

of \$34.2 million per year wasted at foreign airshows and arms bazaars. This figure is up over 31 percent over the period from 1994 to 1995.

The Clinton administration has been under-reporting cost and involvement to the U.S. by excluding transportation costs to and from the foreign shows. The costs reported by the Pentagon to Congress are 15 to 20 times less than the actual costs, leaving the U.S. taxpayer to pick up the tab. An example of this practice is the transfer of a B-2 bomber from the United States to France for a demonstration at an air show in Paris in 1995. This flight to Paris involved at least a 24-hour round trip ticket. The cost to operate the plane for one hour is \$14,166, for a cost of over \$330,000. The total cost submitted to Congress by the Pentagon to cover the entire show was underestimated at \$342,916.

The bill I am introducing today, the "Restrictions on Foreign Air Shows Act" bans any further direct participation of Defense personnel and equipment at air shows unless the defense industry pays for the advertising and use of the DoD wares. The bill prohibits sending planes, equipment, weapons, or any other related material to any overseas air show unless the contractor has paid for the expenses incurred by DoD. If a contractor decides to participate in the air show, he or she must lease the equipment, cover insurance costs, ramp fees, transportation fees, and any other costs associated with the air show. If a contractor is making a profit by showing the aircraft, they will also be required to pay for the advertisement and use of the aircraft. In addition, military and government personnel will not be allowed at the show unless the contractor pays for their services during the air show.

This bill in no way outlaws the use of U.S. Aircraft or other equipment in foreign air shows or other trade exhibitions. The bill simply takes the financial burden off of the American taxpayer and puts it on the defense contractor. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE CRUISE LINE INDUSTRY IN ALASKA AND THE UNITED STATES

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1999

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to address an issue that is very critical to the constituents of my home State of Alaska. The issue I wish to speak about is the significant contribution which the cruise line industry has made to the great State of Alaska and this country.

Alaska is a State where the land mass is larger than all of the Northeastern and Great Lakes States put together. Approximately 600,000 Americans live there. Many Americans have heard of Alaska and have some image of its wildness but fewer than 10 percent of Americans have ever visited. Nonetheless, the opportunity for Americans to visit this great state has increased tenfold with the presence of the cruise industry. Furthermore, the economic benefits that the cruise lines bring have greatly impacted Alaska.

Recently, Price Waterhouse Coopers (PwC) and Wharton Econometric Forecasting Associates concluded a Study on the Economic Impact of the Cruise Industry on the U.S. economy. This study reveals that the cruise industry spent \$6.6 billion in the United States in 1997, and generated an additional \$5 billion of impact on the economy. In the United States alone, the cruise lines purchased \$1.8 billion in transportation from airlines, \$794 million in fuel and lubricants, \$626 million in business services, \$1 billion in financial services, and \$600 million in food and beverage supplies. In the State of Alaska in 1998, the cruise industry spent with Alaskan business and service providers \$363,274,000. These statistics are significant and make clear that the cruise industry has benefited both the state of Alaska and our Nation.

This study also reveals that the cruise industry created 176,433 jobs for U.S. citizens in 1997. These jobs included direct employment by the industry and jobs attributable to the U.S. based cruise line suppliers and industry partners. Through its annual growth of 6-10 percent, the industry is responsible for thousands of new jobs every year for Americans. The cruise industry is the single largest direct employer in the maritime sector of the United States. In my State of Alaska in 1998, the cruise industry was responsible for the employment of 17,189 Alaskans. That is 3 percent of the population of our State.

Another issue that I wish to address is the matter regarding Federal and State taxation of the cruise industry. Some critics state that the cruise industry does not pay federal and state taxes in the United States. This statement is false. In fact the recently completed study revealed that the industry pays millions of dollars in taxes each year. In 1997, the cruise industry paid over \$1 billion in Federal, State, and local taxes in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the contributions made by the cruise industry to our great Nation. The benefits have been abundant, both throughout this nation and in my home State, Alaska. In view of the many contributions, I wish to acknowledge the vital role which the cruise industry plays in sustaining the economy and the maritime sector of this country.

TRIBUTE TO FRANKYE SCHNEIDER

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1999

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my dear friend, Frankye Schneider, who this year is being honored by the 40th Assembly District of the Democratic party. For more than two decades, Frankye held the position of senior deputy to Los Angeles County Supervisor Ed Edelman. Frankye has always considered it an honor to work in politics. She cherished the opportunity to use the resources and power of government to help individual citizens.

Frankye was the perfect model of a professional and compassionate staff person. She was never too busy to listen to the concerns of another resident, and to speak out on behalf of a homeowners' association, chamber of commerce or non-profit agency. Although dis-

tricts in Los Angeles County contain more people than many states, it somehow seemed as if everyone was on a first-name basis with Frankye.

It would be impossible in such a short space to mention each and every contribution Frankye made to our community during the time she worked for Supervisor Edelman. The list of people and organizations that benefitted from her efforts is truly myriad. Frankye had an extremely wide range of interests, including the arts, the environment, education, mental health and juvenile justice.

She is a lifetime member of the PTA, immediate past president of the San Fernando Valley Community Mental Health Center, and a former Board Member of New Directions for Youth and the United Way. After she left the staff of Supervisor Edelman, Frankye worked for the Los Angeles County Museum of Art and the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History.

Frankye has a deep and abiding interest in the fortunes of the Democratic Party. She was a founding member and the first chair of the Democratic Party of the San Fernando Valley, and she has represented the 40th Assembly District at California Democratic party conventions for many years. Frankye also did extensive volunteer work for George McGovern's 1972 presidential campaign and Tom Bradley's 1973 campaign for mayor of Los Angeles.

Frankye doesn't know the meaning of the word "retirement." She continues to stay active in the community and with a variety of organizations. She also spends as much time as she can with her three children and four grandchildren.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Frankye Schneider, who has devoted much of her life to bettering the lives of others. Her dedication and selflessness inspire us all.

CONSTITUTIONAL IMPASSE CONTINUES IN BELARUS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1999

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, the alternative Presidential election concluded in Belarus within the timeframe envisioned by the legitimate 1994 Constitution. While the opposition Central Election Commission (CEC) concluded that the final results of the voting were invalid because of various violations deriving from the impediments placed by Belarusian authorities, the ballot served as an important barometer of democratic engagement by the citizens of Belarus. In the months leading up to the election, President Alyaksandr Lukashenka had imprisoned one of the two Presidential candidates—former Prime Minister Mikhail Chygir—on what were clearly politically motivated charges, arrested hundreds of election officials and volunteers, and instituted administrative proceedings against others. Nevertheless, the authorities were unable to thwart the election in at least one critically important respect—according to the opposition CEC, the voting itself was valid because more than half—or 53 percent of the electorate—participated. When one considers that these were unsanctioned elections that

challenged Lukashenka's legitimacy, this is a substantial number of people.

No matter what the imperfections, Mr. Speaker, the opposition's electoral initiative should send a powerful message to Lukashenka. Clearly, an appreciable number of Belarusian citizens are dissatisfied with the profoundly negative political and socio-economic fallout stemming from his dictatorial inclinations and misguided nostalgia for the Soviet past or some misty "Slavic Union." The vote highlights the constitutional and political impasse created by Lukashenka's illegitimate 1996 constitutional referendum, in which he extended his personal power, disbanded the duly elected 13th Supreme Soviet, and created a new legislature and constitutional court subservient to him.

Last month, the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki Commission), which I chair, held a hearing on the situation in Belarus, with a view toward promoting human rights and democracy there. Testimony from the State Department, OSCE mission in Belarus, the Belarusian democratic opposition and several human rights NGOs all reaffirmed that Belarus is missing out on what one witness characterized as "the great market democratic revolution that is sweeping Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia" because of Lukashenka's power grab and backsliding on human rights and democracy.

Despite repeated calls from the international community, including the Helsinki Commission, for Lukashenka to cease harassment of the opposition, NGO's and the independent media; allow the opposition access to the electronic media; create the conditions for free and fair elections and strengthen the rule of law, we have failed to see progress in these areas. Indeed, we see more evidence of reversals. Earlier this year, for example, Lukashenka signed a decree which introduces extensive restrictions on non-governmental activity and mandates re-registration—by July 1—of political parties, NGOs and trade unions. The decree, which among other onerous stipulations requires that organizations acknowledge the results of Lukashenka's illegitimate 1996 referendum, is clearly designed to destroy democratic civil society in Belarus and further consolidate Lukashenka's repressive rule. Moreover, within the last few months, several disturbing incidents have occurred, among them the March arrests of Viktor Gonchar, Chairman of the opposition CEC, and the Chygir imprisonment, as well as the mysterious disappearances of Tamara Vinnikova, former chair of the National Bank of Belarus and, on May 10, Gen. Yuri Zakharenko, former Interior Minister and a leading opponent of Lukashenka. Just a few days ago, Lukashenka's government announced that no more foreign priests will be allowed to serve in Belarus, making it extremely difficult for the Roman Catholic Church, which is rebuilding following the travails of the Soviet era, to function.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the Belarusian Government to comply with its freely undertaken commitments under the Helsinki Final Act and subsequent OSCE agreements and to immediately, without preconditions, convene a genuine dialog with the country's democratic forces and with the long-suffering Belarusian people.

TRIBUTE TO DR. AUGUSTO ORTIZ
AND MARTHA ORTIZ

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1999

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Augusto Ortiz and his wife, Mrs. Martha Ortiz. For 50 years, this outstanding team has provided medical and clinical services to the under-served, rural and urban, Spanish-speaking populations of Arizona. Dr. Ortiz, a medical doctor who graduated from the University of Illinois in 1945, provided the medical services while Martha, who rarely accepted compensation for her services, acted as the full-time administrator, personnel director, and business manager of the practice. The willingness of Dr. and Mrs. Ortiz to forego salaries or their acceptance of "pay-what-you-can" arrangements made medical services affordable and available to many poor residents of Arizona. Thousands of Arizonans owe their health and lives to the caring dedication of this selfless medical team.

Although Dr. Ortiz' family did not have large amounts of money, they encouraged a love of learning and a dedication to community service. With these values instilled in him as a young boy in Puerto Rico, Dr. Ortiz often dreamed of helping underprivileged people when he grew up. In order to pursue his dream of becoming a doctor to aid indigent people, Dr. Ortiz had to leave his much loved family and childhood home to attend medical school in Illinois. Although he was now thousands of miles away, these early dreams and lessons helped guide and inspire him to continue toward his goal.

In the early 1950's, while stationed at Luke Air Force Base in Phoenix, Arizona, Dr. Ortiz took on a Herculean task. He readily agreed to assist Dr. Carlos Greth with a medical practice that served 80,000 Spanish-speaking people in Maricopa County. At this time, they were the only Spanish-speaking doctors in Maricopa County.

Aside from generously offering his medical talents, Dr. Ortiz also became a champion for those that he treated. His political motivation was his need to "stand up and speak out" because he felt "an obligation to do something to . . . remedy those problems" which were regularly encountered by his patients. Dr. Ortiz was especially active on behalf of his farm worker patients. He was instrumental in obtaining an Arizona state ban on the short handled hoe, as well as improving the Arizona laws regulating pesticides and field sanitation. Dr. Ortiz' commitment and accomplishments make him an outstanding role model for the citizen activist. He identified the problems that needed to be addressed, sought logical, humane remedies for them, and consistently persuaded political decision makers to agree to the solutions.

Dr. and Mrs. Ortiz not only emphasized preventive health care, they organized mobile clinics and community health boards to ensure that this message would be heard and spread throughout many Arizona communities. In 1972, Dr. Ortiz joined the University of Arizona Rural Health Office as the Medical Director. Currently, he continues as the Medical Director of the Rural Health Office while maintaining his rural mobile clinic practice in three commu-

nities. During his tenure, he has worked tirelessly to encourage the poor and minorities to enter and to succeed in healthcare professions, while continually working to develop and deliver better health services for those in need.

Throughout his career, Dr. Ortiz has received many honors and awards, including: The Arizona Latin-American Medical Association Award; the Arizona Family Doctor of the Year Award; Distinguished Leadership Award, American Rural Health Association (national); and the Jefferson Award for Outstanding Service to the Community, Institute for Public Service (national).

Dr. Ortiz and Martha deserve the nation's gratitude and respect for the magnitude of the service they have given for such an extended period of time. I ask my colleagues in Congress to join me in applauding and honoring this noble doctor, Dr. Augusto Ortiz, and his admirable wife, Martha Ortiz.

AMERICAN LAND SOVEREIGNTY PROTECTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. WALLY HERGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 883) to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands:

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 883, The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act and am in favor of its passage. The reason I support this legislation is because it will place constraints on the Clinton/Gore administration's ability to exercise more Federal land control. Mr. Speaker, my main concern is not the United Nations. The United Nations has no more authority than we choose to give it. My major concern, and the concern of the citizens of my northern California District, is the continued use of Presidential powers to exercise Federal land control. This legislation will go a long way in preventing that. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge everyone's support of H.R. 883.

INDIA'S ANTI-AMERICANISM RE- VEALED AS DEFENSE MINISTER ATTACKS AMERICA

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1999

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed to hear that the Defense Minister of India, George Fernandes, led a meeting of some of the world's most repressive regimes at which they agreed that their main goal was to "stop the United States," according to the Indian Express. Fernandes himself called the United States "vulgarly arrogant." This should offend anyone who cares about this country.