the Latin community, the concept of celebrating Latin culture became a unifying factor for members who had diverse interests. The fraternity believes ''En La Union Esta La Fuerza'' (In Unity There is Strength). Membership is open to all college males who wish to work together to reach the organization's goals.

The diverse membership has a social conscience and a commitment to the community. By working in neighborhoods, the fraternity hopes not only to provide service, but also to enhance the image of Latin culture and provide positive role models for the Latin community. Brothers have gone on to become accountants, attorneys, engineers, entrepreneurs, politicians, recording artists, scientists and leaders in various areas.

A few of the fraternity's activities include voter registration programs, citizenship drives, disaster relief, anti-drug rallies, and Hispanic college days, which introduce thousands of high school students to college.

Please join me today in honoring Lambda Theta Phi fraternity on its 20th anniversary as it continues to provide service to the community and guarantees the strongest in brotherhood while upholding the best in Latin culture.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 440, NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, November 18, 1995

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, and specifically the provision within this legislation addressing the Environmental Protection Agency's [EPA] implementation of the enhanced vehicle inspection and maintenance program [I&M] under sections 182, 184, and 187 of the Clean Air Act.

The 1990 Clean Air Act amendments required certain ozone and carbon monoxide nonattainment areas—as well as certain areas within ozone transport regions—to adopt enhanced vehicle inspection and maintenance programs. The act was intended to afford States maximum flexibility in designing their I&M programs. However, in several hearings conducted by the Commerce Committee's Oversight Subcommittee it has become apparent that EPA has taken the enhanced I&M program and attempted to force States into a one-size-fits-all approach. That approach, a centralized or test-only program that favors testing with IM240 equipment, has been resisted, and in some cases rejected, by States and by our constituents as too costly and too inconvenient. In addition, many States and outside experts question whether EPA's centralized approach is indeed more effective than a decentralized approach.

The amendments to the Clean Air Act contained in this bill are designed to require EPA to allow for more flexibility in the implementation of the enhanced I&M program. First, the provision prevents EPA from automatically assuming that decentralized or test-and-repair programs are approximately 50 percent less effective than centralized or test-only programs. Second, it would allow States an 18-month period in which States could configure their own I&M program, experimenting with various network and equipment types. Because it will be difficult to determine a priori exact emissions reductions achieved by such a program, requirements that States propose credits in good faith should be construed loosely. EPA would then be required to base emission reduction credits on the actual data from the I&M program, rather than basing credits on assumptions within a computer model. In developing this credit, the burden should be upon EPA to demonstrate that provisional credits proposed by the States are inappropriate. EPA is then required to adjust credits as appropriate as demonstrated by the program data, which could include actual emission tests results, remote sensing, or other relevant data.

The message of this legislation to EPA regarding the enhanced inspection and maintenance program is clear. Congress is not happy with the present course EPA has taken. This legislation should be viewed as a response to EPA's statements that it will continue to discount decentralized or test-and-repair I&M programs up to 50 percent based on model assumptions. Such statements run counter to the statutory language and intent of this provision which are to allow States, such as Virginia, an opportunity to demonstrate to EPA what credits for decentralized programs should be from actual program data.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 2525 AND H.R. 2519

SPEECH OF

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1995

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my support for both H.R. 2525, the Charitable Gift Annuity Relief Act, and H.R. 2519, the Philanthropy Protection Act. These bills offer much-needed clarity to our securities and antitrust laws and will encourage continued charitable giving by our Nation's non-profit organizations.

Charitable gift annuities and charitable trusts make it possible for donors to make contributions while still retaining some income from the gift. This legislation encourages this flexible arrangement and should be supported.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are the most generous in the world. In 1995 alone, contributions to charity totaled $120 billion. These bills will ensure that this level of generosity continues. Vote ''Yes'' on H.R. 2519 and H.R. 2525.

FRAUD IN LOBBYING

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1995

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join Mr. DINGELL today as an original cosponsor of legislation to make it a Federal crime to misappropriate a person's name in connection with lobbying Congress. I want to commend Mr. DINGELL for bringing this important legislation to the floor.

During the recent debate on the telecommunications bill, Members of Congress were deluged by thousands of telegrams in opposition to the measure.

It turns out that most of the telegrams were sent without the knowledge or consent of our constituents. Their names and addresses were wrongfully expropriated by opponents of the telecommunications bill as part of a massive lobbying scam.

Before the extent of this fraud was uncovered, my office responded to 650 telegrams. I subsequently wrote these constituents a second letter, informing them that their names may have been used without their knowledge.

I received dozens of replies from constituents who were outraged that a lobbying group would use their names without permission. I would like to read just one of them to you:

SEPTEMBER 29, 1995.

Hon. SANDER LEVIN,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEVIN: I found the attached letter at my father's home while sorting through his things following his recent death. He had written my name on the envelope, so I assume he wanted me to handle this matter for him.

The letter you sent was not addressed to my father, but to my brother. My brother died 13 years ago. I don't know where the list firm would have gotten his name. I personally had his name withdrawn from the voters rolls many years ago to avoid the somewhat painful mail being delivered to my parent's home.

I believe I can guarantee you that [my brother] did not authorize a telegram to be sent to you in support or opposition to any legislation

Good luck in your investigation.

Sincerely,

THOMAS H. SHIELDS.

Mr. Speaker, this telegram lobbying campaign was a blatant attempt to mislead the House of Representatives. Congress should take whatever steps are necessary to prevent this abuse from happening ever again.

That's why we're here today. This legislation makes this type of misrepresentation a Federal offense punishable by up to 1 year in prison, fines, or both.

Another one of my constituents hit the nail on the head. Referring to lobbying firms such as the one that orchestrated the telegram scam on the telecommunications bill, she wrote, ''I hope ya get the stinkers.'' This legislation is a good start.

HAYMARKET HOUSE'S CSAT GRANT

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, Nov. 30, 1995

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that Haymarket House in my congressional district has recently been selected to receive a grant to provide residential substance abuse treatment to more than 20 women and their children by the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment [CSAT] Residential Women and Children [RWC] grant program.

Haymarket House currently provides comprehensive and integrated treatment services to approximately 13,000 clients each year, making it the largest drug abuse treatment

center in the State of Illinois. With the CSAT demonstration grant, Haymarket intends to provide 22 chemically dependent women and up to 31 drug-exposed children with a continuum of care.

The goals of Haymarket House's recovery recovery program are to reduce the recidivism rate among chemically dependent women and to enhance the maternal-child attachment and promote independent living.

One of the greatest barriers that high-risk women currently face when seeking substance abuse treatment is lack of child care. CSAT's grant will enable Haymarket House to address this problem by establishing a model recovery home providing drug abuse prevention and treatment, health services, child care, parent training, vocational education, and job placement. This integration helps treatment centers like Haymarket improve their prevention and treatment services so that drug addictions can be treated more quickly.

I commend Haymarket House for their innovative approach to substance abuse and encourage my colleagues to visit this facility in my congressional district to see for yourselves what a remarkably successful drug treatment program Haymarket House has established.

REMEMBER THE NIXON DOCTRINE

HON. Y. TIM HUTCHINSON

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1995

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, considering the high level of interest in the President's plan to deploy 20,000 American servicemen and servicewomen to Bosnia, I thought my colleagues might find the accompanying article of special interest.

It should be noted that Jim Webb, a former counsel on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, was a highly decorated marine in Vietnam, as Assistant Secretary of Defense, as well as Secretary of the Navy.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 28, 1995]

REMEMBER THE NIXON DOCTRINE

(By James Webb)

ARLINGTON, VA.—The Clinton Administration's insistence on putting 20,000 American troops into Bosnia should be seized on by national leaders, particularly those running for President, to force a long-overdue debate on the worldwide obligations of our military.

While the Balkan factions may be immersed in their struggle, and Europeans may feel threatened by it, for Americans it represents only one of many conflicts, real and potential, whose seriousness must be weighed, often against one another, before allowing a commitment of lives, resources and national energy.

Today, despite a few half-hearted attempts such as Gen. Colin Powell's ''superior force doctrine,'' no clear set of principles exists as a touchstone for debate on these tradeoffs. Nor have any leaders of either party offered terms which provide an understandable global logic as to when our military should be committed to action. In short, we still lack a national security strategy that fits the postcold war era.

More than ever before, the United States has become the nation of choice when crises occur, large and small. At the same time, the size and location of our military forces are in flux. It is important to make our interests known to our citizens, our allies and even our potential adversaries, not just in Bosnia but around the world, so that commitments can be measured by something other than the pressures of interest groups and manipulation by the press. Furthermore, with alliances increasingly justified by power relationships similar to those that dominated before World War I, our military must be assured that the stakes of its missions are worth dying for.

Failing to provide these assurances is to continue the unremitting case-by-case debates, hampering our foreign policy on the one hand and on the other treating our military forces in some cases as mere bargaining chips. As the past few years demonstrate, this also causes us to fritter away our national resolve while arguing about military backwaters like Somalia and Haiti.

Given the President's proposal and the failure to this point of defining American stakes in Bosnia as immediate or nation-threatening, the coming weeks will offer a new round of such debates. The President appears tempted to follow the constitutionally questionable (albeit effective) approach used by the Bush Administration in the Persian Gulf war: putting troops in an area where no American forces have been threatened and no treaties demand their presence, then gaining international agreement before placing the issue before Congress.

Mr. Clinton said their mission would be ''to supervise the separation of forces and to give them confidence that each side will live up to their agreements.'' This rationale reminds one of the ill-fated mission of the international force sent to Beirut in 1983. He has characterized the Bosnian mission as diplomatic in purpose, but promised, in his speech last night, to ''fight fire with fire and then some'' if American troops are threatened. This is a formula for confusion once a combat unit sent on a distinctly noncombat mission comes under repeated attack.

We are told that other NATO countries will decline to send their own military forces to Bosnia unless the United States assumes a dominant role, which includes sizable combat support and naval forces backing it up. This calls to mind the decades of over-reliance by NATO members on American resources, and President Eisenhower's warning in October 1963 that the size and permanence of our military presence in Europe would ''continue to discourage the development of the necessary military strength Western European countries should provide for themselves.''

The Administration speaks of a ''reasonable time for withdrawal,'' which if too short might tempt the parties to wait out the so-called peacekeepers and if too long might tempt certain elements to drive them out with attacks causing high casualties.

Sorting out the Administration's answers to such hesitations will take a great deal of time, attention and emotion. And doing so in the absence of a clearly stated global policy will encourage other nations, particularly the new power centers in Asia, to view the United States as becoming less committed to addressing their own security concerns. Many of these concerns are far more serious to long-term international stability and American interests. These include the continued threat of war on the Korean peninsula, the importance of the United States as a powerbroker where historical Chinese, Japanese and Russian interests collide, and the need for military security to accompany trade and diplomacy in a dramatically changing region.

Asian cynicism gained further grist in the wake of the Administration's recent snubs of Japan: the President's cancellation of his summit meeting because of the budget crisis, and Secretary of State Warren Christopher's early return from a Japanese visit to watch over the Bosnian peace talks.

Asian leaders are becoming uneasy over an economically and militarily resurgent China that in recent years has become increasing more aggressive. A perception that the United States is not paying attention to or is not worried about such long-term threats could in itself cause a major realignment in Asia. One cannot exclude even Japan, whose strong bilateral relationship with the United States has been severely tested of late, from this possibility.

Those who aspire to the Presidency in 1996 should use the coming debate to articulate a world view that would demonstrate to the world, as well as to Americans, an understanding of the uses and limitations—in a sense the human budgeting of our military assets.

Richard Nixon was the last President to clearly define how and when the United States would commit forces overseas. In 1969, he declared that our military policy should follow three basic tenets:

Honor all treaty commitments in responding to those who invade the lands of our allies.

Provide a nuclear umbrella to the world against the threats of other nuclear powers.

Finally, provide weapons and technical assistance to other countries where warranted, but do not commit American forces to local conflicts.

These tenets, with some modification, are still the best foundation of our world leadership. They remove the United States from local conflicts and civil wars. The use of the American military to fulfill treaty obligations requires ratification by Congress, providing a hedge against the kind of Presidential discretion that might send forces into conflicts not in the national interest. Yet they provide clear authority for immediate action required to carry out policies that have been agreed upon by the government as a whole.

Given the changes in the world, an additional tenet would also be desirable: The United States should respond vigorously against cases of nuclear proliferation and state-sponsored terrorism.

These tenets would prevent the use of United States forces on commitments more appropriate to lesser powers while preserving our unique capabilities. Only the United States among the world's democracies can field large-scale maneuver forces, replete with strategic airlift, carrier battle groups and amphibious power projection.

Our military has no equal in countering conventional attacks on extremely short notice wherever the national interest dictates. Our bases in Japan give American forces the ability to react almost anywhere in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, just as the continued presence in Europe allows American units to react in Europe and the Middle East.

In proper form, this capability provides reassurance to potentially threatened nations everywhere. But despite the ease with which the American military seemingly operates on a daily basis, its assets are limited, as is the national willingness to put them at risk.

As the world moves toward new power centers and different security needs, it is more vital than ever that we state clearly the conditions under which American forces will be sent into harm's way. And we should be ever more chary of commitments, like the looming one in Bosnia, where combat units invite attack but are by the very nature of their mission not supposed to fight.