government. Most important, government corruption steals hope—the hope for a better future that all citizens of the world have a right to expect. If nurturing democracy and expanding economic opportunity continue to be a goal of this country, then eliminating corruption and cronyism in government procurement must also be a priority. That is why I am proud to join with my colleague, ROBERT MATSUI in introducing H.R. 3116, the Fair Competition in Foreign Commerce Act. This legislation builds upon the excellent work of the Organization on Economic Development and Cooperation which set the international standard with its Agreement on Bribery and Corruption. The agreement makes it a crime to offer, promise or give a bribe to a foreign public official in order to obtain or retain international business deals. Sadly, there are today only thirty-four signatory countries to this agreement.

H.R. 3116 complements the work of the OECD, particularly that of the Development Assistance Committee Recommendation on Anti-Corruption Proposals for Aid-Funded Procurement, approaches the problem of corruption in international government Procurement through U.S. foreign aid and multilateral financial institutions. It is not a club or a blunt instrument, but its says in no uncertain terms that the United States will not continue to underwrite corrupt practices in other countries.

Our bill requires the Secretary of the Treasury to develop a plan to promote international government procurement reforms using U.S. participation in international as the tool. It prohibits U.S. non-humanitarian foreign assistance to nations that have not demonstrated significant progress towards institutionalizing open and transparent government procurement practices.

We want to assist the administration's efforts to promote government procurement transparency, whether through the World Trade Organization or the Free Trade Area of the Americas. But we also want to ensure that transparency in government procurement doesn't take a back seat—that is why we require the administration and other nations to focus on institutionalizing open and transparent international government procurement practices.

The key to the legislation is building institutions in countries which promote and protect

transparency in government procurement activities. We want nations to develop the institutional capacity needed to properly monitor international government procurement contracts. Where nations lack such capacity, we encourage the use of third-party procurement monitoring to ensure openness and transparency in the process. Third-party procurement monitoring is a process where an uninvolved third-party is hired to monitor every stage of the procurement process. The procedure has been used successfully in South America and Africa to fight corruption in international government procurement. Third-party procurement monitors have the expertise needed to ensure that a project is competitively bid and effectively executed. In turn, this expertise gets passed on to the host governments, which further institutionalizes open procurement practices. The goal should be a process free from cronyism and corruption. This legislation will help us accomplish that goal.

RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF THE
AIR LAND EMERGENCY RE-
SOURCE TEAM

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the Congress' attention seven young men and the members of the Joseph Rankin family who sacrificed time and effort to serve the people of Russia from July 10–August 25, 1999, by remodeling an orphanage in Moscow to improve living conditions. In addition to the joy they received from investing in the lives of others, this cross-cultural experience gave these individuals a greater appreciation for the benefits and privileges we enjoy in America. These individuals are to be commended for their willingness to put the needs of others before their own.

Daniel Buhler, MI; Michael Hadden, GA; Jesse Long, WA; Timothy Moye, GA; Joseph Rankin, MI; Joyce Rankin, MI; Benjamin Rankin, MI; Daniel Rankin, MI; Joseph Rankin, MI; Justin Tanner, MI; Jefferson Turner, GA; Neil Waters, VA.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM
MISSES IMPORTANT TARGET

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member highly commends to his colleagues this editorial I submit from the November 1, 1999, Norfolk Daily News regarding campaign finance reform. The editorial rightly notes that campaign finance reform must address the use of union dues (regardless of the union member's wishes) for political contributions.

[From the Daily News, Nov. 1, 1999]

REFORM MISSES IMPORTANT TARGET

CAMPAIGN FOR NEW RESTRICTIONS FAILS TO PUT
FOCUS ON MAJOR SOURCE OF PROBLEMS

At the same time as the McCain-Feingold proposal aimed at changing rules of cam-

paign financing was being defeated in the U.S. Senate, a major endorsement aimed at influencing the 2000 election results was taking place. Its unsurprising results bear on the issue, inaccurately described as "reform," since that term implies beneficial change, not cosmetic change.

McCain-Feingold's aim was to reduce the "soft money" contributions by which unlimited amounts may be given to political parties—not individual candidates—for advancing their views on major issues of the day. It is a contrast to the \$1,000 individual contribution limits, never adjusted for inflation, which can be provided directly to candidates.

Bearing on this issue is the way in which some organizations, notably the AFL-CIO, can support their favored candidates with endorsements, publicity and in-house politicking with little regard for financing limitations.

The recent AFL-CIO endorsement of Vice President Al Gore's bid for the Democratic nomination was not unanimous, and it lacked important initial support from two of the major affiliates, the Teamsters Union and the United Auto Workers. They are likely to check in later. But that endorsement kicked into gear a \$40 million union mobilization for the primaries and the general election. It is "soft money" but vital support—in part provided in violation of the rights of that apparent minority of union members which may want Bill Bradley as the nominee, or as an extreme example, members who might even choose a Republican.

The unions have every right to back whatever candidates they choose. They do not have the right, however, to spend mandatory dues money that was supposed to have been allocated to collective bargaining and the more restricted cause of improving the status of union workers.

Being forced, through mandatory fees, to support candidates and causes with which one disagrees is a violation of a fundamental tenet of a free society. The U.S. Supreme Court has addressed the issue and reached that conclusion. But it is one of several glaring cases of disregard for the law that the Clinton administration has ignored the principle. Without enforcement of that rule, any "reforms" of the current flawed campaign financing laws are worthless. Nothing wrong with unions spending big bucks for politics as long as the money is openly provided and comes from willing donors. Nothing wrong, either, with like amounts coming from readily identifiable business or other organizations operating under the same terms.

But let them use these resources openly to win friends and influence elections, and understand that true reform depends on voluntary contributions.

REAL ESTATE FLEXIBILITY ACT
OF 1999

HON. JIM McCRERY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Mr. McCRERY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, the Real Estate Flexibility Act of 1999, to remove a present-law tax penalty that confronts individual real estate investors who wish to sell debt-encumbered property.

This legislation is important to our Nation's real estate markets. It would provide real estate investors with flexibility in managing tax liabilities while at the same time allowing debt-strapped property to be put to its highest and best use.

An example will help to illustrate the need for this legislation. Assume that an individual investor owns commercial investment real property that is valued at \$100 and that is encumbered by debt of \$90. The individual's basis in the property is zero. Assume that the individual wishes to enter the residential real estate market and that a buyer offers to purchase his commercial property for fair market value. Under the terms of the transaction, the buyer will assume the \$90 of debt and will pay the individual \$10 in cash.

Under current tax law, the individual will be taxed not only on the cash received, but also on the discharged debt. In this case, the tax paid by the individual on the sale—as much as \$25 in this case (taking into account tax on unrecaptured depreciation)—will exceed the \$10 in cash the individual actually receives. Thus, selling the property would force the individual to come up with cash out of pocket to pay the IRS.

In light of this disincentive, many individuals in this situation do not sell. Rather, they sit and hold. As a result, the underlying property does not pass into the hands of new owners who may be more likely to make improvements and put the property to its highest and best use.

In these circumstances, I believe an individual taxpayer should be given flexibility to pay this tax liability when he or she has the necessary cash. The Real Estate Flexibility Act of 1999 would allow individuals wishing to sell debt-encumbered property to elect to pay tax on the sale only to the extent of the cash received; the individual would have to reduce basis in other property to the extent that gains are not taxed. In our example, the individual would pay tax of \$10—i.e., the amount of the cash actually received—upon disposition of the commercial real estate and would reduce his or her basis in other depreciable property by the amount of untaxed gain on the commercial property.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

CONGRATULATORY REMARKS TO
THE FOSTER GRANDPARENT
PROGRAM OF SOUTHEAST MISSOURI
FOR 26 YEARS OF SERVICE
TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to commend the Foster Grandparent Program of Southeast Missouri for recently completing its 26th year serving the senior citizens in the communities of East Prairie, Poplar Bluff, and Sikeston, Missouri.

The Foster Grandparent Program of Southeast Missouri has had a tremendous impact on the senior citizens who serve as mentors to at-risk children in local elementary schools. This program serves as a way for these mentors to be significant change-agents in their communities during their golden years.

In addition to providing an opportunity for seniors to feel a sense of self-worth and responsibility within the community, let me also share with you some stories from teachers who have seen first-hand the tremendous impact of the Foster Care Program.