

may be merit in the proposals of my distinguished friend from Illinois, but this amendment should be thoughtfully considered and evaluated, not presented as an amendment to this piece of legislation without proper reflection.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the amendment.

INTRODUCTION OF THE "BOXING SAFETY, RETIREMENT, AND RE-TRAINING ACT OF 1995"

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1995

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Boxing Safety, Retirement, and Re-training Act of 1995. This bill would create a Government corporation that would oversee the boxing industry, ensure that healthy working conditions exist, and eliminate the widespread corruption and exploitation that runs rampant within the sport. The bill places special emphasis on assuring the health and safety of boxers.

Boxers are never privileged individuals. They primarily are minorities from disadvantaged areas, easily susceptible to the unscrupulous business practices of boxing promoters. Traditionally, minority youth have viewed a boxing career as a way to leave behind a life of poverty and gain wealth and stability for themselves and their families.

Often these men have no other hope. They are poorly educated and face an inhospitable job market. Boxing promoters exploit the dreams of young boxers by promising lucrative careers. Once boxers enter the business, they surrender all control over their careers. They are used like property for the financial gain of others.

The industry is controlled by a few organizations, manipulated like puppets by a small number of immensely powerful promoters. In this equation, the boxer is powerless. He must play by their rules or not play at all. If he complains, he is not allowed to fight. If he speaks publicly about negative conditions, he faces banishment and an end to his financial support. If he wants to fight in title matches, he must sign contracts rife with clauses that direct money to the promoter's family and friends. This situation becomes especially problematic when the boxer has little education, might not speak English, and has no other financial resources.

The boxing industry might say that it is being unfairly singled out because the Government does not directly regulate any other professional sport. But the reason we do not directly regulate other sports is because we do not need to; they have proven over time that they can manage their own affairs. Through players' unions, most professional athletes have recourse against unfavorable working conditions. Golfers, bowlers, and baseball, football, and basketball players, all have an avenue that prevents them from being exploited. Boxers have none.

This bill is not the first attempt by Congress to get involved in an industry that cannot monitor itself. When working conditions became intolerable, the Federal Government stepped in and formed the Occupational Safety and

Health Administration [OSHA]. When financial transactions became suspect, the Securities and Exchange Commission [SEC] was created. When some States proved to be irresponsible on civil rights issues, the Federal Government initiated the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. The boxing industry has had over 100 years to get its act together, and it has failed. It is time for Congress to get involved.

Only a handful of States conduct oversight over boxing, and only a few of those do it effectively. Too often, State agencies have been co-opted by those with a financial interest in the sport. My bill would create an unbiased board whose members would be unable to reap monetary reward from the industry while serving. The board would be comprised of neurological specialists, average citizens, and a representative from the boxing world. The board's members would be given the responsibility of establishing minimum standards to which States must adhere. States with effective agencies would be able to maintain autonomy, but states with little or no oversight would be forced to improve.

Without this bill, the unconscionable practices of this sport will continue. Oversight responsibility will continue to be left to those individuals who have proven that greed is their motivating force. Unsuspecting minority youth will still be exploited. Boxers will never be able to voice objections to working conditions. And an elite group of promoters will keep becoming very, very rich.

I am in no way asking for a ban of the sport, just some oversight. Amateur boxing programs in neighborhoods have been successful in getting young people off the street and giving them confidence. It is the professional arena where the problems lie. For the sake of the young men involved and fostering the integrity of the sport, I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation.

OBSERVING THE FIFTH ANNUAL DAY OF THE AFRICAN CHILD

HON. FLOYD H. FLAKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1995

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to support the observance of the African Child on June 16, 1995.

I come to you today with this request simply because it only seems suitable, coming from a country that invests in human capital, that each and every Member should be able to look within their hearts and realize that the African, specifically the South African, child has been traumatized over the course of apartheid and the demoralization of Africa as a whole.

The Day of the African Child commemorates the June 16, 1976 massacre of school children in Soweto, South Africa. Since the original designation by the Organization of African Unity in 1991, it has become an event that has mobilized communities around the world to look at the situation of all African children and to celebrate the diverse cultures and traditions of the large continent.

The theme of this years Day of the African Child will deal with children in armed conflict. Amazingly enough, a study showed that 75 percent of the children in Rwanda has seen mass killings. In several African countries,

boys as young as 11 years old have been recruited into military training. It is quite obvious that the future of these children is very bleak, that is without proper intervention.

Moreover, since we always only focus on the hardships of Africa, this day is a time to also look at the accomplishments of the continent. For not every child in Africa suffers from disease and malnutrition, or is impoverished or illiterate.

I thank all of my colleagues for their attention to this important matter and I hope that each and everyone of you will participate in this observation.

It is up to us to let these children know that their struggles were not in vain.

A TRIBUTE TO SOUTH GLENS FALLS CENTRAL SCHOOL VOLUNTEER/MENTOR PROGRAM

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today and pay tribute to a program which provides a tremendous service to the students and community of South Glens Falls. The Volunteer/Mentor program is completing its 2nd year of service helping elementary and middle school children with their self-esteem, allowing them to meet their academic and personal potential.

Young people comprise America's greatest asset. In that respect, a program like this one is invaluable and representative of that uniquely American concept of volunteerism. In this day and age especially, our children are subject to an alarming range of negative influences. Therefore, it is critical that we call upon the entire community to assist our young people in overcoming problems with their self-esteem by countering the impact of damaging social ills. That is why the service of the 60 volunteers in this program is so critical.

Allow me to recount some of the efforts of these mentors. They meet with the students in small, or even one to one settings for at least 45 minutes per week. This relationship between mentor and child lasts for a minimum of one school year, whereby affected children receive the degree of attention they need to ensure they reach their maximum potential. These volunteers and the children often establish such strong bonds that many mentors have extended their service for a 2nd year.

This type of devotion exemplifies those qualities which make Americans, and America, great. I have always felt that there are three distinct reasons for this greatness, American pride, patriotism and volunteerism. The American people have been noted for this voluntary service, be it in the fire departments, civic and community organizations or extracurricular programs at our schools.

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America is the longest continuing democracy in the world and a model for emerging countries. In that same mold, people like those who comprise the Volunteer/Mentor program in the South Glens Falls Central School District are models for all of us here. To that end, I have always been one to judge people based on what they return to their community. By that measure, these volunteers are truly great

Americans. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that you, and all fellow Members, join me in paying tribute to this program that works to protect our future.

INTRODUCTION OF THE LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM ACT OF 1995

HON. TIM JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1995

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation, along with my colleague, Representative DAVID MINGE of Minnesota, to authorize the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System. I introduced similar legislation last year during the 103d Congress, with Representative MINGE and then Representative Grandy of Iowa as original cosponsors. I look forward to again working closely with my colleagues for timely consideration of this important measure.

The Lewis and Clark Rural Water System is made up of 22 rural water systems and communities in southeastern South Dakota, northwestern Iowa, and southwestern Minnesota who have joined together in an effort to cooperatively address the dual problems facing the delivery of drinking water in this region—inadequate quantities of water and poor quality water.

This region has seen substantial growth and development in recent years, and studies have shown that future water needs will be significantly greater than the current available supply. Most of the people who are served by 10 of the water utilities in the proposed Lewis and Clark project area currently enforce water restrictions on a seasonal basis. Almost half of the membership has water of such poor quality it does not meet present or proposed standards for drinking water. More than two-thirds rely on shallow aquifers as their primary source of drinking water, aquifers which are very vulnerable to contamination by surface activities.

The Lewis and Clark system will be a supplemental supply of drinking water for its 22 members, acting as a treated, bulk delivery system. The distribution to deliver water to individual users will continue through the existing systems used by each member utility. This regionalization approach to solving these water supply and quality problems enables the Missouri River to provide a source of clean, safe drinking water to more than 180,000 individuals. A source of water which none of the members of Lewis and Clark could afford on their own.

The proposed system would help to stabilize the regional rural economy by providing water to Sioux Falls, the hub city in the region, as well as numerous small communities and individual farms in South Dakota and portions of Iowa and Minnesota.

The States of South Dakota, Iowa, and Minnesota have all authorized the project and local sponsors have demonstrated a financial commitment to this project through State grants, local water development district grants, and membership dues. The State of South Dakota has already contributed more than \$400,000.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe our needs get any more basic than good quality, reliable

drinking water, and I appreciate the fact that Congress has shown support for efforts to improve drinking water supplies in South Dakota. I look forward to continue working with my colleagues to have that support extended to the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System.

AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1561), to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal year 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal year 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes:

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my strong support for the amendment proposed by my distinguished friend from New York, Mr. ACKERMAN. His reasonable amendment calls for reports by the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and budget prior to implementing the provisions of this legislation requiring the consolidation of the functions of the Agency for International Development, the United States Information Agency, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency into the Department of State.

The organizational changes that are mandated in this legislation are the most sweeping and comprehensive changes ever proposed to the structure and function of the agencies charged with the conduct of our Nation's foreign policy. None of the Members of the Congress—no matter how long they have been serving in this House or in the other chamber—have dealt with changes in our foreign policy agencies of this massive a scale and none of us have any sense of what the unforeseen consequences may be.

Before the Department of Defense scaled back and reorganized our national defense effort, a Bottom-Up review was conducted to assess our Nation's defense requirements in the post-cold war world. But here in the case of the Department of State, we have had only a few general hearings before the International Relations Committee earlier this year on reorganization in general. After the specific provisions of this legislation were drafted, the International Relations Committee held a single hearing on the specific reorganization proposals in this legislation—a hearing, I should add, which was requested by the Democratic members of the Committee to provide the administration with the opportunity to comment on the language in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation is facing unprecedented challenges and threats to the security of our Nation as we face the uncertainty of the post-cold war world. No effort has been made to assess the nature of the perils we face, no effort has been made to assess how our Nation's foreign policy agencies can best address these threats, no effort has been made to determine the impact of this massive restructuring of our foreign policy organizations.

In view of the scope of the changes that have been proposed, the amendment of Mr. ACKERMAN is a reasonable, prudent, and thoughtful effort to consider the impact and evaluate the consequences of consolidation before that irreversible step is taken. In the last few months, Mr. Chairman, this House has not been given to actions that are reasonable, prudent, and thoughtful. In this case, however, we are dealing with the national security of the United States—and caution is only appropriate and reasonable in this case.

If this consolidation policy is so all-important and self-evident, why did we not have such proposals from two presidents and four Secretaries of State in the previous administrations. Alexander Haig, George Schultz, Jim Baker, and Larry Eagleburger were obviously guilty of a tremendous dereliction of duty and responsibility for not proposing the wholesale downsizing of our foreign policy apparatus. If there is such urgency for this action, if there is such necessity to take these decisions without essential review, study, and reflection before acting, these previous Secretaries of State should have been able to see and make such recommendations for change.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, no effort has been made to consult and work with the Department of State and the administration to come up with a bipartisan consensus to deal with this consolidation. All of us agree that government can and should be made more efficient and that redundancies should be eliminated. But it is highly inappropriate for the Congress to dictate to the administration the structure of our foreign policy agencies. These are decisions that can and should be made cooperatively in a bipartisan fashion.

Mr. Chairman, during the 14½ years that I have served in this Congress, 12 of those years were with a Republican administration and a Democratically-controlled House of Representatives. During those 12 years, the Democratic members of the Foreign Affairs Committee consulted with our Republican colleagues on the Committee and with the Republican administration to try to achieve a truly bipartisan foreign policy. While there were some areas of disagreement, in the foreign policy realm we were remarkably successful in achieving broad bipartisan agreement.

Mr. Chairman, in coming up with the legislation that is now before us, I find that the procedure which we used through the years—of consulting with Republicans and Democrats to come forward with bipartisan proposals—is all gone by the board. I think it is a sad spectacle when the bipartisan foreign policy process of this Nation is torn asunder for cheap partisan political ends. This is not the way to build a superpower and enhance its ability to conduct foreign affairs in the 21st century.

What we see in this legislation—in this rush to consolidation with no regard for the consequences and with no consideration of alternatives—is rampant isolationism in action. As I told my colleagues in the markup of this legislation in the International Relations Committee, this is nothing more than pathetic, preposterous partisan posturing. It is cutting to shreds the international capabilities of the one remaining superpower on the face of this planet. It was aptly and accurately described by Dr. Tony Lake, the National Security Advisor to the President, as unilateral disarmament.