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ability to participate in air shows. The amendment requires the President to notify Congress 45 days prior to any participation in further air shows. It also requires that participation be in the interest of national security. In addition, the amendment requires a cost estimate to be submitted to Congress as well.

In order to side step the Berman amendment, DoD sends aircraft and personnel to air shows on so called “training missions.” This fulfills the requirement that the air show be in the interest of national security. It is important to look at the total cost of foreign air shows in order to realize the abuse by the federal government on the American taxpayer. A conservative calculation of the total cost of taxpayer subsidies for 1996 and 1997 was at least $68.4 million. That is an average 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 underreporting 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.
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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 the magnificent beauty of the state, but have had only a vague 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.
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Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a 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 districts 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 benefited 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.
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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 Androŭski candidates—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 stop 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 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 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, 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 Helsinki Final Act and subsequent OSCE agreements and to immediately, without preconditions, convene a genuine dialogue with the country’s democratic forces and with the long-suffering Belarusian people.
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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 couple has served the needs of the rural poor in Arizona. They are the only doctors in all of Maricopa County that speak Spanish. When, in 1945, Dr. Ortiz joined the University of Arizona College of Medicine, he did so with the understanding that he would devote his career to increasing the availability of healthcare services to the poor, with an emphasis on rural Arizona. In the years that followed, Dr. and Mrs. Ortiz, along with their son, Dr. Carlos Greth, helped to establish the Arizona Mobile Clinics and the Community Health Centers. They have also been instrumental in expanding the availability of health care services to the rural poor. Dr. Ortiz has served as the Medical Director of the Rural Health Center in Maricopa County and as the Medical Director of the Arizona Indian Health Service. He has received many honors and awards, including the Arizona Latin-American Medical Association Award; the Arizona Family Doctor of the Year Award; the American Rural Health Association Award; and the Jefferson Award for Outstanding Service to the Community. In addition, Dr. Ortiz has been honored by 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 Ortiz are a wonderful example of what can be achieved through hard work and dedication to one’s community. They have shown that even in the face of adversity, it is possible to make a difference. They have inspired many others to follow in their footsteps and continue to work towards improving the lives of those in need. Their story serves as a reminder that with determination and perseverance, anything is possible. I urge all of us to remember the legacy of Dr. and Mrs. Ortiz and to continue to work towards creating a better world for all.
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The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 883) to preserve