changing the course of history and making the world a safer place for people everywhere. He truly is an extraordinary leader.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you and my colleagues will join me in recognizing the contributions and accomplishments of Col. Aaron Bank. I join friends and family who salute him.

THE STRANGE CASE OF EFRAIN BAMACA

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1995

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the democratic Government of Guatemala has been put under a great deal of pressure to resolve the case of Efrain Bamaca, a commander of the URNG, a Marxist terrorist group that has been fighting for power in Guatemala for 34 years.

The Government says Mr. Bamaca was killed in combat in 1992. Jennifer Harbury, an American citizen who says she is Mr. Bamaca's widow, claims he is being held in a clandestine military prison.

As we weigh Ms. Harbury's claims, I urge my colleagues to take the following into account.

First, Ms. Harbury is a strong partisan of the URNG. In the press, this is seldom mentioned. But she makes it no secret. In fact she published a book, ''Bridge of Courage,'' portraying the struggle of this Marxist movement in glowing, heroic terms. On the back cover, the top endorsement comes from one of the worst violators of human rights in the hemisphere, Daniel Ortega. In one chapter, entitled ''How You Can Make A Difference,'' she points out that Americans are legally barred from aiding the military efforts of the URNG, but strictly humanitarian aid is legal. Given her intense commitment to the URNG cause, it is plausible that her campaign on behalf of Mr. Bamaca is, like the URNG's military and political actions, designed first and foremost to weaken the democratically elected Government of Guatemala.

Second, Ms. Harbury is seeking far better treatment than Guatemalans in her position.

Ms. Harbury demands that the government of President Ramiro de Leon Carpio—which took office over a year after the fateful military engagement involving Comandante Bamaca—produce her husband or his remains. This is in the context of a guerrilla war with countless human rights violations on both sides and no record of prisoner exchanges. Bamaca is one of thousands whose fate is unknown.

In fact, there have been so many abuses that the Guatemalan Government and the URNG agreed last June on a way to address them all. A special Historical Commission will conduct a sweeping investigation and issue a public report, as Chile's Government did after the Pinochet era.

So, even though her case received special attention last year, Ms. Harbury continues to demand higher priority than the thousands of Guatemalan widows of soldiers and guerrillas, who will await the Historical Commission.

Out of all this, a few things are clear.

First, Ms. Harbury will be back in the headlines next month with her second hunger strike, pressuring President Clinton to take action against Guatemala.

Second, she is hoping for a second free ride in the media. Human interest coverage brings few hard political questions. Her marriage alone provides a wealth of questions for a good political reporter. There are no photos of her with her husband, and records of her marriage in Texas can only be described as bizarre. When the URNG sought investigators' help locating Bamaca in 1992, their documents didn't mention that he was married. When Harbury has travelled to Guatemala, Bamaca's parents have declined to meet her.

Third, Harbury's campaign helps the URNG at a critical time. The rebels are in the process of abandoning U.N.-mediated peace talks, after those talks made major progress in 1994. The URNG doesn't want to face the next major issue—ceasefire and demobilization—so it is walking away from the table. Its futile military struggle, with the suffering it brings to the Guatemalan people, will continue.

That is the real crime in Guatemala—the trashing of a peace process that is close to ending a 34-year conflict. If U.S. media attention stays on a guerrilla commander lost in combat 3 years ago, it's a crime that won't get the attention it deserves.

WORK IS THE MAIN THING

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1995

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of the House to an article by Mr. Lewis Lehrman that appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Friday, February 10. In the spirit of President's Day, Mr. Lehrman's article on Abraham Lincoln is something I believe that we as an institution should remember about a man who has taught us so much. I submit Mr. Lehrman's article for the RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 10, 1995]

WORK IS THE MAIN THING

(By Lewis E. Lehrman)

Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we celebrate on Sunday, is generally remembered for winning the Civil War and freeing the slaves. He should be. But the great lost truth about our 16th president is that during most of his political career he focused, not on slavery, but on a policy for economic growth and equal opportunity for the new nation. As Lincoln explained over and over, slavery was an involuntary economic exchange of labor, based on coercion; and, therefore, it was theft. Slavery, in short, was the antithesis of free labor, and thus Lincoln opposed it on moral and economic principle.

One of the hidden strengths of Lincoln's political philosophy was its grounding in a thorough grasp of economic theory and policy. That Mr. Lincoln had a coherent economic philosophy is one of the most obvious facts that emerges from Roy Basler's definitive 11-volume edition of the 16th president's original writings, speeches and state papers. Anyone who doubts this should read Gabor Boritt's pathbreaking book on ''Lincoln and the Economics of the American Dream.''

Though Jeffersonian populist in sentiment, Mr. Lincoln's economics were, paradoxically, Hamiltonian in policy. We can see this when, on his way to Washington in early 1861, he declared in Philadelphia, ''I have never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiment embodied in the Declaration of Independence.'' This idea he later vindicated at Gettysburg in 1863 by upholding ''a new birth of freedom'' in an America ''dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.'' One year later he explained to Ohio soldiers visiting the White House that the Civil War itself was a struggle to create ''an open field and a fair chance for your industry, enterprise, and intelligence; that you may all have equal privileges in the race of life. * * *''

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

Lincoln's equality was equality of opportunity. He denied explicitly that American equality was equality of result. In 1857 at Springfield, he said: ''I think the authors [of the Declaration] intended to include all men, but they did not intend to declare all men equal in all respects. They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral developments, or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness, in what respects they did consider all men created equal—equal in certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.''

He also opposed direct federal taxation, except by necessity of war, because, as he said, ''the land must be literally covered with assessors and collectors, going forth like swarms of locusts, devouring every blade of grass. * * *'' Like Alexander Hamilton, he preferred a tariff because, Lincoln suggested, customs collectors on the coast would do less harm to the people than tax collectors roaming their neighborhoods.

He believed that government should be pro-labor by being pro-business; thus for 20 years, he advocated government help in creating canals, railroads, banks, turnpikes and other public institutions needed to integrate a free national market, to increase opportunity and social mobility, and to make the American economy more productive. As the economic historian Bray Hammond has noted, Lincoln was also a sophisticated student of banking and monetary policy, arguing throughout his political career that ''no duty is more imperative on government, than the duty it owes the people of furnishing them a sound and uniform currency.''

His economic philosophy, above all, was based upon ''his patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people.'' He was an authentic populist. But he saw no necessary conflict between labor and capital, believing them to be cooperative in nature. Only cooperation could, in a society of free labor, produce economic growth and increasing opportunity for all. Lincoln argued that capital was, itself, the result of the free labor of mind and muscle. People were the most important resource, not wealth. In fact this idea was so important that President Lincoln argued in his first annual message of 1861 that ''labor is prior to, and independent of capital. Capital is the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed, Capital has its rights, which are as worthy of protection as any other rights.''

He went even further and, once and for all, defined the essence of the American dream: ''There is not, of necessity, any such thing as the free hired laborer being fixed to that condition for life. . . . The prudent, penniless beginner in the world labors for wages a while, saves a surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself; than labors on his own account for a while, and at length hires another new beginner to help him. This is the just, and generous, and prosperous system, which opens the way to all—gives hope to all, and . . . energy, and progress, and improvement of conditions to all.''

Born poor, Mr. Lincoln was probably the greatest of truly self-made men, believing that ''work, work, work is the main thing.'' His economic policy was designed not only ''to clear the path for all,'' but to spell out incentives to encourage entrepreneurs to create new products, new wealth, and new jobs. He himself had applied for and obtained a patent, declaring in 1859 the patent and copyright protection of intellectual property to be one of the greatest incentives to innovation of Western civilization.

While today many Americans would dispute some of Mr. Lincoln's economic policies, it is manifestly true that his proposition—based on the right of every American to rise on his or her merits—defined the colorblind American dream of Martin Luther King. ''I want every man to have the chance,'' Lincoln announced in New Haven in March 1860. ''And I believe a black man is entitled to it . . . when he may look forward and hope to be a hired laborer this year and the next, work for himself afterward, and finally to hire men to work for him! That is the true system.''

This was Lincoln's American system, where government fosters growth, where equal opportunity leads to social mobility, where intelligence and labor lead to savings and entrepreneurship. The black abolitionist Frederick Douglass pronounced a fitting tribute when he said of President Lincoln that he was ''the first great man that I talked with in the United States freely, who in no single instance reminded me of the difference of color.'' He attributed Lincoln's open attitude to the fact that he and Lincoln were both, in Douglass's phrase, ''self-made men.''

Lincoln's economic legacy has had a powerful effect on world history. Without our 16th president there would have been separate slave states and free states; and thus no integrated North American economy in which emerged the most powerful, free-market, commercial civilization the world has ever known. Without pre-eminent American industrial power—which Lincoln self-consciously advocated—the means would not have been available to contain Imperial Germany in 1917 as it reached for European hegemony. Neither would there have been a national power strong enough to destroy its global successor, Hitler's Nazi Reich in 1945, nor to crush the aggressions of Imperial Japan. And, in the end, there would have been no world power to oppose and overcome the Soviet Communist empire during the second half of our century. World conquest—based on the invidious distinctions of race and class, the goal of the malignant world powers of our era—was prevented by the force and leadership of a single country, the perpetual union of the American states.

THE ENIGMA

Hovering over the whole of this history, there lingers still the enigma of the private man and the shadow of his personality. We scrutinize Lincoln; but we see him through a glass darkly. We mine his papers, sap the memoirs left by those who knew him, plumb his personal relationships. But he escapes us.

Surely we know about his humble parents, his lack of formal education, his discreet but towering ambition. But we wonder that, unlike the Adamses, the Roosevelts, the Kennedys, he left no descendants to carry on his legacy of great deeds. It is as if, like a luminous comet, he thrust himself in front of our eyes, the eyes of the world—for a brief moment—then to dissolve into the vasty deep of the cosmos from which he came.

This archetypal American, born poor of the South in Kentucky, elected of the North from Illinois—his professional achievement the very epitome of the American dream—this man Lincoln is the elusive inspiration we should be looking for as we commemorate his birth, 186 years ago, on Feb. 12, 1809.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1995

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, as I stated on February 13, 1995, my wife and I were recently faced with a sudden and unexpected family emergency which has required my presence at home in Los Angeles. We are expecting our second child this May, and under doctor's orders, my wife has been confined to bed rest until she has completed her pregnancy.

As a result, I regretfully missed a number of recorded floor votes during the past few days. For the record, I would like to take this opportunity to indicate my position on each amendment and bill:

Watt amendment of H.R. 667, Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995 (rollcall 112)—''aye.''

Cardin amendment to H.R. 667 (rollcall 113)—''aye.''

Chapman amendment to H.R. 667 (rollcall 114)—''aye.''

Scott amendment to H.R. 667 (rollcall 115)—''aye.''

On motion to recommit with instructions (rollcall 116)—''aye.''

On final passage of H.R. 667 (rollcall 117)—''no.''

On final passage of H.R. 668, Criminal Alien Deportation Improvements Act of 1995 (rollcall 118)—''no.''

Quorum call (rollcall 119)—''present.''

Watt amendment to H.R. 728, Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants Act (rollcall 120)—''aye.''

Mfume amendment to H.R. 728 (rollcall 121)—''aye.''

On ordering the previous question (rollcall 122)—''no.''

On motion by Mr. ARMEY to allow committees to meet on February 14 and for the remainder of the week when the House is meeting under the 5-minute rule (rollcall 123)—''no.''

Schumer amendment to H.R. 728 (rollcall 124)—''aye.''

Schroeder amendment to H.R. 728 (rollcall 125)—''aye.''

Hoke amendment to H.R. 728 (rollcall 126)—''aye.''

On motion to agree to the committee substitute (rollcall 127)—''no.''

On motion to recommit with instructions (rollcall 128)—''aye.''

On final passage of H.R. 728 (rollcall 129)—''no.''

On motion by Mr. WISE to adjourn (rollcall 130)—''aye.''

Quorum call (rollcall 131)—''present.''

On ordering the previous question on H. Res. 83 (rollcall 132)—''no.''

On final passage of H. Res. 83 (rollcall 133)—''no.''

On motion by Mr. VOLKMER to adjourn (rollcall 134)—''aye.''

Spence amendment to H.R. 7, National Security Revitalization Act (rollcall 135)—''no.''

Spratt amendment to H.R. 7 (rollcall 136)—''aye.''

Edwards amendment to the Spratt amendment, as modified (rollcall 137)—''aye.''

Skelton amendment, as amended by the Spence substitute amendment (rollcall 138)—''no.''

Montgomery substitute to the Skelton amendment, as amended by the Dellums amendment (rollcall 139)—''aye.''

Hefley amendment to H.R. 7 (rollcall 140)—''no.''

Herman amendment to H.R. 7 (rollcall 141)—''aye.''

Leach amendment to H.R. 7 (rollcall 142)—''aye.''

Torricelli amendment to H.R. 7 (rollcall 143)—''aye.''

On motion to recommit with instructions (rollcall 144)—''aye.''

On final passage of H.R. 7 (rollcall 145)—''no.''

FAIRNESS FOR WORKERS ''ON THE ROAD''

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1995

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the legislation I introduce today, along with Representatives RICHARD NEAL and WILLIAM JEFFERSON, restores to 80 percent the business meal deduction for long-haul truck drivers, bus drivers, airline flight crews, railroad conductors, and other federally regulated transportation workers who fall under the Department of Transportation hours-of-service regulations. They symbolize the hard-working, middle-class American who struggles for his or her family, abides by the rules, and deserves fair treatment.

As part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, the business meal deduction was reduced from 80 percent to 50 percent. Though Congress was correct in addressing this provision in the Tax Code, it erroneously assumed that it was going to affect only the so-called three martini lunches. In fact, the diminution of this deduction has hurt many hard-working, middle-income Americans, especially in the transportation industry, who find themselves away from their homes and families for extended periods of time.

For example, long-haul truck drivers spend over 200 days per year away from home. They eat at roadside diners and truckstops and sleep in their trucks or modest motels. In doing so, they incur the legitimate and necessary business expenses required in their work and do not enjoy the expense-account lifestyles of the individuals originally targeted in the 1993 legislation.

My bill restores some fairness to the Tax Code by reinstating the 80-percent business meal deduction for certain transportation workers, and I urge my colleagues to lend their support for its enactment.