

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS FLOW CONTROL

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last week, the National Governors' Association passed an important resolution in support of congressional restoration of flow control authority to State and local governments.

When the Supreme Court rejected such authority in its May 1994 decision in *Carbone versus Clarkstown*, New York, it struck a devastating blow to the financial stability of thousands of communities nationwide. Justice Sandra Day O'Connor reminded Congress of its part in developing these circumstances. You see, although Congress had implied that States and localities had the authority to use flow control; Congress had never granted the authority explicitly. We now have not only the opportunity, but the responsibility to finish what we started.

It is imperative that we do so with all due speed because communities nationwide have amassed an outstanding debt of more than \$10 billion purely by meeting its traditional responsibilities of picking up the trash.

Congress held hearings and markups and debates on this issue throughout 1994. The divergent interests of local governments, the private sector waste companies, and Wall Street came together through months of intense negotiations. The product of these efforts was a compromise proposal which passed the House by unanimous consent on October 7, and nearly passed through the Senate before it adjourned the next day.

On January 4, I reintroduced this exact text as the Community Solvency Act (H.R. 24) with a bipartisan group of cosponsors. I encourage my colleagues to read the persuasive and well-reasoned arguments of the Governors' resolution and to join them in their fight to meet the public health and safety needs of our constituents in a cost-effective and environmentally sound way. In short, I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 24.

NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION
RESOLUTION

3.4.1 Each State, Alone or in Cooperation with Other States, Should Manage the Waste Produced Within Its Borders in an Environmentally Sound Manner. This goal requires states to take responsibility for the treatment and disposal of solid waste created within their borders to eventually eliminate the transportation of unwanted waste sent over state lines for treatment or disposal.

It should be the national policy for each state to promote self-sufficiency in the management of solid waste. States should be allowed to use reasonable methods to achieve their goal of self-sufficiency, including the use of waste flow control. Self-sufficiency is

a reliable, cost-effective, long-term path and generally reflects the principle that the citizens ultimately are responsible for the wastes they create.

As states phase in programs to ensure self-sufficiency, Congress should require the federal government to pursue aggressively packaging and product composition initiatives and to identify and foster creation of markets for recyclable or recycled goods. Federal assistance in these waste reduction endeavors is critical to developing national waste reduction and recycling programs to achieve self-sufficiency.

Similarly, the federal government must mandate national minimum performance standards for municipal solid waste disposal facilities. Otherwise, some states may resolve capacity crises brought about by export limitations by keeping open landfills that otherwise should be closed. Also, the lack of minimum standards may encourage exports, because it might be cheaper, even taking into consideration transportation costs, for a community in a state with stringent regulations to ship to nearby states that do not have the same requirements.

The development of solid waste management plans should be the primary responsibility of the states and local governments, and the Governors urge EPA to assist states in the development of comprehensive and integrated planning and regulatory programs through financial and technical assistance. Such plans should include a ten-year planning horizon and should be updated at least every five years. These plans should include a description of the following:

The waste management hierarchy that maximizes cost-effective source reduction, reuse, and recycling of materials;

The planning period;

The waste inventory;

The relationship between state and local governments;

Municipal solid waste reduction and recycling programs;

A waste capacity analysis for municipal solid waste (which in no way should resemble a capacity assurance requirement similar to Section 104 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, or CERCLA);

The state's regulatory program;

The process for citizen participation; and

Self-certification that the state has necessary authority to implement these program elements.

EPA review of plans should be limited to a check for completeness based on elements specified in this policy and raised by EPA during the public comment period of the draft plan. EPA does not have the ability or the resources to take on the solid waste planning and management responsibilities that fall under the historical and rightful domain of state and local governments. Moreover, EPA's intrusion into the planning process (in a manner similar to Subtitle C of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, or RCRA) would frustrate and impede the planning process already underway in many states.

States should retain authority to implement and enforce Subtitle D programs upon

passage of legislation reauthorizing RCRA, and new program elements in this legislation should be automatically delegated to states. Should a state fail to submit a complete plan, EPA should assume responsibility for the permitting and enforcement portion of a state solid waste management program after the state is given the opportunity to appeal and correct any deficiencies.

THE BALANCED BUDGET
AMENDMENT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, February 8, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

In Late January, with my support, the House passed a balanced budget constitutional amendment by a vote of 300-132. Several different versions were considered. The one that passed would require the President to propose a balanced budget each year, and it would take a 3/5 vote of both the House and Senate to pass an unbalanced budget.

It may well be that nothing short of a constitutional amendment will force Congress and the President to confront the tough choices necessary to balance the budget. We have simply had great difficulty in coming to consensus on specific increases in taxes or cuts in government spending. The result is an institutional bias toward running a deficit. An amendment could very well force the government to set priorities, a key task that has not been done very well in the past.

PROBLEMS

Although the amendment was broadly supported in the House, there are problems with using a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. First, a balanced budget amendment could reduce the government's flexibility to deal with national emergencies such as war or recession. It could force the government to raise taxes or cut spending to cover the increasing deficit that a slowing economy was generating. Fiscal policy then would exaggerate rather than mitigate the swings in the economy, and recessions would tend to be deeper and longer. Second, a balanced budget amendment puts off tough decisions and delays action until ratification by the states, which could take many years. Postponing the tough choices could make them much harder in the long run. Third, a balanced budget amendment could draw the courts into budget policy. If Congress failed to pass a balanced budget, unelected judges might have the power to raise taxes or cut programs. Fourth, a balanced budget amendment is an incentive for Congress and the President to evade the requirements. They could do that by imposing or withdrawing regulations, placing new requirements on states or business, saying that certain kinds

● 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.

of spending is off budget, setting up quasi-government authorities to borrow money, or scores of other ways. Finally, a balanced budget amendment should distinguish between general operating expenses and capital investments (such as bridges, research, or education). Indiana has operated under a similar system for years. Like a homeowner taking out a mortgage, borrowing for long-term investments can make sense.

REASONS TO SUPPORT

Despite these concerns, I do support a balanced budget amendment. For years Congress has tried new ways to reduce the deficit, including caps on spending, across-the-board cuts, and pay-as-you-go requirements. These measures have had some effect, and the deficit is down from a record \$290 billion in 1992 to some \$176 billion this year—a cut of 40%. But the longer-term outlook for the deficit—particularly because of rising health care costs—is not good. Particularly disturbing are recent projections by the Congressional Budget Office that show the deficit could rise to as high as \$421 billion in 2005. This trend is unacceptable.

Although I would prefer that Congress and the President face the tough choices and balance the budget on their own, there is little evidence this will be done. Large deficits drain national savings and investment in long-term economic growth, and yearly interest payments prevent policymakers from responding to new challenges. A balanced budget amendment would force us to better reconcile our investment priorities with our economic means.

THE DETAILS

The House considered six versions of a balanced budget amendment. I supported several versions that protected Social Security from being cut to balance the budget and a version that would distinguish between capital investment and general operating costs. I also voted for a version that would require Congress to spell out the difficult choices necessary to balance the budget in the next seven years. We have an obligation to tell the American people how we intend to get the budget into balance. Too many amendment supporters are unwilling to give us specifics on cutting the budget. The cuts necessary will be far deeper than most people have acknowledged, and important programs like Medicare and student aid would be heavily impacted.

I opposed a version that made it easy to waive the balanced budget requirement—in any year when unemployment was above 4%—and also did not support a version requiring a separate 3/5 vote to pass any bill that raised revenue. We should not confer on a congressional minority a veto power over what should be a majority decision to increase revenues. Such a veto power was deliberately rejected by the founding fathers.

A broad coalition of members from both parties were able to put aside their differences and agree on the final version of the amendment. This amendment would be tough on deficit spending. It would require the President to submit a balanced budget every year, and Congress would need a 3/5 vote in both the House and the Senate to pass an unbalanced budget or to raise the federal debt limit. A majority of Congress could waive this requirement in time of war or imminent military threat. The amendment now goes to the Senate, which is expected to take action later this year. If the House and Senate agree on identical language, thirty-eight states will have to ratify the amendment before it becomes part of the

Constitution. The states will be taking a careful look at the balanced budget amendment. It could well hurt them. Drastic reductions in federal spending would leave states with the burden of dealing with those who fall through the safety net.

CONCLUSION

I still have reservations about the House version, and would prefer greater flexibility to deal with national emergencies, protections for Social Security, and requirements that we spell out to the American people what it would take to balance the budget. I believe the House-passed version was good enough, and the need for a balanced budget amendment strong enough, that the process should go forward. I am hopeful that the Senate can address some of my concerns. I will want to see what happens in the Senate before making a final decision on the balanced budget amendment.

TRIBUTE TO THE CLARE ROTARY CLUB

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Rotary Club of Clare, MI. On February 11, 1995, members and friends will gather to celebrate the Clare Rotary's 50th golden anniversary. The Clare Rotary Club has enjoyed a long and distinguished history during which they helped and improved many lives. They may proudly look back on their history and take pride in the many events they have sponsored and the assistance they have provided.

The Rotary Club plays a vital role in the development of our families and communities. By selflessly giving of themselves, members have demonstrated the rewards we reap when we help others in need. The time and effort the members have devoted to improving the community illustrates the sensitivity and caring that makes the Rotary Club of Clare the wonderful organization it is.

Their work and accomplishments provide a sterling example of what deeds can be performed with dedication and contribution. Everyone involved with their efforts lives by the motto, "He Who Profits Most * * * Serves Best" and more recently, "Service Before Self." These are words that, when taken to heart, can help raise people, families, and communities to new levels of achievement. The Rotary Club members have not only embraced these words but acted to help others and inspired us all to help our fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I know you will join my colleagues and I in commending the work of the Rotary members and their 50 years of giving. It is this sense of philanthropy, the cornerstone of our Nation, which has made this Nation and community such an exceptional place to live. I wish them continued success and look forward to another 50 years of service.

LEGISLATION TO NAME YOUNGSTOWN COURTHOUSE AFTER THOMAS D. LAMBROS

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation to name the Federal building and U.S. courthouse in Youngstown, OH after retired U.S. District Court Judge Thomas D. Lambros. Throughout his distinguished career, Judge Lambros embraced the rule of law, human rights, and social justice for all our citizens. I can't think of a more appropriate way to honor his service than to name the U.S. courthouse and Federal building in Youngstown, OH after this great American jurist.

The bill would designate the Federal building and U.S. courthouse located at 125 Market Street in Youngstown as the Thomas D. Lambros Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse.

Thomas D. Lambros was born on February 4, 1930, in Ashtabula, OH. He graduated from Ashtabula High School in 1948. Upon graduation from high school, he attended Fairmont State College in Fairmont, WV, from 1948 to 1949, and received his law degree from Cleveland Marshall Law School in 1952. From 1954 to 1956 he served in the U.S. Army. In 1960, Lambros was elected judge of the court of common pleas in Ohio's Ashtabula County. In 1966, he was reelected to a second term without opposition.

In 1967, in light of Judge Lambros' excellent record as a fair and dedicated jurist, President Lyndon B. Johnson nominated him to the Federal bench in the U.S. District Court in the northern district of Ohio. As a district court judge, Judge Lambros was responsible for many important reforms such as the voluntary public defender program to provide indigent criminal defendants with free counsel. His groundbreaking work in this area preceded the landmark U.S. Supreme Court decision, *Gideon versus Wainwright*, which guaranteed free counsel to indigent criminal defendants. In 1990, Judge Lambros became chief judge in the northern district of Ohio. He officially retired from that post earlier this month. Judge Lambros currently resides in Ashtabula, OH.

Judge Lambros received numerous honors and awards throughout his career, including the Cross of Paideia presented by Archbishop Iakovos of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, and an honorary doctorate of law from Capital University Law and Graduate Center.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also add that it was Judge Lambros' commitment and vision that was the driving force behind the construction of the Federal building and U.S. courthouse in Youngstown. He recognized that the people who live in the Youngstown area—regardless of their station in life—deserve to have adequate and direct access to the U.S. court system. Prior to the opening of the U.S. courthouse building in Youngstown in December of 1993, my constituents had to travel at least 65 miles to Cleveland, OH if they had business in the Federal court system. Judge

Lambros recognized the hardship this imposed on many people, especially senior citizens and the indigent. His commitment to equal justice and equal access for all played an important role in building the Youngstown courthouse. My constituents and I will be forever grateful to Judge Lambros for his broad vision and commitment to justice.

I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation, the text of which appears below.

H.R.—

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building located at 125 Market Street in Youngstown, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the "Thomas D. Lambros Federal Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Thomas D. Lambros Federal Building".

IN HONOR OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN JOSEPH A. LEFANTE WHO WAS RECOGNIZED BY IRELAND 32

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to recognize the accomplishments of former Congressman Joseph LeFante, who was honored on January 20, 1995 by Ireland 32. He is an outstanding citizen and his service to the American people is second to none.

Mr. LeFante was born in Bayonne to Thomas and Rose LeFante. He was raised in Bayonne and attended St. Peter's College in Jersey City. He has been married for 46 years to his high school sweetheart, the former Florence Behym. They have three beautiful children Janice, Tom, and Diane, and five grandchildren.

His achievements and his awards are numerous and exemplary. Mr. LeFante was a member of the U.S. House of Representatives in 1977-78. He served on the Committee on Education and Labor and Small Business Committee. His expertise was crucial in drafting important legislative proposals in these areas. He was the only freshman member to serve on the Select Committee on Welfare Reform.

Prior to his congressional career, Mr. LeFante distinctly served on the New Jersey General Assembly. He was an assembly speaker in 1976, majority leader in 1974-75, chairman of the joint appropriations committee in 1973 and chairman of the assembly appropriations committee in 1972-73. He was commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs. In 1990 for 2 years he served as director at the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs at the New Jersey Department of Environment Protection and Energy.

Mr. LeFante has also been a member of several commissions, such as the Bayonne

Charter Commission and was the director of the Hackensack Meadowlands Development Commission. In addition, he was a member of the Bayonne Municipal Council where he served as chairman of the urban renewal program, the code enforcement committee, and the drug abuse committee.

Mr. LeFante has received countless honors and awards for his outstanding work and dedication. He has been honored by St. John's University with an honorary doctorate of humane letters, Jaycees Distinguished Service Award, and the Dr. Benjamin Rush Humanitarian Award just to name a few.

It is impossible to state all of Mr. LeFante's achievements. He has served his community with dignity and respect. He has been a great humanitarian by serving and helping the public. He is a distinguished gentleman respected by all. I commend him for his countless efforts to help others and for giving his time to help and aid the community.

CLEANING UP THE WELFARE SYSTEM

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, we've heard a lot about the tough decisions that need to be made in order to clean up the welfare system and put our economy back on track. Cutting off payments to families or putting funding into State block grants are not the tough solution to our welfare problems. I often make note of the fact that, as a State legislator I had to deal with block grant issues. Most often, it is only a way of moving the responsibility for painful cuts to the States. The block grants proposed by the Republicans drastically reduce funding for these programs but these proposals oversimplify a very complex problem and do not sufficiently address the factors that contribute to unemployment and welfare dependency.

Yes, we should cut the waste and abuse in the system. I agree that we should root out the fraud in our welfare programs. But, the fact is that real welfare reform must also address job creation, job training, and an increase in the minimum wage. I'm very glad to be participating in this special order this evening, organized by Mr. SANDERS and Mr. OWENS. These are issues that must be addressed in any welfare reform bill and they must be addressed by any government that hopes to lower its unemployment level while raising the standard of living of its people.

I do not know anyone in this House, Republican or Democrat, who would argue with the premise that our ultimate goal in welfare reform is to move people off of the welfare roles and into jobs. We must, however, make sure that people are getting good jobs that provide a livable wage. I believe that the majority of people on welfare right now would jump at the opportunity to work and provide for themselves and their families. What, then, is preventing a welfare recipient from finding a decent job? Those jobs that are within a person's grasp do not pay enough to sustain a family and due to lack of training, higher paying jobs are also not within their reach.

Earlier this week, I spoke on the House floor about the choices a single mother on welfare would face. If she goes on welfare, she can get comprehensive health care and a monthly check from the Government. If she goes to work at a minimum wage job she earns only \$8,800 a year, and her family loses their health coverage. She must find a way to care for her children while she is at work. That is not much of a choice. Throwing these women off the welfare roles will not erase these problems. That is a smoke and mirrors reform.

The Republican approach to welfare reform limits benefits to 2 years, and only 2 years. I have no problem with moving people into the work force as soon as possible, but we must face the fact that, if the jobs are not there, no punitive measure will change the welfare recipient's behavior. The Economic Policy Institute estimates that there are over 12 million unemployed people in this country. These people must be trained for jobs which will raise them up out of poverty and give them stable income.

Today's minimum wage is worth 30 percent less than what it was worth in the 1970's. An increase in the minimum wage is a necessary step in providing people with the tools they need to bring themselves out of poverty. We cannot move welfare recipients into a position where they join the growing number of working poor. Of all poor children, 38 percent under 6 years old have parents who work full or part time. They are working to support their families but cannot make enough money to live above the poverty line. In 1992, a full-time worker only grossed \$8,800, that is \$3,500 below the poverty line for a family of three: \$11,186. How can we expect to move welfare recipients into this subsistence level of employment with no health care and no job training?

We must create a system that rewards work and does not punish someone for trying to be independent. We must make the tough decisions. We must say that job creation, training, and increased wages are national priorities. We must commit to programs that will help us reach a goal of a stable, self-sufficient employment for all Americans.

INTRASTATE MOTOR CARRIER TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress passed H.R. 2739, the Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994, which included a provision in section 601 to preempt State economic regulation of intrastate trucking. Today, I am introducing a technical corrections bill to address an item which I do not believe Congress intended to be within the scope of section 601.

The primary thrust of section 601 is to address issues relating to the transportation by motor carrier of general freight and express small packages. The act clearly provides for continued State regulation of safety requirements and the transportation of household goods.

During consideration of this legislation, however, nobody with the exception of myself raised the question of how it could affect other types of motor carriers, such as tow trucks. And indeed, today, many police departments and municipalities are faced with a great deal of uncertainty over the effect the legislation will have on what is known as nonconsensual towing, that is, that towing which is conducted without the vehicle owners consent. This is the type of towing that occurs when a vehicle is illegally parked on private property, or the vehicle is towed by order of the police.

In this regard, some local public entities believe that they can engage in contractual relationships with one or more tow truck operators for the purpose of providing nonconsensual towing services. Others contend this practice would represent the regulation of rates and services prohibited by the new Federal law. The only fact of the matter is that nobody can provide any clear guidance on this issue.

The technical corrections bill I am introducing today would provide for continued State or local economic regulation of intrastate non-consensual tow services. This bill is very similar to the measure recently introduced by the distinguished Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON and is supported by many State towing associations, including those in Texas and California.

Again, in my view, the intent of section 601 was to address issues relating to the transportation by motor carrier of general freight and express small packages. I do not believe there was any intent to affect the ability of a police department or municipality to regulate tow truck operations in order to protect citizens from the occasional instances of unscrupulous pricing practices that give the entire industry a black eye.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this legislation should pose any controversy. Again, it simply clarifies the intent of Congress in enacting section 601 of the Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994.

ADMINISTRATION IGNORED PESO WARNINGS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of Members a column published in last Sunday's Washington Post that highlights the foresight of our colleague, JOHN LAFALCE, in raising the issue of the exchange rate of the Mexican peso during the United States debate on NAFTA. As the column makes clear, Congressman LAFALCE presciently warned in May and June 1993 that the benefits to the United States of expanded trade with Mexico could be threatened by a devaluation of the peso. Congressman LAFALCE's suggestion that the United States consider a supplemental NAFTA agreement on exchange rate coordination seems very wise in retrospect.

The Post article raises several other important questions about the United States plan to help stabilize the Mexican economy. These

questions deserve consideration by all Members, including those whom support U.S. assistance.

The Washington Post article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 5, 1995]
ADMINISTRATION IGNORED PESO WARNINGS
(By Hobart Rowen)

Rep. John J. LaFalce (D-N.Y.) has a right to say, "I told you so." At a May 20, 1993, congressional hearing on NAFTA, LaFalce warned that the expected benefits to the U.S. economy from the new trade treaty with Mexico and Canada could go up in smoke if the Mexican government devalued the peso.

Supported by a number of prominent U.S. and Mexican economists who predicted that peso devaluation was inevitable, LaFalce—who had wide experience in this field—begged the Clinton administration to recognize that the North American Free Trade Agreement provided no method to coordinate the two countries' monetary policies.

On June 9, 1993, LaFalce wrote President Clinton (and separately, Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen and other Cabinet members): "I believe it imperative that the United States pursue a fourth supplemental agreement that recognizes the importance and impact of exchange rates on the operation of NAFTA . . . perhaps creating a mechanism that would allow for consultation, coordination, and corrections if necessary."

It made good sense, but Clinton & Co. didn't listen. When consulted, the Federal Reserve Board, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund pooh-poohed the possibility of a peso devaluation. White House political aides, already flustered by the need to get side agreements for NAFTA on the environmental and labor conditions, didn't want further complications.

Failure to stabilize the dollar-peso rate may prove to be the worst mistake so far of the Clinton presidency. The Institute for International Economics, which issued a highly influential pro-NAFTA report, also missed the boat. IIE senior fellow John Williamson, who like LaFalce agreed something should be done to ensure a stable peso-dollar rate, admitted that when the IIE reported on NAFTA was published, the monetary issue "slipped through the cracks."

If Clinton and his advisers had paid attention to LaFalce and his supporters, he might not now be engaged in an indefensible bailout of Wall Street investors, including major mutual fund managers who made greedy, high-yield gambles in Mexico after the passage of NAFTA.

Clinton's revamped \$53 billion rescue plan for Mexico, which he can put through on his executive authority, may be worse than the original plan for \$40 billion in loan guarantees, because it would appear that there will be more pure loans and fewer guarantees. But as former FDIC chairman L. William Seidman wisecracked, "at least we're in for \$20 [billion] instead of \$40!"

Among investments that will be bailed out are those that offered interest returns of 15 percent to a reported 50 percent in peso-denominated bonds. But these bonds crashed when the peso dropped more than 40 percent against the dollar, just as LaFalce had warned could happen. But now the peso bonds will be propped up by Clinton's \$53 billion, made up of \$20 billion from the Treasury's stabilization fund, \$17.5 billion in loans from the IMF and the rest from other global lenders, notably \$10 billion from the Bank for International Settlements in Europe.

The operative result of dumping all this money into Mexico is that foreign investors,

including the Wall Streeters, can collect their huge interest payments, then get out while the getting is good. Mexico won't be paying the bill. Clinton and U.S. taxpayers will pick up the check.

"This is basically what everyone on Wall Street was after all along—a vehicle to get out of their peso-denominated assets at a preferential rate," Walter Todd, a former Fed official told The Washington Post. "Clinton has provided it to them."

Senate Majority Leader Robert J. Dole (R-Kan.), who is backing the Clinton plan, said last week that if the money is paid out and doesn't come back, "we'll have to make an appropriation to replace it."

In an extraordinary column in the Wall Street Journal on Jan. 26, New York financier Henry Kaufman hinted at a huge Wall Street coverup, in which the entire financial community was engaged in "suppressing critical evaluation" of Mexico's true economic condition.

Mutual funds became an especially important conduit [for investor-speculators], without calling attention to the potential volatility in their emerging market portfolios, should liquidity problems develop," Kaufman said.

In other words, many small investors were suckered into Mexico, through mutual funds, lured by the promise of double-digit returns there and in other "emerging markets." No one—not in the Treasury, the IMF, the Fed, the SEC—issued a word of caution.

But the first rule of investing is that if an abnormal return is promised, there must be an abnormal risk.

LaFalce told me at the end of the week that the administration had refused to acknowledge the palpable deterioration of the Mexican economy all through 1994 because it was fearful of exacerbating the Chiapas rebellion; because of Clinton's effort to push former president Carlos Salinas de Gortari as the head of the new World Trade Organization; and because it might jeopardize the then-upcoming vote on GATT.

So the administration didn't tell the truth about Mexico.

LaFalce believes that tapping the Treasury's stabilization fund "stretches the president's authority to the outer limits." But, he sighs, "it's a fait accompli and I won't quarrel with him."

POLITICAL PRISONERS RELEASED IN BURMA

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw my colleagues attention to the fact that over the past 2 days the ruling military government in Burma, the State Law and Order Restoration Council [SLORC], has released many prisoners of conscience. In particular, I was pleased to know that on February 6 SLORC released Win Thein, a former political adviser to Aung San Suu Kyi. I met with Win Thein at his prison complex last February and I am heartened to know that he was released on the eve of the anniversary of my trip to Rangoon and my meeting with Aung San Suu Kyi.

I believe that the release of Win Thein and the many other political prisoners is a positive

step in Burma. I continue to hold out hope for the release of Aung San Suu Kyi and all prisoners of conscience in Burma.

**INTRODUCTION OF THE TICKET
FEE DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995**

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today, along with my colleagues, Mr. CONNIT, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. OXLEY, the Ticket Fee Disclosure Act of 1995. This legislation, if enacted, will provide American consumers appropriate and timely disclosure of convenience fees, service charges, and other amounts often added to the face value of entertainment and sporting event tickets, including huge profit markups by so-called ticket brokers and others who sell tickets on the secondary market. It also will result in a comprehensive report to the Congress from the Federal Trade Commission on practices by and the relationships between promoters, owners, and operators of facilities, performers, and sellers and resellers of entertainment and sporting event tickets, along with recommendations to achieve better ticket disclosure, information, access, and value for consumers.

The number of entertainment and sporting event tickets sold in the past few years has escalated rapidly. Based on testimony our committee received last year, the number of such tickets sold annually easily exceed 2 billion. As ticket sales have increased, so too have the methods used to sell and market such tickets. Indeed, with the advent of the communications superhighway, sellers of entertainment tickets likely will create additional avenues for selling tickets that are not feasible today.

This legislation does not inhibit these new and innovative approaches nor does it inhibit the growth of the entertainment and sporting industries or of the marketing and ticketing service industries that support them. This legislation creates no new regulations nor does it impose unreasonable burdens on business. Rather, this simple legislation merely seeks to inform the ordinary consumer who contemplates purchasing these tickets of any additional fees or charges that are added on to ticket prices.

This legislation makes it unlawful for persons who sell or resell entertainment or sporting event tickets: First, to fail to disclose to the purchaser—prior to the purchase of any such ticket—any fee, charge, or other assessment to be imposed in excess of the face amount of the ticket, and second, to fail to have the amount of any such fee, charge, or assessment printed on the ticket or on a receipt evidencing any such ticket sale.

Under the bill, this requirement will be enforced by the Federal Trade Commission, an independent agency that has authority over unfair and deceptive commercial practices under the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45, et seq.). As well, State attorneys general are empowered under the bill to en-

force the requirement on behalf of affected residents in their States. In this regard, the bill parallels other commercial practices legislation developed by the Committee on Energy and Commerce during the past few years, including the Telephone Disclosure and Dispute Resolution Act, enacted in 1992, and the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act, enacted last year. Under the Federal Trade Commission Act, the FTC is authorized to issue cease and desist orders in appropriate cases and to impose civil penalties for each violation of the law.

I also have modified last year's bill by adding an important provision that directs the Federal Trade Commission to conduct a study of ticketing practices, including an examination of relationships between and practices of various persons involved in entertainment and sporting events. I believe an indepth examination of ticketing practices by the FTC is clearly warranted, based on testimony and evidence presented to the Subcommittee on Transportation and Hazardous Materials at its September 29, 1994, hearing on this subject. For example, I have real concerns about the impact on ticket consumers of exclusive contracts between building owners and others that limit options of potential competing services. As well, I have many questions about the manner in which tickets are held back by many participants in the ticket food chain, so that consumers are denied any opportunity to purchase many tickets through conventional means—that is, the box office or through authorized ticket sellers—or are forced to pay exorbitant prices from ticket brokers or scalpers who mysteriously acquire the best seats in the house. If tickets are made available to the public, why are so many tickets simply unavailable to the normal consumer who cannot afford scalper's fees? This long-overdue report from the Commission should inform the Congress whether further action is necessary to provide consumers of entertainment tickets with better disclosure, information, access, and value.

At the subcommittee's hearing last fall, representatives of consumer interests and of ticket sellers indicated their support for the disclosure provisions in the bill. Unfortunately, because of the press of other business, no further action was taken with respect to the legislation. I look forward to prompt consideration and enactment of this modest legislation so that American consumers will be better informed about add-on charges they pay for entertainment and sporting event tickets and so all of us will be informed about how to achieve better disclosure, information, access, and value for ordinary consumers who seek to purchase such tickets.

**TRIBUTE TO MAYOR JIM
SCRIVNER**

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention the Versailles, MO, Chamber of Commerce will soon bestow the honor of citizen of the year on former Mayor Jim Scrivner.

I want to use this opportunity to call the attention to my fellow Members of Congress to the outstanding record of public service demonstrated in the life of this citizen of Missouri.

Jim Scrivner would have been considered successful if viewed only from the perspective of his business and lifelong career as an undertaker with three funeral homes in rural Missouri. He provided a home for his wife, Honey, and their daughters, and is respected in his community.

Through the years he added an ambulance service to the business. It was not financially successful, but he subsidized the service to his neighbors and the surrounding area. The nearest hospital was 40 miles from his hometown and ambulance service was a necessity.

In 1973, Jim Scrivner was elected mayor of Versailles. His term of office was marked by a series of progressive ventures. A new sewage plant, replacement of failed sewerlines in a large section of the town, new housing for low-income and elderly residents and development of a successful industrial park all were accomplished in his tenure as mayor. The people trusted his leadership to the extent that a 1-percent sales tax was passed to provide for funding for future city development.

It is fitting and proper that the people of Versailles recognize Jim Scrivner and his years of service. In doing so they focus a spotlight on the life and career of an outstanding individual. He has been successful as a family man, a businessman, and as an elected official.

I am proud to call him my friend and to take this opportunity to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my agreement with and support for the decision to honor him. His record is one we should all note and seek to emulate.

**TIME TO TAKE BACK OUR
STREETS**

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, the statistics paint a grim picture. In the past 30 years violent crime increased threefold. The American people are afraid to go out at night. Our children are afraid to go to school. It is time to take back our streets.

On November 8, Americans made it clear they did not think much of last year's liberal, hugs for thugs crime bill. They endorsed the Republican get tough approach to crime fighting. Our crime package strikes at the heart of our violent crime problem by deterring criminals from committing crimes in the first place.

No more hugs for thugs; no more phony prevention programs; and no more endless appeals or technical loopholes. Our Republican crime bill holds criminals accountable for their actions, not hold their hand. We need a criminal justice system that protects the victim, not the criminal.

Republicans are working hard to fight crime by giving police the tools to catch, convict, and confine criminals. The streets across America belong to the people, not to the thugs. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in the fight to take back our streets.

BIRDS OF A FEATHER

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues a tragic story of loss that struck New York and, indeed, the Nation during this past weekend's snowstorm. On Saturday, February 4, 1995, the outdoor aviary at the Bronx Zoo collapsed under the weight of a foot of snow allowing dozens of exotic birds to escape. The Harry de Jur Aviary was built in 1899 and was one of the first animal shelters built at the Bronx Zoo.

Saturday's snowstorm was wet and heavy and the foot of snow on the aviary's arch probably weighed several tons. A strong gust of wind caught the structure like a sail which caused the collapse. Although many of the birds were caught under the wire mesh, at least 33 rare birds were carried away on high winds. The zoo has asked local birders to be on the lookout for these rare avian species.

The aviary was the home to the largest breeding colony in North America of the inca terns, a South American sea bird. Also lost were grey gulls, andean gulls, and a bandtail gull. These birds have a slim chance of survival in the urban wild due to their sheltered upbringing. Zookeepers hope that some of these birds will return to the familiar site of the aviary due to their hunger, but fear that the winds may have carried them too far away.

Mr. Speaker, the Bronx Zoo aviary was an historic landmark which generations of New Yorkers and visitors enjoyed. I commend to my colleagues' attention the New York Times article of this tragedy. The zoo will celebrate its centennial next year and zoo officials hope to rebuild the aviary, despite the cost of such a project at a time of tight budgets.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 1995]

BIRDS FLEE WRECKAGE OF BRONX ZOO AVIARY

(By Robert D. McFadden)

The gracefully arched, 19th-century aviary at the Bronx Zoo—home to a colony of 100 South American sea birds and a landmark to generations of New Yorkers and visitors—collapsed in a gust of wind under the weight of a foot of snow during Saturday's storm, and dozens of rare, exotic gulls and terns flew away, zoo officials said yesterday.

No people were in the aviary at the north end of the zoo near Fordham Road when the huge cage of torn, twisted wire mesh crashed down on a coastal habitat of rock outcroppings, murky pools, pebble beaches and island nesting nooks at 10:45 A.M. No birds were killed and only one was known to have been injured.

And many birds were trapped under the tangle of wire and saved, officials said. Ten flightless Magellanic penguins waddled into their rookeries, guanay cormorants and other survivors, including an oystercatcher, took cover in nesting cavities. Zoo keepers quickly rushed in with nets, trying to minimize the loss.

But at least 33 birds—8 Grey gulls, 12 Andean gulls, one Band-Tail gull and 12 Inca terns—escaped and were carried away on high winds from the small artificial realm where they had been hatched, fed and protected into a harsh world where they may have to compete with city sea gulls, crows and other toughs of the air.

"It's a very sad day," Dr. Donald Bruning, the zoo's curator of birds, said in an interview yesterday. "The aviary was beautiful and has been around for almost a century. And the birds would be very difficult to replace. The Inca terns were by far the largest breeding colony in North America, and we've lost almost half of them."

Zoo officials asked bird-watchers and the public to be on the lookout for the escaped birds, whose native habitats are the coasts of Peru and Chile, and issued descriptions and other advice about how to spot, capture and report them. To avoid being swamped by calls from everyone who sees a nonexotic gull or a tern, the zoo issued a list of "bird rehabilitators," licensed experts in aiding wildlife, to serve as intermediaries.

But Dr. Bruning said the chances of recovering the birds seemed slim. He noted that high winds, which gusted up to 50 miles an hour, could have carried them by late yesterday across most of the New York metropolitan area and New Jersey, and that the likelihood of finding and recapturing them appeared to be as dubious as their chances of survival in the urban wild.

"Most of them were hatched and raised in the aviary and have no experience outside," he said. "The cold will not bother them, but it will not be easy for them to find food. They will have to compete with local gulls and other birds, and this is not the best time of the year for trying to find food."

Since the flyaways were accustomed to shelter and regular feedings of fish, Dr. Bruning said the best hope for their recovery was that some had resisted the high winds and taken shelter nearby and would return to the aviary ruins in search of a meal.

"They know food is available and would come back to that," Dr. Bruning said. "We're hoping that when they get hungry and can't find a supply of fish, they may start looking to come back to the cage—that is, if the wind hasn't blown them too far away. If they find themselves in a completely strange area, they won't know how to find their way back."

Pans of smeltlike capelin and other small fish were put out at the aviary wreckage yesterday to lure any nearby fugitives back, but the only taker seen at dusk was a strutting crow.

The structure that collapsed, known as the Harry du Jur Aviary, was built in 1899, three years after the founding of the New York Zoological Society. It was one of the first animal shelters built at the Bronx Zoo, then still in the midst of farms and now a 265-acre tract of hilly parkland bounded by Fordham Road, Southern Boulevard, East 180th Street and the Bronx River Parkway.

The aviary was unique at the time—a huge cage topped with an arch of wire mesh 80 feet high, 150 feet long and 90 feet wide—where birds could live and fly about in a habitat that simulated nature's, and where the people could enter through double wire doors and walk unobtrusively among them.

In the early 1980's, Dr. Bruning said, the aviary was remodeled and a new wire mesh arch was installed, along with a redesigned interior habitat. But the pipelike supports for the arch were not replaced, and after the collapse many of these pipes—96 years old—were found to be rusted where they joined the wire mesh of the arch, about 15 feet above the foundation, Dr. Bruning said.

"You could see the rust once it broke off," he said. "All of the pipes broke at the same joint all the way around the cage."

Saturday's snow was wet and heavy, Dr. Bruning noted, and when it ended at mid-

morning the foot of snow that spread over the arch must have weighed many tons. It became even heavier as sleet and rain began falling and were absorbed into the snow. But it was not mere weight that brought the aviary down, he said.

"Apparently there was a strong gust of wind that caught the whole structure like a sail," he said. "The entire cage collapsed on the interior. All the arch members broke apart and separated. There were cables that went across for support and they came down too. It was a mass of twisted and torn mesh, and there were gaps in it—very large holes where some of the birds escaped."

The only immediate casualty of the collapse was a cormorant that sustained a slight cut. Many of the birds were trapped under the mesh. Some took refuge in their nesting areas, others were saved by keepers, who were next door in the Aquatic Bird House and rushed out with nets after hearing the roar. Survivors were taken to other bird shelters at the zoo.

Zoo officials asked bird-watchers and the public for help in finding the escapees, and they provided brief descriptions:

Inca tern adult has a dark blue-gray body, white mustache, red bill and feet and is 14 to 17 inches long, while the juvenile has a black bill and feet and no mustache.

Andean gull has a white head with crescent black earmarks, light gray upper body with white underparts and a 22-inch length.

Grey gull is uniformly slate gray with black bill, faint eye rings and is 19 to 20 inches long.

Band-Tail gull is white with yellow bill and feet, a white body and black wings.

All but the Band-Tail and some of the Andean gulls have leg bands. Zoo officials asked anyone who spots one of these birds to contact the zoo or one of the bird rehabilitators whose names and numbers it made public. They noted that it was unlikely that anyone could catch one of the birds, but if a bird is caught, it should not be taken indoors, but kept in a well ventilated cardboard box. The birds are not dangerous, but can bite if grabbed.

Dr. Bruning said he hoped the aviary would be rebuilt, especially in time for the zoo's centennial next year. He noted that it might cost several hundred thousand dollars and that there was little money for such a project at a time of tight budgets. But he called it an important facet of the zoo.

"It is tragic to lose this beautiful landmark aviary," the curator said.

THE NORTH KOREAN NUCLEAR ACCORD—DOES IT MATTER?

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues to turn their attention today to the nuclear accord signed last October with North Korea.

As Members know, this is a complex agreement that will be implemented in stages over a 10-year period. At its simplest, this agreement constitutes a trade. On one side, North Korea will halt and eventually dismantle its nuclear weapons program, accepting extensive international inspections to verify its compliance. In exchange, the international community has agreed to provide the North with alternative energy sources, initially in the form of

heavy fuel oil, and later with proliferation-resistant light-water reactor technology.

The agreement also provides for movement toward the normalization of relations between the United States and North Korea, and for resuming a dialog between the two Koreas.

In evaluating this accord, it is instructive to compare what we get from this agreement with what we have agreed to give North Korea. On the positive side of the ledger, the benefits to us and our friends, including South Korea and Japan, are substantial. The agreement calls for:

An immediate freeze on the North Korean nuclear weapons program—a step the North has already taken.

Immediate international and United States inspections of the North's principal nuclear facilities—which are now being carried out on a continuing basis.

The promise of the eventual elimination of the entire North Korean nuclear weapons program.

A commitment by North Korea not only to live up to its obligations under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, but to accept restrictions that go well beyond the treaty.

The beginnings of a process that could dampen tensions along the demilitarized zone separating the two Koreas and reduce the chances of the outbreak of a new Korean war.

A North Korean commitment to resume a political dialog with South Korea.

And what does North Korea get in return for these significant concessions?

Interim shipments of heavy oil in quantities equal to the energy it has given up by shutting down its graphite moderated nuclear reactors—roughly 3.5 percent of its electrical generation capacity.

Two light-water reactors, to replace the graphite moderated reactors it has forsworn.

The gradual lifting of United States sanctions against North Korea.

Political dialog and the beginnings of a process that could eventually lead to the normalization of diplomatic relations with the United States.

Certainly this agreement does not address every concern we have about North Korea—its conventional military might, ballistic missile program, or deplorable human rights record. Even in the nuclear sphere, we will have to wait some 5 years before we are permitted to carry out the special inspections that will reveal whether the North has secret stocks of plutonium.

What this agreement does is provide us with an opening—one that did not exist before—to lift the specter of a nuclear arms race from the Korean Peninsula, begin a process of meaningful dialog between the two Koreas, and come to grips with the other problems that continue to concern us.

Mr. Speaker, four decades ago more than 30,000 brave Americans gave their lives in Korea for the cause of freedom. They succeeded in turning back North Korean aggression. But their larger purpose—to lay the groundwork for a Korean Peninsula free from the threat of war—remains unfulfilled.

This agreement represents a giant step toward the achievement of that larger purpose. It does not resolve all outstanding issues between North Korea and the rest of the world.

It does not guarantee that future relations with the North will be without tensions and difficulties.

But, if fully implemented, the Geneva accord will advance our national interests and those of our allies, while holding out the promise of a better, more peaceful life to the people of Korea, both South and North.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

HON. BILL ORTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, there are few things that more people agree upon than the fact that our welfare system is a failure. No one likes it. Taxpayers don't like it, politicians don't like it, and most of all—welfare recipients don't like it.

Our welfare system often provides people who choose not to work with a better deal than those who choose to take a job. We need to create a system where work is not penalized, and where the logical choice for parents is to work to provide for their children.

For this reason, I am pleased to reintroduce the Self-Sufficiency Act, a bill aimed at encouraging the welfare reform efforts that States already have underway. The Self-Sufficiency Act uses a commonsense approach to welfare that provides assistance to participants who are working toward self-sufficiency, promotes work, and gradually eliminates benefits to those who have chosen not to participate in a self-sufficiency plan.

Moreover, the Self-Sufficiency Act may serve as a necessary transition to a welfare system that provides States with even greater control over the welfare system.

Many of the reform plans that are on the table right now are based on controversial assumptions. For example, while block grants sound like a good idea, there are serious concerns about whether most States have the capabilities and resources to take over the reins of a social welfare system that spans some 350 programs. The Self-Sufficiency Act provides for the coordinated services and State flexibility necessary to shape welfare systems that reflect the unique needs of each State population. This bill provides a middle ground for those States that have reservations about other reform proposals.

This bill is based upon a program, the single parent employment demonstration program, that decreased the Aid to Families with Dependent Children caseload in the Kearns demonstration area 33 percent in just 2 years. The best part is that the decrease in the number of participants is due to success in assisting people in finding jobs that exist in the labor market.

Amazingly, 44 Federal Government waivers had to be approved before Utah could begin using this approach to welfare. Other States seeking to improve upon the current system have encountered similar obstacles. This plan allows States to forgo the redtape and get on with helping people enter the labor market.

Under this act, States may choose an approach to the Aid to Families with Dependent

Children [AFDC] program that requires participants to work toward self-sufficiency. This approach requires every participant to negotiate a self-sufficiency plan with a caseworker. Each plan specifies an employment goal.

Under this approach, participants will have 25 percent of benefits reduced for the first month and a gradual complete phase-out of benefits over the course of 2 years if they do not follow their self-sufficiency plan.

Once a State receives approval to use the self-sufficiency approach, it must phase-in 25 percent of the State recipients at the end of 3 years, 50 percent at the end of 5 years, 75 percent at the end of 8 years, and 100 percent at the end of 10 years. In other words, the State must be committed to transforming its welfare system into a self-sufficiency based system.

States that choose this approach are required to coordinate self-sufficiency activities with programs operated under the JTPA and any other relevant programs.

States that choose this approach must provide child care for those participants that require child care assistance. This provision ensures that children will not be neglected due to the activities required of a parent participating in the self-sufficiency program. In order to lessen the financial burden for States that choose this approach, Federal matching rates for AFDC, transitional, and at-risk child care are increased by 10 percent for these States.

In order to encourage States to continually increase the efficiency and effectiveness of their welfare program, States may receive half of any estimated AFDC grant savings to use to improve their self-sufficiency programs.

In addition, certain AFDC eligibility requirements are altered or eliminated for States using this approach in order to decrease administrative burdens and discourage long-term welfare dependency:

(1) The requirement that families must have received AFDC for a minimum period before becoming eligible for transitional Medicaid and child care benefits is eliminated. This provision served as an incentive for families to stay on welfare for a certain minimum amount of time even if they had to turn down employment opportunities.

(2) Transitional Medicaid benefits and transitional child care benefits are allowed without regard to type of income that would otherwise make the family ineligible for benefits. This is a deletion of a well-meaning regulation that has resulted in administrative time needlessly being spent to determine how the last dollar of income was received by a participant.

(3) The current requirement that minor parents and pregnant minors without children must live with a responsible adult is strengthened.

Finally, the Secretary of HHS and other specified entities are called upon to develop performance standards appropriate to judge the effectiveness of programs developed under this approach. HHS is allowed to modify the AFDC Federal matching rate for participating States to reflect the effectiveness of the State in carrying out the program. State effectiveness will be judged in part on the basis of the number of participants who have become ineligible for AFDC due to earnings.

A State that has been approved to use the self-sufficiency approach may choose any or all of the following options:

(1) Treat two-parent families in the same manner as single parent families—although two-parent families are ineligible for AFDC until 30 days after the loss of employment, and both parents must follow a personal plan or invoke the benefit reduction for the entire family.

(2) Limit family AFDC benefits to the amount for which the family was initially determined eligible—family cap.

(3) Provide a diversion payment of an amount up to 3 months of the benefit for which the family would be eligible if they participated in AFDC. This option can only be used for families that are facing a crisis or need only temporary assistance to prevent them from coming onto AFDC. If the family later decides they must enter the AFDC system, the entire amount is subtracted from payments before they begin receiving assistance. Families that received diversion payments would be eligible for 3 months of transitional child care and Medicaid benefits.

(4) Enhance AFDC payments by not more than \$50 per month for participants with a full-time self-sufficiency schedule.

(5) Increase the earned income disregard rate from the current one-third rate to a rate as and high as one-half, or allow income earned by teens in the JTPA summer program to be discounted.

(6) Eliminate the time limit on the earned income disregard.

(7) Increase the cap on asset limitations from \$1,000 to \$2,000. In addition, allowed to exempt up to one vehicle.

(8) Upon mutual agreement with the participant, use funding from Food Stamps as a wage subsidy for that participant or as a direct cash payment to a participant following a full-time schedule self-sufficiency plan.

(9) Create sanctions based on poor school attendance or failure to immunize children.

In addition, the Self-Sufficiency Act outlines three changes beyond the scope of the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program:

(1) Allows States to deny any need-based benefits and services to noncitizens.

(2) Mandates that consumer credit reports include information on overdue child support payments.

(3) Provides that quarterly payments of earned income credit and dependent care credit will be made available.

SALUTING ELEANOR J. WILLIAMS DURING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, each February our Nation celebrates Black History Month. This occasion provides us the opportunity to herald the accomplishments of African-Americans in United States history, and to honor those still setting the pace by which history is both created and measured. Today I rise to recognize one such individual, Eleanor J. Williams, who was selected to be the first black woman manager of an enroute air traffic control center. Ms. Williams oversees the Cleve-

land Air Route Traffic Control Center in Oberlin, OH, the Nation's second busiest such facility.

Eleanor Williams began her diligent career with the Federal Aviation Administration in 1965 as a clerk stenographer in Anchorage, AK. Those who know her never had any question of how far she would go in her career. Her determination, and sense of self and spirit have marked her personality, as well as her resumé. In 1985, she received the Secretary's Award for Excellence from the Department of Transportation. In 1990, she was a Women in Management Delegate to the Soviet Union with People to People International. And in 1991 she was the recipient of the C. Alfred Anderson Award from the National Black Coalition of Federal Aviation Employees. Eleanor Williams was listed in Who's Who of American Women 4 years in a row.

After her start with the FAA in Alaska, in 1971 she became the first black woman to certify as an air traffic control specialist. By 1979 she had become an area supervisor in San Juan, Puerto Rico before her promotion to staff specialist for the FAA in Atlanta. By the mid-1980's she moved into a staff specialist role at FAA headquarters in Washington, DC before yet another promotion to area manager of the Kansas City region Air Traffic Division Office. Two more promotions followed in Kansas City before she received her historic post in Cleveland last year.

Mr. Speaker, the awards from Ms. Williams' professional life cannot begin to match the rewards of her personal life. Eleanor, the mother of seven and a foster child, is not only a role model to colleagues, but also the employees she supervises, and to the union members she has led. Her commitment to the Air Traffic Control Association, the Gamma Phi Delta sorority, Business and Professional Women, the Second Baptist Church, and the NAACP has left these and many other organizations the richer for her involvement. Eleanor's passion for excellence and ability to reach any goal inspires those around her to strive for the stars. Her powerful spirit is fueled by her faith in God, which enables her to tackle any task before her and has navigated her into uncharted waters.

Mr. Speaker, Eleanor Williams is a perfect example of the opportunity to be won by hard work and ardor in America. Eleanor is someone of whom the African-American community, women, and indeed Americans everywhere should be proud. Let me share with you a portion of a stunning poem written by an eighth-grader named Shondel, which was composed in honor of Ms. Eleanor Williams and her pioneering spirit.

You've accomplished many things all because in life you've dared and won yourself wings.

Long ago your wings took flight, never in darkness being lost, for you saw the path with inner-sight
Your faith and freedom forever shall live, for in your life you have never believed in Never.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me during Black History Month in saluting Eleanor J. Williams, an outstanding individual with a spirit that joins her with outstanding African-Americans of the past and those who will follow.

TRIBUTE TO ORNA SIEGEL

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the efforts of Orna Siegel, a woman whom I admire greatly.

Orna currently serves as the Outreach Chair of the Los Angeles chapter of AIPAC, however her community activities do not start and end with that organization. Orna is deeply committed to the security of the State of Israel but she is equally committed to making a difference in her community and in the lives of individuals.

For years, Orna has been actively involved in Yad B'Yad ("hand in hand"), an organization that takes critically ill people from Israel to any place in the world where they can get the medical care they need—be it transplants, surgeries, or emergency treatment. She has also been an active fundraiser for many other worthy causes in her community.

Although Orna's public service technically began in 1967, when she began a 3-year stint in the Israeli Defense Forces, her personal turning point came in 1990, years after she had married and moved to the United States. Orna witnessed the molestation of a 5-year-old boy in the darkness of a movie theater and followed the criminal out of the building until the police responded to her calls for assistance. She later testified against the culprit, who turned out to be a registered sex offender.

I would like to submit into the RECORD a magazine article detailing Orna Siegel's courageous act. Her story demonstrates that ordinary citizens can affect the lives of their neighbors in a positive way if they only take the time to get involved.

Essentially, that is the story of Orna Siegel's life; she is a person who has chosen to become involved. Her actions have literally saved the lives of people in desperate need of help. It is a story worthy of commendation by this House, and a lesson worth sharing with the American people.

The article follows:

[From the Moxie magazine, September 1990]
JUST A HOUSEWIFE, UNTIL SHE HAD TO BE A
HEROINE

(By Mary Ellen Strote)

The 11-year-old boy sitting next to Orna Siegel in the movie theater just wouldn't sit still. He kicked, he jostled, he wriggled. Annoyed, she glanced sideways and saw that the blond, blue-eyed youngster was grimacing. Then she looked down and gasped. The boy's companion, a man in his middle sixties, had his hand inside the boy's shorts.

Orna had brought her children to last summer's opening of Honey, I Shrank the Kids. The theater was crowded, but she had found a couple of seats five rows from the front. Holding Jonathan, 7, in her lap, and with daughter Shana, 10, on the seat to her left, she had looked forward to the comedy. But the minute the movie had begun, the boy had started with his wriggling. Now she left her children and sought out the manager. "I told him, 'Please call the police. A child is being molested in Row 5,'" Orna remembers. "He

promised to call." Orna bought a cup of soda so her kids wouldn't suspect anything, went back to her seat, and took her son in her lap again.

Then she waited for the police. And waited. And waited. All the while the boy kept kicking her. "I watched him, not the movie," Orna says. "the man was molesting him the whole time. And I watched what that son of a bitch was doing.

"Maybe I was in shock," she goes on. "It was a funny movie and everyone was laughing. It was so noisy and Jonathan was heavy on my lap and we were too close to the screen and the lights were changing so fast. I got such a big headache. I was very nervous, not knowing what to do, just waiting for a policeman to come with a flashlight, for someone to get me out of this ordeal."

But suddenly the movie was over. "The crowds were leaving," she says. "I hadn't made up my mind to follow them, but I knew at that moment: If I don't make a move now, it's all over. I told my kids, 'Please be quiet,' and I grabbed their hands and held tight, looking with my eyes straight after the guy. I would let him out of my sight. On the way out the door, I saw the manager. He looked at me and shrugged, as if to say, 'No one showed up * * *'"

Until that day, Orna, 41, would have described herself as a housewife. More likely, she would have used the words just a housewife. She cooked. She lunched with her friends. She waited for her kids to come home from school. She dressed up to go out with her husband, a successful businessman.

She was such a relentlessly traditional wife and mother that except for the fact that she had been born Orna Tieb in Tunisia, the seventh of eight children in a family that moved to a small town in Israel when she was just four * * * and the fact that she'd joined the Israeli army in 1967, right after the Six Day War, when she was 18 * * * except for that history, she could have passed for June Cleaver.

A pretty, perfectly coiffed redhead with a manicure to match her meticulous makeup, and color-coordinated down to her very toes, Orna at first glance seems too perfect to be real. Indeed, she has lived a Cinderella life: The poverty and hardship of her childhood vanished virtually overnight when she met tall, blond American Saul Siegel. She was 22, a student at a university in Tel Aviv. He asked her to marry him the day they met, and a couple of days later she was on a plane to America.

Today she keeps house in an airy French Normandy-style home that would be called a mansion almost anywhere in the world, although in the guard-gated, upper-class neighborhood in Los Angeles' San Fernando Valley where she lives, it seems almost average. She receives a guest with the gracious ritual that is common in her homeland: cake on the table and an offer of tea. A few minutes sitting at the table in her immaculate kitchen, listening as she fields phone calls from her husband's clients in her rapid-fire Israeli-accented speech, however, less even a casual observer see the rock-hard substance beneath her polished, feminine exterior.

But until that day at the theatre, Orna herself had no idea of her own strength. "I thought I would go after the molester, follow him to his car, get his license number," she remembers, "but instead, the man took the boy next door to the magic store. Now, this happens to be a wonderful store, and my children love it. So we went inside, and I told them to go wander around by themselves."

Orna approached the store manager and asked to use the phone. "I need to call the

police," she whispered. "That child was abused," and she nodded toward the boy.

But the manager refused. "I didn't see it happen," she told Orna.

"What is the matter with you people in America?" Orna asked in despair, and she started crying. "Why won't you get involved? I saw it happen! Look at that man! That's not a father-son hug."

And it wasn't. The man was buying presents for the boy and kept his arm around the child all the time. "The manager realized that if I was going to be that upset, she didn't want the trouble, so she told me to go into her office and use the phone there," says Orna.

She called 911, and the operator seemed to ask a hundred questions. What does he look like? What color are his eyes? Orna covered her mouth and the receiver with her hand: "He's only 10 feet away; I can't talk loud."

By the time Orna got off the phone, even the manager had noticed that the man was behaving oddly. He was about to buy an Indiana Jones hat and whip for the boy, so Orna suggested to the manager that she try to get a name when he paid.

The manager asked, "May I have your name and phone number?" Before the man could stop him, the boy gave a name—Richard—and a number.

"What do you want that for?" the man asked suspiciously.

The manager was very clever. "You are buying a whip," she replied. "It's like a weapon, so we need a name and number for our records."

Now Orna felt some relief; at least she had a name and a phone number. When the pair left the store, she suggested that the manager follow and get a car license number too, which the woman did. Then Orna went into the back office and called the number the boy had given her.

A woman answered. "I was very emotional," Orna says. "My hands were trembling. I was crying. I didn't want to scare her; I didn't want her to misunderstand and think her son was dead or something, so I said, 'I'm, sorry, but I was at the movies. Do you have a son named Richard?'—I gave the name the boy had said."

The woman replied no, that her son was named —. Orna was confused—whose name had the boy given?—but she went on: "I was at the movies, and your son was molested throughout the movie."

The woman became very upset and asked Orna a string of questions: "Where is he now? Can I see you? Can I talk to you?"

Orna just repeated, "I wanted you to know that I was there and I saw it."

The mother protested, "But that man is his Uncle Richard." (Aha, Orna realized, the boy had given the man's name. * * *) He took my son to the movies for his eleventh birthday. * * *

Just then, at long last, the police walked into the magic store. Orna was finally able to make her report, and the police told her the man would be apprehended when he took the boy home.

"I was still so upset," she remembers. I couldn't breathe properly, I couldn't take a regular breath. I was in the army for three years, but nothing had ever been this hard for me. Oh, it was a terrible thing to see," she says, closing her eyes at the memory.

But now it was over. She had gone as far as she could go. She had told the police. She had told the mother. Now no one could say it wasn't true.

"Then I took my two babies and went to my car," she says. "I couldn't wait to get

there. I just wanted to sit in my car with them for a while." Her children were frightened; they had thought she was crying because their car had been stolen. "I had to tell them what had happened," says Orna. "They wouldn't let go of me until I did, I reminded them of what they'd been told at school: that no one else was supposed to touch their privates. Then I told them what the man had done."

The children were shocked. Her daughter asked what would happen to the man.

"He will probably go to jail," Orna said. "Isn't that sad?" asked Shana.

"No," Orna reassured her, "they will help him there."

When Orna returned home, there was a message from the police on her answering machine. The message was very short. It went: "Thanks to your efforts, you've saved the life of a little boy. The man has been arrested."

Orna remembers feeling very high, but also scared. "It wasn't that I had done all that and nothing came of it—the man had been arrested. But I started having flashbacks, and in my mind I saw my own son having that happen to him."

She agreed to testify against "Uncle" Richard, a registered sex offender, now charged with nine new counts of child molestation. In court, she met the boy's parents and learned that Richard had been a trusted family friend who helped with carpools and babysitting. He had been molesting the boy and his older brother for about three years. She was told that the boys had been placed in therapy immediately. She also learned that the movie theater manager never had called the police. "The manager had a theater full of customers," say Orna, still angry at the thought. "He didn't want a scene." (The theater management later sent her some complimentary tickets, but she returned them.)

The boy's mother invited Orna to come home for lunch during the court's noon break. Once there, the woman called to her younger son, "Come meet the lady who saved your life * * *"

"The whole family was very open about it," says Orna. "I admired them; they were so honest. They appreciated what I did * * *. Instead of just sending me a bouquet of flowers, the mother wanted to be close. We still call each other."

So, what started out as a horror story had a true happy ending. But for Orna, this story provided not just an ending, but a beginning.

Aside from five years as a part time volunteer at a local hospital, Orna had never done anything outside her home. Even after 18 years in America, she didn't feel comfortable expressing herself in English, her second language. "I never worked since I married my prince; I never got myself out of this package deal I got myself into," she says.

Needless to say, she never did public speaking. Whenever she even thought about speaking in front of people she didn't know, she blushed so red she glowed.

But now, suddenly, this quiet little housewife was famous. A heroine! The police department honored her with a citizen's recognition award. This led to publicity, newspaper articles, and an invitation to address the Julia Ann Singer Center, a community treatment center for children and families in Los Angeles.

"There I was," says Orna, talking in front of all the therapists and Ph.D.s." She was terrified. "Who the hell am I?" she wondered. "I'm nobody with the authority to speak. But I just told them what happened, and they gave me a standing ovation."

The talk at the Singer Center was important, but it was the day that Orna received the award from the chief of police that permanently changed her view of herself. "All of a sudden I wasn't just a wife, a mother, a friend," she says. "I had done something that outsiders noticed. I was recognized! I felt taller, bigger, stronger than I thought I ever could be.

"People called, they sent notes. I have been thanked by everybody: the police, the county supervisors, the city council, the state assembly, the district attorney, the district this, the district that. . . ."

She pulls the awards down from the shelves in her den—the plaques, certificates, framed letters, and laminated newspaper clippings, all adorned with brass and seals and calligraphy and fancy signatures, and lines them up on a seven-foot sofa until they cover the cushions.

What the awards said to her, Siegel realizes now, was: You are capable. You can do something. You can save a life. "I grabbed these awards," she says with a smile. "I said thank you, and I just grabbed them."

Then she went out and started doing things; the awards had triggered more than feelings, they had triggered action. She helps with fund raising for the charity Yad Byad ("hand in hand"), an organization that takes sick people from Israel to wherever in the world they can get the medical care they need—transplants, surgeries, emergency treatment. "With 24 hours' notice, we can organize a dinner, a luncheon, an auction * * * whatever it takes to get the money to handle the emergency," she says proudly.

Her other new activities also revolve around charitable fund raising, and they all require that she speak up and speak out.

It is so easy to make a difference in the lives of others, Orna says in amazement. She often wonders why she had never done anything like this before. "I was not involved," she says. "I was nothing. I was blah. Now I'm someone who changes things for the better. Sure, the changes are tiny in the larger scheme of things, but it feels so good."

At a recent Yad Byad fundraiser dinner for which Orna was a primary organizer, an 11-year-old boy made a speech. He told how a bone marrow transplant paid for by Yad Byad had cured his leukemia. "He got up in front of the 350 guests," Siegel recalls, "and we were all crying. And he said, * * *" Siegel stops and looks away in an attempt to compose herself, but her eyes fill with tears anyway. "And he said to us, 'You saved my life'."

CLINTON POLICIES ON HUMAN RIGHTS MARRED BY INCONSISTENCY, FLIP-FLOPS, WEAKNESS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is particularly fitting that the first hearing of the new Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, which was held last February 2, was for the purpose of receiving and beginning to analyze the 1994 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices.

The subcommittee, which I chair, is an amalgamation of two Foreign Affairs subcommittees from the previous Congress. In addition to our substantial legislative respon-

sibilities, including the crafting of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, last week's proceeding marked the beginning of an extensive series of hearings, briefings, and reports by the Subcommittee on Human Rights and humanitarian concerns around the globe.

I am delighted to have my good friend TOM LANTOS serving as ranking member of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights. Previously, TOM had chaired the Subcommittee on National Security, International Organizations, and Human Rights and was eminently fair, consistent, and effective. During my 15 years in Congress, I have had the privilege to fight alongside TOM in numerous human rights battles from Romania to the former U.S.S.R. to the People's Republic of China.

It is my intention and sincere hope to leave no stone unturned in the attempt to expose, scrutinize, and seek remedies for man's inhumanity to man, wherever and however it occurs. In like manner, our subcommittee will endeavor to recognize and encourage improvements in human rights practices. Above all, I will insist that objectivity, fairness, and the pursuit of trust be at the core of our work.

In the weeks and months ahead, the subcommittee will explore policy options designed to mitigate the seemingly endless suffering and abuse endured by so many.

In my view, the Country Reports are among the most important work the Department of State does. They allow the United States Government an opportunity to bear witness, to reassert fundamental principles, and also to examine its own conscience about whether its foreign policy comports with these principles.

Mr. Speaker, let me make some general observations about human rights.

First, the very idea of human rights presupposes that certain rights are fundamental, universal, and inalienable: they are too important to be taken away or circumscribed by governments.

Second, the United States has a commitment to human rights that is unique in the history of the world. It is no accident that the signers of our Declaration of Independence rested their resistance to tyranny not on tradition, self-interest, or the balance of power, but on the conviction that all human beings are "endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights." More recently, President Ronald Reagan reminded us that it is the destiny of the United States to be a "shining city on a hill," a living monument to the idea of freedom.

Human rights are indivisible, mutually reinforcing, and all-inclusive. Human rights cannot be abridged on account of race, color, creed, gender, age, or condition of dependency. Inclusiveness means everyone, and perhaps especially the inconvenient: the unborn child, or the dissent, or the believer in another religious tradition.

The right to life, religion, speech, assembly, and due process are the pillars of a free, sane, and compassionate society. The moral character and depth of soul of any society is measured not by its military might, technological prowess, athletic excellence or GDP, but on how well or poorly it treats its weakest and most vulnerable members.

It is particularly ironic that the subordination of human rights to other concerns, such as trade, immigration control, or congenial relations with other governments, is often justified on the ground that these are U.S. interests. This formulation misses the point: the most important U.S. interest is the promotion of freedom and of decency. We are strong enough and prosperous enough that we have no need to accept blood money, or to send refugees back to persecution, or to seek our alliances among regimes that murder and torture their own people.

Immediately prior to Thursday's hearing I received portions of the reports and had the opportunity to read the findings concerning about 10 countries. I have some reservations concerning certain portions of the reports, which I would like to state briefly.

First, I hope that in the State Department's effort to keep pace with what it calls "the changing nature of human rights problems," you do not lose sight of the fact that some rights are fundamental. Every year the reports seem to tell us more about the extent to which various societies have developed such institutions as collective bargaining and one-person-one-vote democracy. I do not mean to suggest that these things are not important. They are. They tell us much about a society. However, we must not allow their presence or absence to deflect attention from extrajudicial killing, torture, and imprisonment on account of religious or political beliefs.

Second, and even more troubling, on some issues in some countries the 1994 reports seem to acknowledge, yet minimize, human rights abuses. In a few cases the reports seem almost to suggest excuses or justifications for such abuses. At least three instances of this forgiving approach involve cases in which the foreign policy of the present administration has also given too little attention to egregious and well-documented human rights abuses. I refer to the harsh measures taken by the Chinese Government against those, especially women, who resist its coercive population control program, and by both China and Cuba against people who try to escape from these countries.

Finally, the reports raise deep concerns about the half-hearted and inconsistent human rights policy of the present administration. On ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and the brutal killings in Chechnya, the reports fully state the extent of the human rights abuses. Unfortunately, the administration has not given sufficient weight to these abuses in formulating its policy toward the nations in question. Human rights appears not to have been the primary concern.

CHINA: FORCED ABORTION AND STERILIZATION

The 1994 report acknowledges that forced abortions have been reported in China. Indeed, it acknowledges that "most people still depend on their government-linked work unit for permission to have a child," and that the "highly intrusive one-child family planning policy * * * relies on * * * propaganda, and economic incentives, as well as more coercive measures including psychological pressure and economic penalties * * * [including] fines, withholding of social services, demotion, and other administrative punishments such as loss of employment * * *". The report also clearly

states that "penalties for excess births can be levied against local officials and the mothers' work units * * * providing multiple sources of pressure * * *"

The report, however, then seems to accept blindly and uncritically the Chinese Government's oft-stated lie that "physical compulsion to submit to abortion or sterilization is not authorized" by the government. This is the same story the Chinese Government has been telling for years. The 1994 report also continues—as in past years—to suggest that the one-child policy is not even enforced in rural areas of the country. This ignores the 1991 country-wide tightening of enforcement of the coercive population control program. The pervasive use of forced abortion and sterilization, particularly since 1991, has been well documented by demographers, dissidents, journalists, and human rights activists. Most recently, a series of articles in the *New York Times* in April 1993 showed clearly that forced abortion in China is not rare, not limited to economic coercion or social pressure, not confined only to urban areas or to certain parts of the country, and definitely not unauthorized by those in power.

The report, as in past years, also seems to excuse the excesses of the brutal People's Republic of China policy by pointing with alarm to the size of China's population and with evident approval to the general thrust of the regime's effort to minimize population growth.

Forced abortion was properly construed to be a crime against humanity at the Nuremberg war trials. Today it is employed with chilling effectiveness and unbearable pain upon women in the People's Republic of China. Women in China are required to obtain a birth coupon before conceiving a child. Chinese women are hounded by the population control police, and even their menstrual cycles are publicly monitored as one means of ensuring compliance. The 1993 *New York Times* articles pointed out that the People's Republic of China authorities, when they discover an unauthorized pregnancy—that is, an illegal child—normally apply a daily dose of threats and browbeating. They wear the woman down and eventually, if she does not succumb, she is physically forced to have the abortion.

The 1994 report also barely mentions the brutal eugenics policy under which the People's Republic of China regime has undertaken to reduce the number of defective persons. In December 1993 the Chinese Government issued a draft law on eugenics that would nationalize discrimination against the handicapped. That law is now going into effect. This policy of forced abortions against handicapped children, and forced sterilization against parents who simply do not measure up in the eyes of the state, is eerily reminiscent of Nazi Germany.

CHINA: REPRISALS AGAINST FORCED REPATRIATES

The report on China also states that escapees who are forcibly repatriated "are often detained for a short time to determine identity and any past criminal record or involvement with smuggling activities." The report adds that "[a]s a deterrent and to recover local costs incurred during the repatriation, the authorities in some areas levy a fine of \$1,000 or more on returnees."

This appears to be a deliberate attempt to put government reprisals against escapees in the most favorable possible light—perhaps because these reprisals have frequently been conducted against people who were forcibly repatriated by the United States Government. The report fails to mention that a \$1,000 fine amounts to several times the per capita income in rural areas of China. A fine of this amount is a clear indication that the People's Republic of China regime regards these people as its enemies, not as routine offenders. Nor does the report say what happens to people who are unable to pay these oppressive fines. Newspaper reports during 1993 state that hundreds of people repatriated by the United States have been imprisoned for more than a brief period and have been forced to serve on prison work gangs. The report does not say whether any of these people remained incarcerated during 1994.

CUBA: MASSACRES OF PEOPLE ATTEMPTING TO ESCAPE

Similarly, the report on Cuba describes two well-documented instances in which the Cuban border guard deliberately killed people who were trying to flee the country. These are the sinking of the *Olympia* and of the *13th of March*. The report goes on to state, however, that there have been no reports of such killings since the September 9 Clinton-Castro immigration agreement. The reports do not state how we would know whether such killings have taken place since the agreement, or what steps—if any—we have taken to make sure they do not. Rather, it leaves the clear impression—without any supporting evidence—that the Castro regime quickly changed its ways upon signing the agreement.

OTHER COUNTRIES: DISCONNECT BETWEEN HUMAN RIGHTS CONCERNS AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

I have already stated my concern about the incongruity between the well-documented human rights abuses in Bosnia and Chechnya and our policies toward those countries. The 1994 reports confirm the atrocities in these countries: In Bosnia, concentration camps, routine torture, and rape as an instrument of government policy; in Chechnya, the killing of thousands of civilians and the destruction of hospitals and an orphanage. The director of the Washington office of Amnesty International has commented that the administration's policy toward Chechnya amounted to giving Russia a green light to commit the brutality that is so well documented by the report. I raised this same concern last month to an administration official who testified before the Helsinki Commission, which I chair. He dismissed it out of hand. This is part of an unfortunate pattern: After an initial period of encouraging rhetoric, the Clinton administration's human rights record has been marked by broken promises, weakness, retreat, inconsistency, and missed opportunities.

There is a similar incongruity between the administration's new friendship with the Government of North Korea and the 1994 report about the situation on the ground in that country. This is a rogue government that not only detains an estimated 150,000 political prisoners in concentration camps, but, also kidnaps citizens of other nations and causes them to disappear. The reports also state that "Political prisoners, opponents of the regime, repatriated defectors, and others * * * have

been summarily executed." This is the regime to which the administration, amid much self-congratulation, recently arranged a \$4 billion multilateral aid package.

Other abuses, well documented in the 1994 reports, to which our Government's response has been inadequate or nonexistent include the "extrajudicial executions, torture, and reprisal killings" by Indian security forces fighting separatist insurgents in Kashmir, and the brutal persecution of Christian missionaries and others by the Government of Sudan.

CONCLUSION

Future country condition reports will be far more useful to Congress, to the executive, and to the American people if they take care never to understate the extent of human rights abuses—especially when a thorough and honest account of such abuses might compel the reconsideration of United States Government policy toward the perpetrators. We must also work together to ensure that these reports are not just published and then forgotten. Rather, they must be regarded by those who conduct our foreign relations as an indispensable guidebook for a foreign policy worthy of the United States.

HISTORY STANDARDS ARE BUNK

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit an article from the February 6, 1995, *U.S. News & World Report* entitled "History Standards Are Bunk," to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HISTORY STANDARDS ARE BUNK

A funny thing happened to the National History Standards on their way to a famous forum: They were denounced by the United States Senate by a vote of 99 to 1.

This is a major turning point in the debate. The standards are, as Washington Sen. Slade Gorton said, a "perverse" document, loaded up with crude anti-Western and anti-Americans propaganda, but until now, the authors of this mess have been able to pose as bewildered moderates, set upon by a pack of crazed right-wingers.

A new spin will be needed now that the pack of irrational right-wingers includes Ted Kennedy, Carol Moseley-Braun and the entire Senate.

During a debate on other legislation, Gorton introduced an amendment to pull the plug on funds for the history standards. That probably would have passed fairly easily in a closer vote. But several senators were queasy about pre-empting other concerned groups, including the nation's governors, who have led the effort to set voluntary standards. So a "sense of the Senate" condemnation was voted on instead and passed without dissent. Even the one "No" vote, by Louisiana Democrat Bennett Johnston, was a "Yes" in disguise. He wanted stronger action than simple condemnation.

How do you get all 100 senators to repudiate your standards? Easy. Just do it the way the major perpetrators, historians Gary Nash and Charlotte Crabtree, did it at UCLA's National Center for History in the Schools. Start the standards with the "convergence" gambit: America is not a Western-

based nation but the result of three cultures (Indian, black and European) "converging." This subliminally puts the Founding Fathers, and whites in general, in their place as mere founders of a third of a nation.

TRASHING EUROPEAN CULTURE

Though two of these three founding cultures were preliterate, depict all three as equal in value and importance, except for the fact that European culture was worse and dedicated largely to oppression, injustice, gender bias and rape of the natural world.

Carry this theme through, trampling moderate opinion to the point where Albert Shanker of the American Federation of Teachers says: "No other nation in the world teaches a national history that leaves its children feeling negative about their own country—this would be the first."

Connecticut Sen. Joseph Lieberman took up this theme in the Senate debate, calling the standards "a terrific disappointment." We don't need "sanitized history," he said, but we certainly don't need to give our children "a warped and negative view" of America and the West, either.

How did these standards get to be so bad? After all, historians and teachers of all political persuasions (and none) took part in the discussions. But most of the power, and control of the drafting process, stayed in the hands of academics with a heavy ideological agenda.

Earl Bell, head of the Organization of History Teachers, and one of four K-through-12 teachers on the panel, felt run over by the ideological academics. He hates the view of the cold war in the standards as a clash that wasn't really about anything, just a quarrel between what he called "equally imperialistic nations." The companion World History Standards, he says are even worse, "unrelentingly anti-Western."

The fiasco over the American and Western history standards is a reflection of what has happened to the world of academic history. The profession and the American Historical Association are now dominated by younger historians with a familiar agenda: Take the West down a peg, romanticize "the Other" (non-whites), treat all cultures as equal, refrain from criticizing non-white cultures.

The romanticizing of "the Other" is most clearly seen in the current attempt to portray American Indian cultures as unremittingly noble, mystical, gender-fair, peace-loving and living in great harmony with nature. All the evidence that doesn't fit is more or less ignored. The premise of the exercise makes it profoundly dishonest and propagandistic.

In the World History Standards, as Senator Lieberman noted in the Senate, slavery is only mentioned twice, and both times as practices of white cultures: in ancient Greece and in the Atlantic slave trade. The long and well-documented worldwide slave trade, including Muslim and black slave traders, is not mentioned. It doesn't fit the agenda.

History textbooks, curricula and museum displays are becoming the carriers of the broad assault against American and Western culture. The same kind of gratuitous touches that turned up in the Enola Gay exhibit text (e.g., Japanese brave and noble, Americans racist and destructive) show up in many other Smithsonian exhibits now, and, to nobody's surprise, in the proposed history standards, too.

Don't be fooled by the argument that these standards are voluntary and nonbinding. So not much is at stake. Over 10,000 copies have already been distributed, and textbook pub-

lishers are poised to make them the basis of new texts. Any approval of these standards by a public body would give them more momentum. They are beyond salvage and need to be junked.

SO YOU WANT TO BE A DOCTOR

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, almost every-one today agrees that our health care system requires some reform and that encouraging more young people to choose a career in medicine, particularly primary care medicine, is a critical element of that reform.

One family physician in my district, Dr. Fred Hurst, is proving that we can pursue this goal without relying on the heavy hand of the Federal Government to set quotas for various medical specialties.

Last year, Dr. Hurst started a program called FutrDOCS, which enables talented high school students interested in medicine to get first-hand experience working with patients at St. Mary's Medical Center in Knoxville.

These students have the opportunity to observe and participate in various different types of treatments, from prenatal care to helping heart attack victims recover to complicated surgeries. This unique experience not only provides them with valuable insight into a potential future career, but also benefits the patients at St. Mary's, who clearly enjoy having them around.

FutrDOCS has been such an unqualified success that numerous other hospitals, both in Tennessee and across the country, are designing similar programs of their own. In my view, FutrDOCS is a perfect example of what enterprising individuals who care enough to make a difference can do without turning to the Federal Government to solve all of our problems for us.

I commend to my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD the following article describing the FutrDOCS program, which appeared in the Knoxville News-Sentinel's Sunday magazine on Christmas Day.

SO YOU WANT TO BE A DOCTOR

(By Michael Ryan)

When I was in high school, I wanted to be a doctor," Fred Hurst told me. "But nobody in my family had ever been a physician, and I lived in a small town about 40 miles from Knoxville." Hurst wanted to learn more about what a doctor does, but he was stymied. "To gain entry to the local hospital, I had to join the Future Nurses' Club," he recalled. "I decided then that, if I ever had the chance, I would start a program to interest young people in primary care."

Encouraged by his parents, Hurst went to college, then medical school. Last year, at age 46, Dr. Hurst fulfilled the commitment he'd made as a youth. The need, as he saw it, was obvious: Only about one-third of the doctors in America today are primary-care physicians; almost two-thirds are specialists. The federal government and the American Medical Association agree that at least half of our physicians should be primary-care doctors. But four-fifths of today's medical students are planning to specialize, which will make the imbalance even worse.

"We had to show young people that they can have a gratifying future in service to their fellow humans—and handle 95 percent of the ailments of their patients—as primary-care physicians," said Hurst.

His solution was FutrDOCS, a program that brings talented high school juniors and seniors into St. Mary's Medical Center in Knoxville, where he is chief of staff. They see what doctors actually do and later serve in summer internships, where they "shadow" primary-care physicians in all of the many tasks doctors perform.

Last year, Trang Nguyen, 18, helped administer a sonogram at St. Mary's after Annette Neubert, a pregnant patient who is also a nurse, encouraged her to try her hand at the painless, risk-free procedure. Nguyen handled the sophisticated equipment as if she had performed the procedure before. "Can you find the baby's head?" asked Dr. Paula Peeden, 36, an obstetrician/gynecologist. The student expertly located the tiny head moving back and forth deep within Neubert's womb.

"Have you chosen a name yet?" Nguyen asked with an easy bedside manner. "Courtney," Neubert said with a smile.

Since FutrDOCS began last year, 125 students have completed the program. This year, about 70 Knoxville-area students took part. Each participating high school nominates four outstanding students, based on their academic record, their interest in pursuing a career in medicine and their desire to help people. FutrDOCS is funded solely by St. Mary's Medical Center.

I went to St. Mary's on a day when eight FutrDOCS were visiting. I was surprised to learn that these young people saw all sides of the medical practice—its failures and limits as well as its successes. They accompanied Dr. Hurst on his rounds, meeting a heart-attack victim headed for full recovery but also seeing a man who had been left semi-comatose and incoherent by a stroke, beyond the help of modern medicine. In an operating room, they watched surgeons struggle to repair the body of a drunk driver with a damaged kidney, pelvis, bladder and spleen. "Medicine isn't always glamorous," FutrDOC Emily Herbert, 17, a senior at Karns High School in Knoxville, told me after that experience. "But ultimately it's about helping people."

The patients seem to enjoy having the teenagers around. "Without a doubt," said Dr. Hurst, "the patients are thrilled to be visited by and see the concern of these students." Diane Holloway, the surgical nursing supervisor at St. Mary's, also thinks highly of FutrDOCS—even though it obliges her to shoehorn visitors into her crowded operating rooms. "It's good for them to get this kind of experience early," she said.

Students in the program also learn what doctors think. The group sat down for a meeting with Dr. Douglas Leahy, 46, an internist who began his medical career the hard way—as an orderly at St. Mary's 30 years ago. Doctors make a decent income, but there are a lot of things you can make a lot of more money in," he told the students. "Medicine is an opportunity to be a part of people's lives. You can make their lives better. I think that's what drives most doctors."

FutrDOCS offers students a chance to see what they, as tomorrow's physicians, might want to do with their own careers. "It helped me to focus," said Mark Buckingham, 18, now a freshman at Notre Dame. For Trang Nguyen, FutrDOCS provided insight into a long-cherished dream. "I came to this country when I was 5, from Vietnam," she said.

"It was my parents' dream that I become a doctor, and that was a challenge to me. This has helped me discover that I really want to be a pediatrician. I just love kids," Nguyen, now 19, is a freshman at the University of Tennessee.

Fred Hurst has received at least 100 inquiries about the program from more than 35 states. Next year, 15 additional schools in suburban and rural areas of Tennessee will join FutrDOCS. Institutions in New York and Pennsylvania, as well as several Tennessee medical centers, may start their own programs. "My goal is to expand this program throughout the nation," said Dr. Hurst.

Early in my visit, Bryce Bowling, a FutrDOC, approached me to say how terrific he thought the program was. Bowling, 18, is now a freshman at the University of Tennessee. "My dad has had two surgeries on his heart," he told me. "I owe a debt to medicine. Doctors saved his life." That, I realized, was the greatest thing FutrDOCS has to offer young people: It shows them a way to give something back.

IN HONOR OF JOHN T. BRENNAN
WHO WAS RECOGNIZED BY IRELAND 32

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate John T. Brennan who was being honored by Ireland 32 at a dinner. He has been and continues to be an outstanding citizen. As fire chief of the Bayonne Fire Department he has served his community with much bravery and determination.

Mr. Brennan is the son of two Irish immigrants, Michael and Mary Brennan. He is married to the former Meg Connolly with whom he raised six children. They are also the proud grandparents of 13 grandchildren. Mr. Brennan joined the Bayonne Fire Department on December 18, 1943 and has served proudly and courageously for 45 years.

Mr. Brennan always put the lives of the people ahead of his own. His heroic deeds are hallmarks of his career. When I think of heroism I am reminded of the time that Mr. Brennan risked his life when he ran through an inferno of flames after a propane storage plant had exploded. He managed to reach the propane gas valve that was feeding the fire while his firefighters were using high powered hoses to water him down.

Mr. Brennan was the youngest firefighter, at the age of 38, to be named fire chief in Bayonne and in the State of New Jersey. In February 1974 he was named Irishman of the Year for the 12th annual Hudson County St. Patrick's Day Parade in Jersey City. Also he received a service award for making it possible to speedily apprehend criminals by the Bayonne Police Department.

Mr. Brennan has been a faithful member of St. Vincent's Parish and a member of the 3d and 4th Degree of the Knights of Columbus. He is also a member of several associations such as the New Jersey Paid Fire Chiefs Association, the National Fire Protection Association, the Hudson Country Fire Chief's Association

and the New Jersey State Exempt Fireman's Association just to name a few.

Mr. Brennan has served his community with much courage and bravery. His valor and dedication is appreciated by the citizens of Bayonne. I am proud to have him as a constituent. I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring this great and brave man.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FIRE-
FIGHTERS PAY FAIRNESS ACT
OF 1995

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as a dedicated member and former chairman of the fire services caucus, I am proud to introduce the Firefighters Pay Fairness Act of 1995.

Mr. Speaker, every day over 10,000 Federal firefighters around the country put their lives on the line to protect our lives and property. They work exhausting shifts and take on the greatest of physical and mental challenges. We have an obligation to properly compensate them for their work.

For far too long, our Federal firefighters have received significantly inadequate pay for their hard work. Under the present system, Federal firefighters work over 25 percent more hours a week, yet earn nearly 44 percent less per hour than the average municipal firefighter. Furthermore, the average Federal firefighter is also paid significantly less per hour than their Federal employee counterparts.

Mr. Speaker, Federal firefighters currently work an average of 72 hours, while their municipal counterparts work an average of 50 hours. Meanwhile, Federal firefighters are paid an average hourly rate of \$7.34, while the municipal firefighters earn an average of \$12.88.

I introduced this legislation to correct the inequities that exist under the present system. This is not an issue about rewarding firefighters for their hard work. Moreover, this should not be viewed as a complimentary pay raise. Rather, this is an issue surrounding fairness comparability. These firefighters work endless work days, put their lives on the line for our constituents, and deserve to have a fair and equitable pay system.

This bill does nothing more than seek fair and equal pay rates for Federal firefighters. It will employ the existing statutory provisions of the Federal general schedule pay system to compute their hourly pay. Thus, Federal firefighters will earn equal pay as compared to their Federal employee counterparts. It also seeks to pay all firefighters, including those who are not defined solely as Federal firefighters, including forestry technicians. These forestry firefighters have braved the brushfires in California and throughout the West over the past several years and thus, deserve adequate compensation.

Mr. Speaker, far too many Federal firefighters have had to work under the inequitable pay system that we presently have. Moreover, upon completion of their required training, many Federal firefighters leave for the private sector where they can earn a larger

salary. Thus, this lengthy, expensive training process goes for naught when a firefighter leaves the Federal fire system. It is our duty and responsibility to both those firefighters and the people they protect and serve, to reverse the ills of this system. We should not let another day go by where our Federal firefighters are put in an unfair position as compared to other municipal firefighters and Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will join with me in support of this legislation to replace the present inequities of this pay system with a fair, comparable pay structure for our Federal firefighters.

DEATH OF DR. RAYMOND C.
BUSHLAND

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, it was with the most profound regret that I learned recently of the death of my long-time colleague and dear friend, Dr. Raymond Bushland. For decades, I have had both the pleasure and privilege of working with Dr. Bushland in his capacity as a senior research scientist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. During his long and distinguished career, Dr. Bushland's prodigious research armed the battle against insect-borne diseases of humans, animals, and plants, thereby making a significant contribution to human health and nutrition worldwide.

The internationally acclaimed screwworm eradication program will be a lasting tribute both to him and his friend and colleague Dr. E.F. Knipping. The most successful research program in USDA's history, it was a pioneering effort among Federal and State officials, producers, and the private sector to eliminate a serious scourge.

During his 38-year career with USDA, he was the author of over 70 scientific papers on the biology and control of insects, and pioneered numerous insect research methods. Dr. Bushland was a member of several scientific societies and received many honors and awards including: the USA Typhus Commission Medal, the gold medal of the National Hide Association, the Distinguished Service Award of the Texas, and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, and Progressive Farmer magazine honored him as Man of the Year in service of southern agriculture. He was jointly recognized, with Dr. Knipping, with the Hoblitzelle National Award in 1960 and the John F. Scott Medal in 1961. Also in 1992, Dr. Knipping and Dr. Bushland were awarded the World Food Prize. The USDA Agricultural Research Service's U.S. Livestock Insects Research Laboratory in Kerrville, TX bears his name.

Our prayers and those of all who knew or worked with him are with his family and many friends during this period of mourning.

FEDS SHOULD LET STATES
HANDLE ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, more and more people across this Nation are voicing their vehement opposition to the Federal Government's continued intrusion upon their individual rights. Leading this authoritarian onslaught upon the public are the cumbersome and often frivolous regulatory actions that have become part of our environmental policy. These regulations have become so pernicious that they actually prevent any sensible or rational interpretation/implementation of our environmental laws. This does not, however, have to be the case.

The following article by a Tucson, AZ resident, Mr. Hugh Holub, illustrates the absurdity of some of these regulations. But Mr. Holub also touches upon a key element to any prudent environmental strategy: That we must have confidence in and trust the local people to protect the environment in which they live.

The article appeared in the Tucson Citizen on January 30, 1995.

FEDS SHOULD LET STATES HANDLE
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

(By Hugh Holub)

The rapidly spreading revolt against federal environmental regulation being led by state governors such as Fife Symington is not an attempt to degrade our environment.

State and local governments are seeking the opportunity to prioritize risks so limited financial resources can be applied to obtain the maximum public benefit, and to fashion their own ways to accomplish environmental goals without being told how to do it by Washington.

The greatest threat to our environment today is not the Republican Congress, or state governors fed up with unfunded federal mandates. The greatest threat is the federal regulatory system itself, which has lost sight of the relationship between cause and effect, which bases regulatory mandates on junk science, which ignores the human and economic consequences of regulatory mandates, and which increasingly demands specific actions that strain the credibility and pocketbooks of the public.

The Endangered Species Act is probably the most controversial expression of federal power yet devised in Washington. Recently, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service proposed the listing of the pygmy owl as an endangered species, and proposed various urban rivers in Phoenix and Tucson as "habitat recovery areas."

Included as a "habitat recovery" area in Tucson is the Santa Cruz River flood plain from the I-19 bridge to the Avra Valley Road bridge. What this means is that federal mandates will follow, if the pygmy owl is listed, to prevent groundwater pumping in Phoenix and Tucson and the restoration of riparian forests along the Salt and Santa Cruz Rivers.

Since the time of the Hohokam Indians, there probably hasn't been a riparian area along the Salt and Santa Cruz rivers through Phoenix and Tucson because the rivers were diverted for agricultural uses and the flood plains were irrigated. However, since these rivers theoretically could become habitats for the owls, the federal government claims

the authority to make us re-create habitat for the owls, notwithstanding the absurdity of the goal, and the cost.

It is also very arguable that there is no credible scientific evidence that pygmy owls normally lived in these areas, at least according to the Arizona Game and Fish Department.

Since the listing argument is based on the need for forests to provide nesting sites for the owls, it is conveniently ignored that there are more trees on the valley floors of the Salt River valley and the Santa Cruz River valley today than since the end of the last ice age. However, these trees are on residential lots, in city parks, and around commercial and industrial properties and thus aren't "natural."

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has, by their interpretation of the Endangered Species Act, the power to play God, and restore habitats for what they believe to be endangered. There is obviously a not so hidden agenda with the pygmy owl listing, as the target really is to usurp state water law.

One of the elements of the habitat recovery program is the limitation of groundwater pumping in the valleys of the Salt and Santa Cruz rivers. All of this conveniently ignores—at least in the Tucson area—recent changes to Pima County's flood control laws to protect riparian areas, and serious proposals to restore river flows with CAP water for recharge projects.

According to one of the advocates of the listing of the pygmy owl, protecting this owl under the Endangered Species Act is the last, best chance to save the owl. Like the state and local governments can't do more and better to restore riparian areas without having the Endangered Species Act used as a club to beat Arizona's management of water into submission.

The message to be gleaned from the growing conflict over federal environmental regulation is that while the overwhelming majority of Americans support protection of the environment, we do not want to sacrifice our homes and our jobs to federal environmental mandates.

We want a balance—a win-win solution. We want environmental protection and economic prosperity. We haven't been able to get that from the federal level of government.

Besides being governor of the state of Arizona, Fife Symington is also a serious trout fisherman. He shares a brotherhood and sisterhood of people who really go out into the environment, and who appreciate the spiritual value wild places give us.

Symington is every bit as much an environmentalist as any federal official. The salient difference, which is the bedrock of the revolution that is growing in America today, is that Fife and a lot of people such as him—Republican and Democrat—have confidence in local people being able to protect the environments they live in and depend on without someone in Washington telling them how to do it.

AMERICAN FARM PROTECTION
ACT OF 1995

HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am joined today by several of my colleagues, including

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ENGLISH, in introducing legislation to provide an election to exclude from the gross estate of a decedent the value of certain land subject to a qualified conservation easement, and to make technical changes to the alternative valuation rules.

The bill, to be titled "American Farm Protection Act of 1995," offers direct relief from the burden of the Federal estate tax to the families of the owners of these farms and other rural families, while insuring the future agricultural use of their land.

The best caretakers of America's land are the farm and ranch families who have owned and cared for it for generations. Once these families are displaced from their land, no amount of regulation or tax spending can replace their productive stewardship of the land. According to "The Second RCA Appraisal," published by the Department of Agriculture in 1989,

1.5 million acres of agricultural land, most of them prime farmland, are irreversibly removed from production and converted to nonagricultural use each year.

The problem is especially acute near metropolitan areas. Here development pressure has caused the value of farm and ranch land to escalate dramatically over the past several decades. Yet this is some of our most productive agricultural land.

An important factor contributing to the displacement of America's farm and ranch families is the Federal estate tax. That is because rural land is valued for estate tax purposes, not necessarily at a value representing its actual rural use as a farm, but at its potential value as development property. The tax can force families to sell land on which they have lived and made their living, sometimes for generations. Once farm and ranch families are gone the cycle of speculation, sprawl development, and overregulation often takes over.

The bill removes this problem for America's rural families and lets them do what they can do better than anyone else: take care of the land. For rural landowners who voluntarily and permanently provide for the commitment of their land to rural uses through the donation of a qualified conservation easement, the act will exempt that land from the Federal estate tax.

The concept embodied in the bill has been endorsed by the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Farmers Union, as well as many other local, regional, State, and national forestry and land conservation organizations. We welcome other Congressmen as cosponsors of this legislation.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose

of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, February 9, 1995, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 10

9:00 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on the national drug control strategy. SD-226

9:30 a.m.
Budget
To hold hearings on the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Defense. SD-608

10:00 a.m.
Small Business
To hold hearings on the future of the Small Business Administration. SR-428A

FEBRUARY 14

9:00 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine Federal crime control priorities. SD-226

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine how to reduce excessive government regulation of agriculture and agribusiness. SR-332

Armed Services
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense plan, focusing on the military strategies and operational requirements of the unified commands. SR-222

Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1996 for Indian programs. SR-485

2:30 p.m.
Environment and Public Works
Water Resources, Transportation, Public Buildings, and Economic Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Water Resources Development Act and the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 1996 for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. SD-406

FEBRUARY 15

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for defense programs, focusing on Pacific issues. SD-116

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 1996 for the Forest Service. SD-366

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on S. 141, to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act of 1931 to provide new job opportunities, effect significant cost savings on federal construction contracts, promote small business participation in Federal contracting, and reduce unnecessary paperwork and reporting requirements. SD-430

2:00 p.m.
Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 1996 for the Environmental Protection Agency. SD-406

Judiciary
Antitrust, Business Rights, and Competition Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the court imposed major league baseball antitrust exemption. SD-226

FEBRUARY 16

9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1996 for Indian programs. SR-485

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for foreign assistance, focusing on U.S. policy toward Russia and the New Independent States. SD-192

Labor and Human Resources
Children and Families Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the effectiveness of the Federal child care and development block grant program. SD-430

2:00 p.m.
Small Business
To hold hearings on the small business owner's perspective on the Small Business Administration. SR-428A

FEBRUARY 23

2:00 p.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to examine the structure and funding of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. SR-485

MARCH 1

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the Disabled American Veterans. 345 Cannon Building

MARCH 2

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Transportation. SD-192

MARCH 7

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. 345 Cannon Building

10:00 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to review Federal programs which address the challenges facing Indian youth. SR-485

MARCH 9

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Transportation Safety Board. SD-192

MARCH 16

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation. SD-192

MARCH 23

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, and the National Passenger Railroad Corporation (Amtrak). SD-192

MARCH 30

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of AMVETS, American Ex-Prisoners of War, Vietnam Veterans of America, Blinded Veterans Association, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart. 345 Cannon Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation. SD-192

