

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REMARKS BY MARTIN S. DAVIS
ABOUT PROTECTIONIST ACTIVITIES
BY THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I want to insert into the RECORD a statement about European Community trade practices made by Paramount Communications Inc, chairman, Martin Davis, at the European Chairman's Symposium.

His statement reveals a deeply disturbing trend within the European Community to restrict the purchase of United States-produced programming. Members of the European Community are claiming that the cultural integrity of its member-nations are threatened by American programming. But Mr. Davis effectively argues that the cultural integrity argument is simply a facade for the protection of European production facilities.

I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Davis' insightful and informative remarks.

PROTECTIONISM: A DEADLY VIRUS

(Remarks by Martin S. Davis)

As we meet here in the center of Europe, we see a world around us light years away from a world we knew just a decade ago. There is nothing as constant as the constancy of change.

And nowhere is that more evident than in the transformation of the Company I am privileged to lead.

Just a few years ago we were known as "Gulf & Western Industries." Our businesses spanned the alphabet—from A-autoparts to Z-zinc.

Today, we are a totally different enterprise. Beginning in 1983, we carried out as thorough a strategic restructuring as any I know. We reshaped and refocused by divesting capital intensive, low profit or no profit businesses. At the same time, we continued—through a series of specialized acquisitions—to build our core operations in entertainment and publishing. Reflecting that restructuring, our name is now Paramount Communications.

In entertainment, our Paramount Pictures was one of America's motion picture pioneers—the first to distribute a full length feature film and the first to present motion pictures in color. So we reached back into our own history and brought forward a name that consumers all over the world easily recognize.

You might ask: "why did we divest all those commodity and heavy industrial businesses to focus our energies and resources on entertainment and publishing? It was because we saw a future in which consumers not only in America but throughout the world would be eager to see our films . . . or to read our novels . . . or to enjoy our television programs . . . or to learn more about the universe around them.

We envisioned an unprecedented global demand for these inventions of the mind and of the creative spirit. And we were prepared to make the investments, to take the risks, and to reach out to new markets beyond our shores—from the Pacific to Latin America and to the European heartland.

We also witnessed the startlingly swift emergence of advanced technologies that injected a new dynamism into our markets. Consider these facts:

In 1980, the home video market was virtually non-existent. Today, there are over 200 million VCRs in use throughout the world.

Books, not much changed from the days of Gutenberg, now appear on audio cassettes, on CD-ROMs and on discs. And through high speed data links they can be sent from a library to a university to home and back again in a matter of minutes.

Television programming, once carried locally by microwave relay antenna systems, is now transmitted by orbiting satellites—instantly—to anywhere in the world, leaving a truly "global footprint."

These leaps of technology made it possible to reach out to consumers in all corners of the Earth. We can now watch the CNN news in our hotel room here . . . or in New York . . . or in Rome. Or, if we desire, the early edition of The Wall Street Journal or Handelsblatt can be "faxed" to us within minutes over AT&T's fiber optic telephone lines with the latest digital switches.

We live in an environment in which technology has made it possible to move from a climate of scarcity to one of abundance. Now, we are no longer confined to a few channels telecast over the air. We can transmit programming on broad band—or multi-band channels. As the chairman of our Federal Communications Commission has observed, one can no longer simply "leverage profits" by controlling a limited spectrum—the race is now open to all.

Just as communications technology opened the gates to the "global village," another sweeping trend profoundly changed the economic scene—the "privatization" of the means of communications.

Today, telephone companies in Europe are being turned over to private hands. European television, once state-dominated, has now attracted continental investors like Canal Plus, Kirch, Havas, Elsevier, Feruzzi, Wallenberg, and Berlusconi.

In the United States, our own publishing industry has drawn non-U.S. investors like Reed International of the UK, Bertelsmann of Germany, Thomson of Canada, and Hachette of France. Old-line American publishing houses like Doubleday, Addison-Wesley and Grolier are now owned by non-U.S. enterprises. And, such non-U.S. companies as Sony, Matsushita, Phillips and EMI have major stakes in the U.S. entertainment industry.

We welcome those changes and we welcome the healthy competition they bring. These cross-border investments exemplify the international scope of the media and publishing industry and just how vast it has become—with revenues of some \$1.4 trillion worldwide.

These technological and commercial changes did not take place in a vacuum. They occurred in the midst of sweeping political change.

The cold war is over. Ironically, some observers have linked the breakdown of oppressive Eastern Bloc regimes to the influence of television and radio, which expose the world to Democratic values and ideas. Germany is reunified and the Common Market soon will be a reality. We are now on the threshold of what President Bush has described as a "new world order."

But what kind of world will it be? Will it be a world of free and fair trade? Or will it be a world that slips behind a newly erected wall of protectionism?—a subject that was high on the agenda of the just-concluded G-7 summit meeting a few miles from here.

I am not an alarmist by nature. But I believe that a return to protectionism would be a disaster for us all. It would certainly be a disaster for the European Community—not only the world's largest market, but the world's largest exporter. Last year, for example, the EC's total exports were \$1.36 trillion. Our future prosperity and growth are intertwined with yours. They both depend on open avenues of trade.

Foreign markets make up an ever increasing share of our business as well. In 1985, U.S. motion picture, television and home video export revenues were \$1.9 billion. In 1990, they were \$7.5 billion.

Altogether, the motion picture industry returns some \$3.5 billion in surplus to the U.S. balance of payments account. It is a bright spot in an otherwise dismal deficit picture. Consumers everywhere have a large appetite for American films, which are perennial box office leaders worldwide.

Yet, these gains, and indeed the very growth of our businesses, are threatened by a new wave of protectionist sentiment and activity.

Protectionism crops up in the most unexpected places, like a virus. It is so pervasive, says Arthur Dunkel, the Director of GATT, that "only collective action by governments can defeat it."

The "National Trade Estimate" prepared by the U.S. Government—the catalog of all the Trade Barriers we exporters face—is as big as the telephone books of many major cities. And it is full of unfair trade practices, overt and covert.

One of the most troublesome of these unfair practices is the EC directive, ironically mislabeled "Television without Frontiers." It requires that all members states place a restrictive quota on television programming produced by non-Europeans—reserving at least "a majority" of programming for European productions.

In their zeal to implement this directive, the French government has actually gone even further by slapping a 60% European quota on U.S. television programming. These are restrictions aimed directly at American companies, their writers, producers, directors—and shareholders. And they defy the basic trade precept of reciprocity. We have no such quotas in America.

And that is not all. European directives are now diverting millions of dollars derived

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

from levies on our videocassettes away from American producers. These levies are being used to subsidize our competitors, the local production companies. This is unfair!

Let me emphasize an important point. We are not seeking any special privileges. We ask only to play by the rules of the trade game. Given us a level playing field and let us compete. The consumer should be the ultimate decision maker.

The purpose of the quota on U.S. television programming, it is said, is to protect the Europeans against the invasion of America's "mass popular culture." I doubt that the culture of Moliere or Goethe is really that fragile. As the French writer Patrick Wadjsman astutely observed, "France is in trouble if it is really threatened by Mickey Mouse and Donald Duck. A child's laughter has no nationality, no passport, no ideology."

In France, the most popular U.S. made television show—"Knots Landing"—competes directly with "Sebastien, C'est Fou." In Germany, "ALF" competes head-to-head with "Wetten das." In Italy, "Twin Peaks" goes up against "Festival di San Remo."

Just recently, a new French-German cultural TV network was launched called "Arte." That kind of cultural competition is just fine with us.

And if consumers all over the world dislike our products, their choice is simple. They won't turn on that channel. Or they won't go to the motion picture theater that day.

Years ago, I started my business career working with the great movie mogul Samuel Goldwyn, who was famous for his colorful sayings. When he was told about the poor attendance at his studio's latest film, he just shrugged his shoulders and said, "Listen, if they don't want to come—you can't stop them."

In my opinion, and in the opinion of many others in my country, as well as on the continent, the purpose of this television quota is not to preserve European culture, but rather to protect the local production industries—the very form of protectionism I just referred to.

Tolerating piracy is another unfair trade practice that places an enormous burden on all of us. When governments fail to crack down on piracy, they hurt us. They also hurt their own local industries and their own legitimate distributors. The theft of books, films, videocassettes, computer software and recorded music owned by U.S. companies exceeded \$4 billion last year alone—and we are still counting! As businessmen, we are offended by the sheer lack of effective safeguards against the relentless disregard of our copyrighted properties.

All of the historical trends we are talking about today have common themes. They are supposed to be about the emergence of free market economies, private ownership and the entrepreneurial spirit. In fact, they are observed more in theory than in practice.

Let us have fair trade, not just talk about it. Let us have television across all frontiers, not just within European borders. If we prize the right of the individual to travel freely, let us not blockade the free travel of ideas, information, and entertainment.

This is the time to be vigilant. It would be folly to engage in trade wars or to drift ever so dangerously into a twilight zone of subtle or not so subtle protectionist measures.

Today, we have some marvelous opportunities for progress. As enlightened businessmen, we must not waste them.

So, first, let us urge our political leaders to resolve their differences over farm subsidies and get on with a meaningful GATT

services agreement. Trade liberalization will allow us to roll back those EC television quotas and usher in new safeguards against the piracy of intellectual property.

Second, let us collaborate as partners in the research and development of the new technologies so that modern communications systems will not be fragmented. Advances such as high definition television, video compression, digital transmission and broad band delivery must be harmonized so that these systems, wherever deployed, are compatible with each other. Years ago, motion pictures were standardized in a 24 frame per second/35mm format. This opened up the windows of enjoyment for consumers across the globe.

And, third, let us vow never to return to the trade wars of the past. Consumers, not bureaucrats, should dictate choice.

What we are celebrating here, it seems to me, is the triumph of history over ideology. Communism collapsed, not because Adam Smith won the argument and Karl Marx lost. It happened because ordinary people all over the world, most of whom never heard of Adam Smith, decided that individual freedom and the right to make choices were worth fighting for.

We are truly living in Marshal McLuhan's "global village." Gone are the days when dictatorial governments could ban books, jam broadcasts, control communications and keep people in ignorance.

And if dictators could not—then neither, in our time, should democracies.

ADDRESSING THE PROBLEMS OF OUR INNER CITIES

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly recommend the following article about the Federal Government's failure to address the severe problems in our inner cities. Despite the rebellion in Los Angeles over 2 months ago, and much media attention to the deep-seated anger and frustration of inner city residents nationwide, next to nothing has happened to address the underlying economic causes of the pain.

The \$1.1 billion supplemental appropriations bill signed by President Bush replenished the Small Business Administration [SBA] and Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA] disaster funds, and spent \$500 million for 6- to 8-week summer jobs for school kids.

The urban aid package passed by the House is an experiment. No one really knows whether enterprise zones will actually encourage business relocation in inner cities. Moreover, even if it does work, it will be years before these businesses create any jobs.

The net effect is that millions of Americans are waiting to see if Washington cares. There are things we can do, that is what the attached letter outlines. I hope every Member of Congress reads it and heads its message.

THE MILTON S. EISENHOWER
FOUNDATION,

Washington, DC, July 10, 1992.

HON. MAXINE WATERS

U.S. House of Representatives, Longworth
House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN WATERS: In the wake of the Eisenhower Foundation's na-

tional policy conference on the Los Angeles riots and the inner city in Washington, D.C. on June 24, 1992, I am writing you, and other leading Members of Congress, with information about the inadequacy, in the view of our conferees, of the policy currently being negotiated between Congress and the Administration for at-risk children, youth and the inner city.

The conclusions of the Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation's national policy conference (agenda attached), which was held at the Washington, D.C. law offices of Eisenhower Trustee Harry C. McPherson, included (though were not limited to) the following:

Over the last decade, federal policy has demonstrated questionable moral values—by increasing taxes on the poor and the working and middle classes and reducing taxes on the very rich, by doubling prison cells while reducing by more than half the budget authority for low income housing, and by placing one of every four young African-American males in prison, on probation or on parole at any one time. (The ration is one-in-three in California, which often is ahead of future trends in the rest of the nation.)

The \$1.2B "short-term" emergency urban package signed into law on June 22, 1992, was a band-aid—too little, too late—after the Los Angeles riots.

The summer jobs part of the \$1.2B package will not provide inner city youth with the education and training needed for long-term employment, so that they can become productive, taxpaying citizens.

The additional, "middle-term" urban package now being negotiated in Congress and between Congress and the Administration, including enterprise zones and "weed and seed," is a "quick fix" that will not spend taxpayer money in a cost-effective way and that is not based sufficiently on scientific evaluations over the last twenty years of what really works. After the first year of this "middle-term" package as passed by the House of Representatives, there is no extra room to provide even these inadequate funds under existing spending caps.

Enterprise zones are another failure of the "trickle-down" economic of the last decade, which only has resulted in the rich getting richer and the poor (and working class) getting poorer.

Enterprise zones have been tried in most states—and scientific evaluations have shown that they do not provide many jobs for the high-risk inner city youth who need them—like the Crips and Bloods in south central Los Angeles. There is little scientific evidence to predict that federal enterprise zones will work any better.

The enterprise zone plan currently proposed is even more inadequate because it is spread over too many locations. This repeats the failure of the Model Cities Program of the 1960's to concentrate only on places of greatest need. Congress and the Administration have not learned the lessons of history, and the American taxpayer again will suffer.

Even with new provisions for less "weed," the "weed and seed" program is a gimmick that is not comprehensive—especially when it comes to replicating at a sufficient level of funding scientifically evaluated successful programs for all eligible at-risk children and youth—like Head Start for all eligible children for three years and remedial education, intensive year-long job training and job placement in the primary labor market for all eligible at-risk youth, in ways that, in part, build on the successful Job Corps program.

The first major scientific evaluation of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) shows

that it is a failure for at-risk youth under age 22—with youth in the program doing worse than “comparison” youth not in the program. JTPA needs to be reformed to function more like Job Corps-like initiatives.

Congress and the administration have not really considered what most knowledgeable observers conclude is the most logical point of departure—a preventive rather than reactive policy over many years that offers adequately funded, comprehensive “multiple solutions to multiple problems” in the inner city, and for children and youth.

Long-term, comprehensive policy must balance human investment in children and youth with economic “bubble-up” (not “trickle-down”) development of inner city housing, businesses and infrastructure.

Inner city educational reform should be based on Head Start, Jule Sugerman's Children's Investment Trust, Yale University Professor James Comer's School Development Plan, businessman Eugene Lang's “I Have a Dream,” the plan of the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, and the plan of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Between preschool for young children and Job Corps-like training and placement for young adults, the nation needs a rapid but orderly replication of scientifically evaluated grass-roots, nonprofit organization successes that mentor intermediate-age school youth, prevent their dropping out of school, and offer them extended family “sanctuaries” off the street for social support and discipline—like the Argus Community in the Bronx, the Challengers Boys and Girls Club in south central Los Angeles (where President Bush spoke), and Centro Isolina Ferre in Puerto Rico. A national non-profit Corporation for Youth Investment and Management is needed to replicate success and teach sound business management to inner city leaders.

Economic development in inner cities should “bubble-up” through direct federal grants to new, minority-owned inner city development banks, modeled in part on the South Shorebank in Chicago, and through private non-profit community development corporations (CDC's), using existing successful private non-profit national intermediary models, like the Ford Foundation's Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) and developer James Rouse's Enterprise Foundation, to continue to expand the number of CDC's to teach sound management, and to link non-profit and for-profit enterprises.

After sufficient social and economic infrastructure is “bubbled up” via federal funding to community-based, grass-roots, youth and economic development non-profit organizations—which tailor their own local solutions, are well managed and incorporate social goals as part of their bottom line—then we can expect for-profit businesses to invest more in the inner city, not before.

Europe and Japan have been more responsible, morally and economically, than the United States over the last decade in investing in children, youth and urban infrastructure.

Only the U.S. Federal Government has enough resources to generate change that will have a significant national impact and that can leverage the additional private and local public funds needed.

Long-term comprehensive policy should be financed through a number of well discussed, bi-partisan plans—like breaking down the budgetary “Berlin Wall” that now proscribes reallocating defense and foreign aid funds into domestic investment, increasing taxes

on the richest one percent (who had their taxes reduced and incomes increased by 120 percent over the 1980's) and redirecting some pension fund investments in ways that benefit our children, youth, and cities.

Present plans to repeal the luxury tax on boats, airplanes, jewelry, and furs and to provide tax breaks for for-profit real estate developers (some of whom were in part associated with the \$7B HUD scandal of the 1980's) are the wrong way to proceed.

To release the present political gridlock and counter special, monied interests which have betrayed the American democracy, we need new political leadership; grass-roots political organizing like the kind that caused Head Start funding to increase over recent years; voter registration of the disempowered; reform so our elections more closely resemble the short, inexpensive British system; and electronic media messages over the next decade by respected moral leaders, who communicate how we know what works, and how it is cheaper, more effective and more morally sound than prison building.

Apart from new leadership, the new American democratic insurgency that is needed must originate among ordinary people who more assertively question the conflict between what they are told by political public relations “spin controllers” and what they see and experience.

A number of sound, long-term plans have been proposed for children, youth and the inner city, and there is not yet a clear consensus on their cost, but the general direction points to hundreds of billions of dollars over at least a decade, not a few billion in quick fixes over a few years.

The speakers at the Eisenhower Foundation's national policy conference on June 24 included neighborhood leaders, representatives of city halls, national non-profit leaders, researchers, government officials and political leaders.

Not everyone agreed to all of the above conclusions, but there was considerable convergence.

The implication from the conference is that Congress and the Administration need to:

reconsider the “intermediate” urban package now being negotiated to more realistically base it on replicating what works, given scientific evaluations over the last twenty years;

need to downplay enterprise zones and other experiments; and

need to re-enforce sound moral values that target the truly needy—not the better off.

Enclosed is the list of speakers and other participants at the June 24 Eisenhower national policy conference and a summary of the specific ten year, \$300B policy that Trustees of the Eisenhower Foundation presented at the conference. A more detailed review of the conference recommendations will be available soon.

The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation is prepared to provide more information, should you require it.

Over the next 2 years, the foundation will organize other policy hearings on children, youth and the inner city and hold major national conferences, with associated reports, to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the 1967 Kerner Riot Commission Report and the 1968 (Milton) Eisenhower Violence Commission final report. We would like to invite you and your staff to be participants, and will write more details later.

With best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely,

LYNN A. CURTIS, Ph.D.,

President.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 192, to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. During this Congress, Members from both sides of the aisle have continually stressed the need for reform. We should all be able to agree that the time has come to make a serious commitment to improve the way in which this body operates; to begin to formulate the solutions to the problems so many of us recognize.

The joint committee established by this resolution will carry out an indepth examination of the organization and operation of both the House and the Senate and the relationship between the two bodies. It will also examine the relationship between Congress and the Executive. This will give us the opportunity to address the stumbling blocks standing in the way of making real progress on the pressing issues facing us today.

I regularly receive letters from my constituents asking me to take steps to curb congressional spending, and I would venture to say that every other Member receives similar correspondence. We have an opportunity to make an intensive study of where we may be able to make the cuts the American people are asking for. Last week, we all agreed we need to address the Federal budget deficit. Let us use this opportunity to lead from the front; to demonstrate to the American people that we have the budget discipline necessary to lead the country out of the recession that has been generated by 12 years of Republican-led fiscal mismanagement.

The recommendations made by the joint committee will also enable us to determine what changes are necessary to begin to break the legislative gridlock which has apparently set in over the past decade. We were sent here to legislate. Yet, in this year of record retirements a common complaint is that the legislative gridlock prevents us from doing our job. We have the opportunity today to take the first step toward alleviating some of the problems that have caused us all to feel this same frustration. Let us seize this opportunity and take the first step.

BAKER'S UNEARNED REPUTATION

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest gaps that exists in Washington today is between the reputation of Secretary of State Baker and the reality of his performance. On the one hand, Mr. Baker has a superb record of diverting attention from the failures for which he ought to be held responsible. There is no better example of this than

the crisis in the savings and loan industry, which grew to a flashpoint during his years as Secretary of the Treasury. One of the most glaring examples of a failure to bring administrative resources to bear that we have ever seen is Secretary Baker's essentially sidestepping any responsibility for this problem as it got worse and worse. In fact, it is to the credit of Secretary of the Treasury Nick Brady, Mr. Baker's successor, that he at least face up to this problem after 4 years of Mr. Baker's successfully dodging it.

In his current position, Secretary Baker has managed to avoid responsibility for one of the great foreign policy blunders in American history, the disastrously wrong courting of Saddam Hussein from the period after the end of the Iraq-Iran war up until the moment that he invaded Kuwait. Ambassador Glaspie has been unfairly criticized in my judgment simply for carrying out Secretary Baker's orders, and those of President Bush. And it is clear that Secretary Baker was a major force in pushing ahead in the courting of Saddam.

In addition, despite his gentlemanly image, Secretary Baker has been at the forefront of the most virulent negative tactics in American campaign history during his management of the Bush campaign in 1988. Now that he may be returning to the Bush campaign helm in 1992, heralding among other things a return to this kind of destructive negativism, I think it is appropriate for people to see Secretary Baker as he really has been. He is one of the most unvarnished partisans in our Government, and his record as Secretary of State and Secretary of the Treasury ought to get fuller scrutiny.

The Boston Globe last week published an editorial which is very much on point in this regard and I ask that this editorial be printed here.

BAKER'S UNEARNED REPUTATION

Republican notables have been telling reporters how elated they are that Secretary of State James Baker will soon be changing jobs. Citing his past performances as a political operative, they express their eagerness to see Baker bestow order, coordination and coherence on the campaign to reelect his old friend, President Bush.

But Republicans who look to Baker as a savior had better hope that he can do a better job directing the Bush campaign than he did guiding US foreign policy.

Baker's knack for winning over the press corps with his charm allowed him to skip from one blunder to another while keeping intact a reputation for sage statecraft. His record is too often at odds with that reputation.

Baker's efforts to initiate Mideast peace talks have been widely praised, but as he prepares to leave his diplomatic post he can take credit only for arranging the formal preliminaries—while much hard negotiating remains to be done.

Declassified documents and the testimony of former officials indicate that Baker and Bush willfully persisted in acting as Saddam Hussein's dupes until Iraqi tanks rolled across the Kuwaiti border. Baker pressured other Cabinet members to reverse sound decisions to deny Saddam US-guaranteed loans and technology with military applications. He refused to heed warnings about Iraq from his own specialists and from officials in other departments of the government.

After Saddam exterminated thousands of Kurdish civilians with poison gas in the vil-

lage of Halabja, Baker should not have let Bush confine the American reaction to muted, pro forma expressions of dismay. In February 1990, when Saddam gave a virulent anti-American speech at an Arab summit in Amman, Jordan, shocking and scaring even his pliant neighbor, King Hussein, Baker ought to have advised Bush to reconsider the administration's groundless policy of supporting Saddam in order to encourage his "moderation."

In the same vein, Baker blundered when he paid for Syria's participation in Desert Storm by giving Hafez Assad an American blessing for his de facto annexation of Lebanon.

Less costly but no less disguised by Baker's skill at image-making were the errors in Soviet policy during his watch. Until Mikhail Gorbachev let the satellites of Eastern Europe go their own way, Baker presided over a policy so blinded by Cold War habits that it provoked the retired Ronald Reagan to chide his successor for wasting the good will he had invested in US-Soviet relations.

Then, almost until the moment the Soviet Union imploded, Baker and Bush went on backing Gorbachev and the communist central government against the dreaded specter of "instability."

To rescue Bush's campaign from the wrath of the voters, Baker will have to do more than merely refashion his friend's image. The domestic failures of the last four years are more transparent to the voters than foreign-policy blunders.

IT'S COOL TO HAVE VALUES

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it's cool to have values. That's the message from the students at the Learning School in Mount Prospect, IL.

I rise today to commend the Learning School in Mount Prospect, IL. This school was chosen No. 1 in the Nation, from among 624 schools enrolled in the competition, by the judges of the sixth annual American set a good example contest. To win, these outstanding students designed the best projects to influence their peers to set a good example, be honest, trustworthy, and content.

The young men and women of the Learning School are models for young people and adults everywhere. They are committed to ending drug use and promoting high personal standards. They try to set good examples in the school and at home through their own conduct. They work with younger children, try to keep their word once given, are truthful and honest.

In America, there is a rising problem of youth going astray. Many young people are falling prey to the influence of drugs and delinquency. In order to restore the moral and social consciences of our children, we need strong morals to be taught in the home and more hands on groups like the Concerned Businessmen's Association of America [CBAA]. This group has been getting involved and making a difference for the last 10 years. It was the CBAA which created the set a good example program and contest. Children are

the future of this country. We must take the time to instill in them a well developed social conscience.

The CBAA is an organization of business leaders who have achieved success and want to return some of their good fortune to their communities. These men and women care about our country and its future. In an effort to improve our country's social values this group created the set a good example program and contest, a grassroots campaign created to restore common sense social values. This contest gets students active in their own grassroots campaign to help get drugs off school grounds, prevent delinquency, illiteracy, and drop outs through positive peer pressure. Since its establishment seven years ago, this contest has become one of the most effective youth programs in America. CBAA has provided books and supplemental resource materials for the nearly 6 million students participating. The goals of the CBAA and set a good example program are my goals as well, and should be the goals of all Americans. We must never forget that our country's most valuable commodity is our children.

The success of the young people at the Learning School could not have been achieved without the help of interested adults. A special thank you goes to Jacquelyn Meyers, a teacher at the Learning School, for teaching the students how to be model citizens. In addition, this program would not have been possible without the sponsorship from business in Chicago, Arlington Heights, Mount Prospect, Brookfield and surrounding areas. I would like to give special commendation to the Concerned Businessmen's Association of America and its chairperson Barbara Ayash for taking such an interest in the young people of this country.

I extend to the Learning School congratulations and my complete support. I wish you continued success.

STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I recently received an excellent letter from one of my constituents, Marsha Frizzell of Benton, KY, a student at Paducah Community College in Paducah, KY.

In her letter, Marsha voices her deep concern over the high cost of postsecondary education and the onerous financial burden placed on students from middle-income families because of their inability to qualify for financial aid.

I congratulate my colleagues on recently approving a major reform of the Higher Education Act, to rectify this terrible injustice by increasing the availability of financial aid to middle-income families. I am delighted that the President signed this measure into law yesterday.

I urge my colleagues to read Marsha Frizzell's letter. It follows in its entirety:

BENTON, KY, July 15, 1992.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUBBARD: My name is Marsha Frizzell and I am a student at Paducah

cah Community College. In the summer of 1990 I became employed at Druthers in Calvert City, KY, presently Dairy Queen. As I started out, I didn't work too many hours. As time progressed, I graduated from high school and went on to college immediately that summer.

During my first year of college I was involved in the Vocational Rehabilitation program with Connie Talent at Murray State University. During this first semester of college everything was taken care of sufficiently. At the end of the second semester, I was notified that tuition was going to be the only thing Rehabilitation would take care of. At this time I had a Pell Grant that would take care of the rest of my school expenses.

I recently left Dairy Queen to work for Franklin College in Paducah as a secretary. I still planned to go to school at night to further my education. By working a full forty-hour week my Rehabilitation was dropped. I still had my Pell Grant to use for schooling. My Pell Grant was turned down because I worked too many hours at Dairy Queen the year before. This raised the household income to slightly over twenty thousand a year.

My father is employed for Pip Johnson Construction Company and will be retiring within the next two weeks. Pip Johnson Construction Company is closing down. He will not receive social security for another ten months after retirement until he turns 62 next May. My parents have raised five children on what he has made alone.

Acceptance of a Pell Grant should not be based upon income of the household. A household making a little over twenty thousand a year and who owns their own home, still has expenses which they are responsible. With the cost of living the way it is today, and the benefits that are available, you're better off either dirt poor or pregnant. It seems that they are the ones who qualify for grants and the only ones who receive them.

Congress has messed up this whole system. Pell Grant is supposed to be raised to \$3600.00 in the upcoming year. A question I have for you is, "Where is the money going to come from?" People don't have the money to raise taxes. If minimum wage is raised, the only thing that will come from that is the cost of living goes up and businesses fail. The U.S. is in debt enough already. Congress should worry about what is important to the people and what there needs are to live, rather than what is unimportant and not necessary for life.

I am currently enrolled in summer classes at Paducah Community College. Mr. Hubbard, school is too expensive to go for a couple of years and then never finish. Now, I think of going to school as time, energy, dreams, and money wasted. It's a shame when someone who wants to make it in life has a downfall like this.

Sincerely,

MARSHA FRIZZELL.

**ARMS CONTROL THAT BUILDS
LASTING PEACE**

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the United States joined free nations around the world in relishing the collapse of communism and totali-

tarism in the Soviet Union last year. Indeed, the future holds great hope for peaceful and mutually beneficial relations between our country and each of the former Soviet Republics. At this time, however, many security concerns remain regarding the former Soviet nuclear arsenal, and in the long run these issues could pose the most serious threat to lasting peace. Frank J. Gaffney, Jr. wrote an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal on June 26, 1992, which warns about the need to address these concerns. Mr. Gaffney asserts our need to incorporate provisions in the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty [START] to resolve these issues before the agreement is ratified by the Senate. I commend Mr. Gaffney's article to my colleagues' attention and urge them to read and consider his arguments.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 26, 1992]

AMEND START FIRST, RATIFY LATER

(By Frank J. Gaffney, Jr.)

The Senate faces a historic challenge. It is being asked by the Bush administration to give its "advice and consent" swiftly to a strategic arms reduction agreement (known as START) that is, in important respects, seriously flawed. Ironically, in the "joint understanding" on nuclear arms reductions initiated last week by Presidents Bush and Yeltsin, the White House implicitly acknowledged some of START's shortcomings. The Senate would do itself and the nation a favor by postponing action on this treaty unless and until it can be significantly reworked.

The joint understanding, in effect, amends the START treaty by roughly halving the number of strategic nuclear warheads each side is nominally to have. More important, it also eliminates the right the former Soviet Union was accorded under START to field and modernize 154 of its dreaded SS-18 heavy intercontinental ballistic missiles and hundreds of other threatening multiple-warhead ICBMs.

The missile force Moscow could retain under the unamended START treaty—but not under the accord as modified last week—would leave Russia with the ability to execute a fearsome pre-emptive strike against the U.S. The threat that such an attack might actually be launched has receded for the moment, thanks to the collapse of Soviet totalitarianism and the policies adopted by democratic successors led by Boris Yeltsin. But until the former Soviet Union's first-strike weaponry is actually dismantled, that threat could quickly re-emerge.

Unfortunately, recent developments in the old Soviet empire have underscored the dangers of confusing permanent changes with ones that can be rapidly reversed. The renewed assertiveness of imperialist elements—evident in the increasingly belligerent rhetoric of, among others, the new Russian defense minister, Gen. Pavel Grachev—is seen in Russia's involvement in an escalating conflict in Moldova.

Other bloody crises may be in the making as Moscow "assists" ethnic Russians or Slavs elsewhere. The ascendancy in the Yeltsin cabinet of leading figures from the Soviet military-industrial complex, moreover, augurs ill for the domestic transformation so urgently needed—to say nothing of the prospects for a permanent, peaceable realignment of Moscow's foreign relations.

Under these circumstances, it behooves the Senate to use its unique status under the

Constitution—that of a partner with the executive branch in treaty making—to effect two changes in the Bush administration's approach to START:

First, the Senate should insist that the administration abandon its current two-track strategy: prompt ratification of the present treaty and then separate action on the amendments entailed in the Joint Understanding in the form of a "START II treaty." Instead, President Bush should be directed to present as quickly as possible the fleshed-out agreements outlined in that understanding as a protocol to START—an integral part of the original treaty that would be considered simultaneously by the Senate. In this manner, the danger would be reduced that we will be stuck with a strategic arms reduction treaty bereft of changes that even the administration agrees (at least implicitly) are needed.

Whereas effort to fix a crucial defect in START by linking its ratification to the elimination of all SS-18s might once have been resisted on the ground that it would be a deal-breaking "killer amendment," that argument no longer applies. Today, this defect can be fixed merely by formally incorporating in the treaty, before it is ratified, the Russians' expressed commitment to disperse with their SS-18s.

While we are at it, the negotiations on such a protocol should readdress other problems with the START treaty. Most of these problems, like START's grandfathering" of 154 SS-18s, were incorporated when the Bush administration acquiesced to Mikhail Gorbachev's intransigence. If the starkly contrasting spirit of cooperation and flexibility that Mr. Yeltsin seemed to exhibit in Washington is real, we should be able to correct such other serious—but as yet unaddressed—deficiencies as:

Moscow's right to deploy hundreds of mobile ICBMs—systems designed to defeat U.S. monitoring and verification.

The latitude Russia will enjoy to retain every single missile and warhead taken offline to meet reduction requirements. If such systems are not destroyed, they could be used to field a significant covert offensive force.

Limitations on verification activities that preclude the continuous U.S. monitoring of former Soviet missile production facilities, the "tagging" of missiles to assist in distinguishing between legal and illegal ones, and the freedom to inspect all sites suspected of concealing proscribed activities or systems.

Delaying START's ratification would also give the signatories a chance to clear up seemingly conflicting commitments made by Russia and the other three Soviet successor states now parties to START (Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan). As it stands now, Russia may delay ratification of the treaty until the latter give up all nuclear weapons deployed on their territories and conform to the Non-Proliferation Treaty—something that may not happen anytime soon.

Second, the Senate should encourage the executive branch to engage in some new thinking about arms control. Specifically, the Bush administration should be urged to concentrate less on the symptomatic treatment of the residual Soviet threat (traditional arms control) and more on systemic therapies (approaches that address its underlying cause). After all, only when a genuinely democratic political system and a free-market economic system have fully displaced the persisting institutions of empire and militarism can fears of renaissance danger from the former U.S.S.R. be allayed.

In this regard, the Senate may want to urge the Bush administration to propose a deal: The U.S. will help in securing generous, multiyear relief of the \$80 billion-plus in international debt that was the crushing legacy of Soviet misrule once START's shortcomings have been formally fixed and the amended treaty ratified.

By these two initiatives, the Senate could help transform the START treaty from a major liability into a useful instrument for constructive change in the former Soviet Union and for stable, peaceful relations between the U.S.S.R.'s successor states and the U.S. advice and consent to anything less would be an abdication of the Senate's constitutional role and a disservice to the nation's strategic interests.

(Mr. Gaffney, a senior arms-control official in the Reagan Defense Department, now directs the Center for Security Policy in Washington.)

TRIBUTE TO SARAH BREMER

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege to submit an essay written by a young constituent, Sarah Bremer, that won first place for the State of Hawaii in the National Peace Essay Contest sponsored by the U.S. Institute of Peace. As a State winner she received a \$500 scholarship and competed in a special awards program in Washington, DC, where I had an opportunity to meet this talented young woman.

Sarah's award-winning essay, "From Wars to Words: The Possibility for Peaceful Negotiation in the 21st Century," is an impressive critique of United States foreign policy, demonstrating insight into the complexities of the Cuban missile crisis and the Persian Gulf war. She eloquently stresses the need to rethink America's role in the post-cold war world.

It is so inspiring to see a young person articulate with such clarity and conviction her views on U.S. foreign policy and the larger goal of world peace. Sarah feels, as do I, that we should continue to promote academic and cultural exchanges between the United States and other countries through organizations such as the U.S. Institute of Peace, in order to achieve better understanding and mutual respect.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting Sarah's essay with these remarks so that all Americans may be encouraged to rise to the challenge of securing a more peaceful future for our world:

FROM WARS TO WORDS: THE POSSIBILITIES FOR PEACEFUL NEGOTIATION IN THE 21ST CENTURY

For nearly half of the twentieth century, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.'s battle for world dominance steered the course of American foreign policy. Their precarious power balancing act stocked arsenals capable of destroying the world several times over. The disintegration of the Soviet empire left the weapon-laden U.S. without a counterbalancing military force.

The Persian Gulf War revealed the imbalance of power the arms race had created between the U.S. and other nations. Whereas 305 American and 244 allied troops died in the conflict, Iraqi deaths totaled approximately

230,000, about half of them civilian.¹ An estimated 90,000 tons of bombs dropped by American and Allied forces on Iraq and Kuwait destroyed civilian hospitals, sewage and power plants, markets, and water supplies.² This carnage created in just 47 days demonstrated that the current U.S. military is simply too strong to launch an offensive attack without violating the codes of morality and justice on which our country runs.

In resolving international conflict, the U.S. should instead take the route established in the Cuban Missile Crisis: the lowest level of defensive military action possible combined with high-level diplomacy. Complemented by a pro-active agenda for peace which uses the opportunities sprouting from the thaw of the cold war to their full advantage, this approach provides a means of international negotiation which maximizes respect and understanding while minimizing bloodshed.

When Iraq invaded Kuwait on August 2, 1990, America and the Soviet Union became allies for the first time since the end of World War II. Their cooperation unified the UN Security Council, providing an unprecedented opportunity to use non-military pressure to induce Iraqi President Saddam Hussein to withdraw his troops from Kuwait.

Though he supported UN resolutions to use economic sanctions and diplomatic pressure against Iraq, U.S. President George Bush remained in the Cold War mindset which viewed military power as omnipotent. Immediately after the invasion he deployed American troops to the Saudi Arabian border. During the next several months of Iraqi occupation of Kuwait, Bush increased the troops to 430,000. He pushed the November 29, 1990 passage of Resolution 678 authorizing the use "all necessary means" to force Iraqi observance of UN resolutions after January 15, 1991.³

When the deadline arrived, diplomatic relations with Iraq had barely begun and analysts predicted that another 3-9 months of sanctions would debilitate Iraqi military forces.⁴ Nonetheless, Bush, with "an underlying belief that war might be the wise option," launched attack on Iraq.⁵

In October of 1962, the U.S. discovered that the Soviet Union was positioning offensive ballistic missiles and other weapons in Cuba, 90 miles off the coast of Florida. The U.S. had to take action to preserve U.S. security and restore the balance of power in the Soviet-American arms race.

A military attack on Cuba could have produced a civilian massacre like that of the Gulf War and risked provoking a Soviet retaliation on Turkey. An air strike would have to be "massive" and could still not guarantee complete destruction of the missiles.⁶ Against the judgments of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who unanimously supported military attack as the only alternative strong enough to be effective, President Kennedy decided that an attack risked too much without ensuring positive results and chose instead to instigate a naval blockade, the lowest level of defense available, around Cuba.⁷

In carrying out the blockade, Kennedy made sure "never to put [Soviet Chairman Nikita Khrushchev] in a corner from which he [could] not escape." To avoid antagonizing the Soviets and spurring a hasty reaction, Kennedy chose not to board the Soviet tanker *Bucharest* and instead let it pass through the quarantine line after it identified itself. Kennedy instead selected the *Marcula* as the

first ship to board because, as an American-made, Lebanese-owned ship under charter to the Soviets, a search would not constitute a personal affront as would a search of the Soviet-owned *Bucharest*.⁸

In offering a settlement to Khrushchev, Kennedy explicitly stated his concessions to the Soviet Union: upon the removal of all weapon systems from Cuba, the U.S. would immediately lift the blockade and would ensure that Cuba would not be invaded.⁹ Had Bush followed such a careful, conciliatory procedure in the Gulf Crisis diplomacy, the outbreak into war could possibly have been prevented. As it was, Bush faced Hussein with a firm "no compromise" stance.¹⁰ He offered Hussein no possible way to withdraw from Kuwait gracefully. Even token conciliations similar to those Kennedy lined out for Khrushchev, such as a timetable for stopping economic sanctions with Iraqi withdrawal, an agreement to replace Iraqi troops in Kuwait with a peace-keeping force, or allowing Hussein to present his grievances to the world court, may have softened Hussein's position.¹¹

Because Bush and Hussein approached each other on different cultural planes and neither understood the other's position, they could not converge on a solution. By increasing the power of the U.S. Institute of Peace, the U.S. could instigate a program of cultural and peace education which would improve diplomacy's future effectiveness. To provide students with an awareness of the contributions of non-Western societies, America should establish a high-school graduation requirement of at least one year of non-Western history. An increase in government international exchange programs and colloquiums would also break down the prejudices barring the achievement of peace.

During the Cuban Missile Crisis, Kennedy had the legal and moral backing of western hemisphere coalitions. An OAS charter confirmed the legality of the quarantine, and NATO and OAS support for U.S. actions strengthened the blockade's influence.¹² The U.S. did not, however, have any support from the WARSAW pact countries nor from any other nations under the Soviet domain.

In contrast, opposition to the Iraqi invasion was backed by the strongest UN in history. Since the UN's inception, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. had used their powers as Security Council members to veto each other's resolutions and held the organization static. With the U.S. and the Soviet Union as allies, the UN provided a strong international coalition to influence Iraq.

Without such a unifying force, economic sanctions would probably have followed in the footsteps of the embargo against Cuba in 1960. Though in pre-Castro years the U.S. and Latin America supplied 80 percent of Cuba's imports and bought 65 percent of its exports, the U.S.'s 1960 embargo against Cuba had very little effect. The Socialist bloc simply replaced the U.S. as a trading partner, providing 80 percent of Cuban imports and consuming 82 percent of Cuban exports by 1966.¹³

Less than a week after the invasion of Kuwait, the U.N. established compulsory international economic sanctions against Iraq which blocked 97 percent of the country's exports and over 90 percent of its imports.¹⁴ Iraq's GNP was cut in half, "an amount 20 times greater than the average impact of history's most successful sanctions."¹⁵ As an embargo of this magnitude and scale was unprecedented in modern history, analysts disagreed about the time required for the sanctions to take effect. Retired Admiral William Crowe, Jr., ex-chairman of the Joint

Footnotes at end of article.

Chiefs of Staff, spoke the thoughts of many when he asserted that sanctions would ultimately "bring [Saddam Hussein] to his knees" and that waiting for embargoes to work instead of hastily waging war would "be more than worth it."¹⁶

To further strengthen the United Nations influence as a peacekeeping force, we must disentangle it from the Cold War mentality which excluded the vanquished nationalities of Japan and Germany from the Security Council. The roles which these two countries play in today's political and economic arenas make them essential to comprehensive and just solution to global conflicts.

As America leaves the Cold War era to enter the twenty-first century, we have the opportunity to steer towards reasoned and fair conflict resolution. The replacement of military confrontation with peaceful negotiation provides a firm foundation on which to build a stable world community.

FOOTNOTES

¹"The Ones that Got Away," Newsweek, January 26, 1992: 18.

²Eric Hoskins, "Pity the Children of Iraq," Middle East International January 24 (1992): 16-17.

³Daniel C. Diller, ed., "The Middle East," 7th ed. (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1991) 320-322.

⁴George J. Mitchell, "Should the Congress Authorize the Use of Military Force Against Iraq?" Congressional Digest 70 (1990): 79.

⁵Diller, 329.

⁶Graham T. Allison, "Essence of Decision: Explaining The Cuban Missile Crisis" (Little, Brown, & Co., 1971) 209.

⁷Robert Kennedy, "Thirteen Days" (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1969) 36.

⁸Kennedy, 103.

⁹Charles Lane, "Saddam's Endgame," Newsweek January 7, 1991: 14-18.

¹⁰Steven V. Roberts, "Bush in the Bazaar," U.S. News & World Report December 24, 1990: 24-27.

¹¹Kennedy, 51 and 96.

¹²Donald L. Losman, "International Economic Sanctions: The Case of Cuba, Israel, and Rhodesia" (Albuquerque: U. of New Mexico P., 1979) 22-24.

¹³George Bush, "The President's Letter to Congressional Leaders," Congressional Digest 70 (1990): 69.

¹⁴Richard A. Gephart, "Should the Congress Authorize the Use of Military Force against Iraq?" Congressional Digest 70 (1991): 89.

¹⁵"Even the War Experts Disagree," Newsweek December 10, 1990: 32.

WORKS CITED

Allison, Graham T. "Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis." Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1971.

Bush, George, "The President's Letter to Congressional Leaders," Congressional Digest 70 (1990): 69.

Diller, Daniel C., ed. "The Middle East," 7th ed. Washington, D. C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1991.

"Even the War Experts Disagree," Newsweek December 10, 1990: 32.

Gephart, Richard A. "Should the Congress Authorize the Use of Military Force Against Iraq?" Congressional Digest 70 (1990): 87-91.

Hoskins, Eric. "Pity the Children of Iraq," Middle East International January 24, 1992: 16-17.

Kennedy, Robert. "Thirteen Days." New York: W. W. Norton & Co. Inc., 1969.

Lane, Charles. "Saddam's Endgame," Newsweek January 7, 1991: 14-18.

Losman, Donald L. "International Economic Sanctions: The Cases of Cuba, Israel, and Rhodesia." Albuquerque: U. of New Mexico P., 1979.

Mitchell, George J. "Should the Congress Authorize the Use of Military Force Against Iraq?" Congressional Digest 70 (1990): 75-7.

Roberts, Steven V. "Bush in the Bazaar," U.S. News & World Report December 24, 1990: 24-27.

"The Ones that Got Away," Newsweek January 26, 1992: 18.

MAYOR BLACKWELL RECOGNIZED FOR DEDICATION

HON. MIKE ESPY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give tribute to Unita Blackwell, the mayor of Mayersville, MS, for being a recent recipient of the MacArthur Fellowship. The honor was awarded to Mayor Blackwell for her unselfish dedication to community service and civil rights. She is a true career public servant. She is a small town leader with ideas and energy big enough to improve the world.

As the first African-American woman mayor in Mississippi, Ms. Blackwell has helped build bridges between the races and promote understanding. Since 1976 as mayor of this small delta town, she has brought water and sewer services and housing to the impoverished. In announcing her fellowship, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation noted that even while working to improve her community, Mayor Blackwell continued her own development by earning a master's degree in regional planning.

Mayersville and all of Mississippi are proud of the accomplishments, work and dedication of Mayor Blackwell. She is a mentor for many and an inspiration for all. She has proven that one person can make a difference.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate America's observance of Captive Nations Week.

During the past few years, the world has seen unprecedented ideological and political changes across the European and Asian landscapes. Totalitarian governments and empires have collapsed, igniting the sparks of democracy and freedom. However, despite these immense strides of political and ideological progress, the world has not yet been completely purged of the evils of totalitarian dictatorship. As stated in the proclamation below, the people of fourteen nations of the world still remain under the manipulative bureaucracies of Communist dictatorships.

As Americans, who ardently espouse and cherish those exact freedoms being withheld from these nations' citizens, it is imperative that we, as a nation, continue to strive for their realization of democracy.

It is in this spirit of patriotism, democracy, and responsibility that States and cities across America declare the week of July 19-25, 1992, to be Captive Nations Week and issue the following Captive Nations Proclamation.

Whereas, the dramatic changes in Central Europe, within the former Soviet Union, Central Asia, Africa and Central America have fully vindicated the conceptual framework of the Captive Nations Week Resolution, which the United States Congress

passed in 1959 and President Eisenhower signed into law as Public Law 86-90; and

Whereas, the resolution of 1959 demonstrated the foresight of the U.S. Congress and has consistently been, through official and private media, a basic source of inspiration, hope and confidence to all the captive nations; and

Whereas, the recent liberation of many captive nations is great cause for jubilation, it is vitally important to bear in mind that numerous other captive nations are under Communist dictatorship and the residual structure of Soviet Russian imperialism still exists among others: Cuba, Mainland China, North Korea, Tibet, North Caucasus, Cossackis, Idel-Ural (Tartarstan) and the Far Eastern Republic (Siberyaks); and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the remaining captive nations (over 1 billion) look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence from Communist dictatorship and imperial rule; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90, establishing the third week in July each year as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such a week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their great sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of the still remaining captive peoples.

Now, therefore, The cities and states listed below, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 19, 1992 be observed as "Captive Nations Week" and call upon their citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of the remaining captive nations.

As of today proclamations have been issued by the States of Alabama, Arkansas, California, Idaho, Iowa, Kentucky, Montana, New York, Nebraska, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and West Virginia.

Proclamations have also been issued by the cities of Akron, OH; Albany, NY; Argyle, NY; Buffalo, NY; Clearwater, FL; Dayton, OH; Elizabeth, NJ; Erie, PA; Fairfax, VA; Fremont, CA; Glens Falls, NY; Greenwich, NY; Honolulu, HI; Hudson, NY; Independence, MO; Jackson, MS; Jacksonville, FL; Mechanicville, NY; Mesa, AZ; Modesto, CA; Nashville, TN; Pittsburgh, PA; Portsmouth, VA; Providence, RI; Riverside, CA; Salt Lake City, UT; Santa Rosa, CA; Shreveport, LA; Sunnyvale, CA; Tampa, FL; Washington, DC; and Waterford, NY.

RESTORING MFN TO ROMANIA

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on June 22, 1992, President Bush submitted the United States-Romanian trade agreement to Congress. Once ratified, this agreement will restore the coveted most favored nation [MFN] trade status to Romania—status that former dictator Nicolae Ceausescu renounced in 1988, rather than face congressional criticism of his regime's appalling record on human rights.

I look forward to supporting this trade agreement, correctly perceived as a symbol of United States commitment to democratic and market reform in Romania. But congressional approval of the agreement may be premature if it comes before Romania holds its general elections, now scheduled for September 27.

Shortly after the bloody events of December 1989 that ousted Ceausescu from power, the National Salvation front [NSF] that has assumed control in Romania reversed Ceausescu's renunciation of MFN. Many Romanian officials believed that the United States would immediately respond. Instead, the United States wisely chose to withhold the legitimization MFN status would provide until the new Romanian authorities had demonstrated their commitment to democracy. Free and fair elections were flagged as a cornerstone of that commitment.

Unfortunately, the May 1990 elections that swept the NSF to power were preceded by a lopsided campaign of harassment, intimidation, and media monopolization. One month later, the world recoiled in horror as President Ion Iliescu warmly thanked the miners who rampaged through Bucharest, bludgeoning anti-Communist demonstrators in University Square and ransacking opposition party headquarters. The Romanian leadership's democratic intentions were immediately thrust into doubt. The 2 years since then have seen the thorny struggle of the Romanian authorities to restore the confidence and trust of the people of Romania and the international community at large.

Despite severe economic dislocation, pernicious inter-ethnic tensions, and a debilitating legacy of social atomization and mistrust, real progress has undeniably been made. Prime Minister Theodor Stolojan and his caretaker government—formed in September 1991 following the miners' fourth assault on Bucharest, which forced the ouster of his predecessor Petre Roman—have overseen the adoption of a new constitution, the continuation of economic reforms, and the holding of free and fair elections at the local level in February 1992.

The local elections were particularly significant, not only for their procedural improvements relative to the elections of May 1990, but also because they demonstrated a major shift in the political inclinations of the Romanian voters. The Democratic Convention, an opposition alliance, won the mayorships of many important urban centers, including the capital Bucharest. The National Salvation Front, in contrast, saw its support decline dramatically—from 66 to 33 percent of the vote.

Yet developments since then have been less than encouraging. The date for Romania's general elections, originally targeted for May, was repeatedly postponed. Furthermore, the parliament passed electoral legislation purporting to restrict the role of domestic observers, contravening the spirit of Romania's CSCE commitments. And certain aspects of the electoral law seem to have been designed to inhibit the strength of the opposition.

MFN remains a powerful symbol of legitimization. In seeking to attain that symbol, all political forces in Romania should work to ensure that the September 27 elections are truly free and fair. The Romanian authorities

are well aware that free and fair elections have been a critical component of our policy on restoring MFN. The preparation and administration of the September 27 elections will be an important indicator of the Romanian authorities' commitment to democratic institutions.

MAZIE MONIQUE BOND NAMED SPECIAL POSTER CHILD

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mazie Monique Bond of Salt Lake City, UT, who has been selected as the national special poster child by the Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the World, Department of Special People.

For the next year, Mazie will utilize her own gifts and talents to demonstrate to our Nation that there are millions of special people of the world—persons who, because of physical or mental challenges, have very special needs. Mazie will spend the year encouraging others to assist, provide for, and improve the quality of life of all special persons.

I also want to commend the department of special people of the IBPOE of W for their outstanding work on behalf of people with special needs. Through their efforts, the attention of our country will focus on the needs of special people and what all of us can do to assist special people in achieving their own unlimited potential.

I salute the IBPOE of W for their contributions to the health and welfare of our Nation and I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives and the Senate, and the President of the United States, to join me in designating August 3, 1992, as "National Special People Day."

CLARIFICATION OF TERMINOLOGY

HON. AL SWIFT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we debated at length the propriety of releasing raw and unprocessed transcripts of interviews made by the Task Force on the Post Office. I noted then that all of the information the task force possesses, including those transcripts, are available to the House Ethics Committee and the Justice Department who are charged, respectively, with enforcing the House rules and the laws of this Nation.

In that regard I referred to busybodies. The context makes clear what I meant, but lest there be the slightest doubt, I would note that when I used the word I meant and should have specified I was talking about "legislative" busybodies.

There are those in our body who are never satisfied with the work of anyone else—even when there is equal partisan representation, even when there is equal access to all infor-

mation by both sides of the aisle, and even if both parties can and did put everything they wanted into the task force report.

There are always those Members who can never be satisfied. It was to them that I referred.

THE MINERAL LEASES SHARE TO THE STATES

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Committee, in seeking additional Federal revenues to pay for our spending measures, must use some reasonable restraint. In the case of the committee's provision that changes the share of mineral lease revenues to be shared with the States, it has not used proper restraint, and that is why I object to this part of this bill.

Both the Mineral Leasing Act and the long-standing implementation of that act provide for States and Federal agencies to split the revenue collected on Federal mineral leases. That policy has been observed for many years, and the law specifically prohibits the Federal agencies from taking their administrative costs out of the revenue before sharing the income with the States. The committee bill alters that practice without any consideration by the authorizing committees for such a change in policy.

This is essentially Federal revenue sharing in reverse. The bill arbitrarily requires States to give part of their share to the Federal Government. It is particularly disturbing that the bill requires the States to provide part of their share of revenue to help pay for a bloated, inefficient minerals management bureaucracy that the States have no role in controlling or reforming.

This provision of the bill takes \$75 million from State treasuries, an amount they can sorely afford to give up, and does it without consultation with the States and a chance for the States to be heard.

LOCAL YOUTHS WIN STATE BOWLING CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend five Chichester High School students for their performance in the Young American Bowling Alliance's [YABA] Pennsylvania Bowling Tournament in Altoona. These five young men, Fred Bartholf, Kevin Bartholf, Steve Green, Lenny Katerynczuk, and Brian McMullen, captured first place in the statewide tournament.

The success of these students in the tournament involving 2,500 teams is very impressive. Their hard work and team spirit brought recognition to their local communities of Marcus Hook and Boothwyn by winning them the title of YABA 1992 Pennsylvania State

Champions. I commend the effort and determination of these young gentlemen which led to their victory.

In a time when so much of our attention is focused on the negative, it gives me great pleasure to be able to single out these young men for their positive accomplishments. The residents of these two towns and I are proud of the manner in which these students represented us in this State competition. I congratulate them on their success.

TRIBUTE TO PHOENIX HOME LIFE
MUTUAL INSURANCE CO.

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, since its founding in Hartford, CT, in 1851, Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Co. has been a vital and visible part of the Greater Hartford community.

Located since the 1960's in its unique, two-sided headquarters building on Constitution Plaza in downtown Hartford, The Phoenix today merges with Home Life Insurance Co. to form Phoenix Home Life Mutual Insurance Co., the 12th largest mutual life insurance company in the Nation.

During its long history in Hartford, The Phoenix has contributed to the economic growth of the region as an employer and it has contributed to the area's overall well-being as a fine corporate citizen. The Phoenix has contributed both financial resources and the talents of its employees to programs in such vital areas as health, housing, and education, programs that have a direct impact on the residents of the community.

Now, as a merged company, Phoenix Home Life has pledged to build on this fine tradition. It will maintain its corporate offices in Hartford and continue to contribute to the region's economy as a major employer. And it has committed itself to continue its corporate social responsibility program, which has established a fine record of contributing to programs that can be demonstrated to help the community. The Greater Hartford community is pleased that Phoenix Home Life will continue its traditions there.

OCCUPATION OF CYPRUS MUST BE
TERMINATED

HON. THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, 18 years ago, thousands of Turkish troops invaded the Republic of Cyprus. Today, approximately 35,000 Turkish troops still remain in Cyprus.

This illegal seizure and occupation has been discouraged by this body and the United Nations since the beginning. The United States must help the United Nations and NATO resolve regional disputes, such as this one, that have long been overshadowed by the Soviet

threat. Although Turkey has been an important friend in the Middle East region, we should not allow our ties to influence our actions. We have a responsibility to the world community to work for peace, and to end aggression. Above all, we must continue to help enforce a standard of international law as we have for decades.

Most recently in Kuwait, the United States led an international coalition against the invaders from Iraq in an effort to show the world that aggression and violations of international law would not be tolerated. We must carry on our campaign against violations of international law in every area of the world.

We must not condone violations by any country, even our allies. The Turkish occupation of Cyprus has been responsible for countless human rights abuses and years of oppression. The Greek-Cypriots have suffered long enough, the time has come to end this conflict. I understand that Turkey has been an important ally of the United States for many years, but we can not allow this fact to stand in the way of action.

The occupation of Cyprus must be terminated as expeditiously and as easily as possible. We must be prepared to take action against Turkey so that this matter is resolved. In the past we have continued to give them aid while attempting to negotiate a fair settlement. This has had little success to date. The time may have come for the United States to consider stronger actions to induce a settlement.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that this is an extremely important matter, and I hope that any action taken by this Congress should be in the name of democracy. We must strive toward the ultimate goal of sovereignty for the Republic of Cyprus, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the restoration of a true democratic government in Cyprus.

COMMEMORATING THE 33D OB-
SERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS
WEEK

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, for 33 years Captive Nations Week has served to remind Americans of the continuing ordeal of those living in nations that have lost their independence to communist aggression. The world has changed dramatically since 1959 when President Eisenhower designated the third week in July as a time to reach out to the nations of the world that do not enjoy the freedom so cherished in America. In 1992, there are far fewer people held captive by oppressive governments, yet the specter of communism has not yet been eradicated. Still well over 1 billion people are not free to express their opinion or to pursue their dreams. Among others, the people of Cuba, mainland China, North Korea, Tibet, North Caucasus—Chechen, Ingush—Cossackia, Idel-Ural—Tartarstan—and the Far Eastern Republic—Siberyaks—remain captive.

Throughout the long course of human history, freedom has been on the defense. How-

ever, through the triumphant aftermath of Ronald Reagan's tenure as President, freedom and liberty are now on the offensive and the United States must continue to take an active role in fostering world freedom and ending totalitarianism.

As Captive Nations Week comes to a close let us continue to keep in mind the over 1 billion people who still suffer under oppressive rule. Although the world has seen the end of the cold war and has made great strides toward eliminating communism from the face of the Earth, the list of captive nations remains extensive. Therefore it is imperative that we continue our struggle for universal self-determination as the world moves into the 21st century.

THE ESCAPE OF DRUG BARON
PABLO ESCOBAR

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1992

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1991 the world's most infamous drug trafficker surrendered to Government officials in Colombia. Pablo Escobar, the leader of the world's largest illicit narcotics trafficking organization—the Medellin Cartel—surrendered on conditions that would make any fugitive rush to surrender. One year later, he has escaped from his ranch house prison, which he himself had designed and tunneled.

Mr. Speaker, last year, we were outraged when we heard the news that Escobar would be spending his time in a luxury prison near his home. Furthermore, the fact that Escobar continued his deadly drug operations unabated from his prison cell was a betrayal of the Colombian Government and of all those who have lost their lives at the hands of this one man.

Evidence points to Pablo Escobar for single-handedly ordering the assassination of innumerable judges, newspaper editors, security officials and politicians. He is also largely responsible for the misery of drug abuse throughout our Nation's cities, towns and villages. Escobar's cartel is the source of much of the drug-related violence that occurs all over the world—from the small towns in middle America, to the streets of London, Paris, and Tokyo, to Medellin, Colombia.

In order to curtail this drug baron's conduct of worldwide business from his prison cell, it was encouraging to note President Gaviria's decision to move Escobar to a maximum security prison. Unfortunately, as we now know, Escobar and his lieutenants, learning of the plan to move him, overpowered their guards, took hostages, and eventually escaped under the noses of 400 commandos. It is now incumbent upon the Colombian Government not only to fully investigate this operation, as it appears, that Escobar had help in his escape, but also to conduct an extensive manhunt for the escapees.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to treat this man as the criminal that he really is, a ruthless, murderous criminal who broke his agreement with the Colombian Government from day one. I

