

more to help those less fortunate than herself than most people do in their entire lives.

When Emily was a third grader and only 8 years old, she and her older sister Amy helped organize a charity auction to benefit a Boston area homeless shelter. Working with other children their age, they wrote to celebrities and asked them to autograph squares of material which were later made into patchwork pillows and auctioned. Together with their friends, Emily and Amy raised over \$4,000 for homeless children and their families.

Eighteen months ago while researching South Africa, Emily learned about the effects of apartheid on the citizens of South Africa. Anxious to help improve their quality of life, Emily became a key organizer of the South African book drive. As the youth chairperson, Emily collected over 10,000 books for an elementary school in the Capetown area and received an award of \$3,000 to be used toward the cost of shipping.

Emily Kumpel should serve as a role model for all of us, both young and old. Her work on behalf of the homeless and the children of South Africa illustrates her deep commitment to the advancement of humanitarian goals. Emily truly is an amazing individual, and she deserves our respect and admiration.

TEXAS STATEHOOD

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1995

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity, before Congress recesses for the holidays, to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very significant anniversary coming up next month in my home State of Texas.

On December 29, 1995, the people of Texas will celebrate our sesquicentennial of statehood. Entering the Union as its 28th State, Texas has consistently played a pivotal role in all facets of American history. Texas has supplied to this Nation a wealth of human talent in every field of endeavor—from science and technology to business and commerce; from academics to government; and from entertainment to agriculture; to name only a few.

Mr. Speaker, on April 21, 1995, the regular session of the 74th Texas Legislature adopted House Concurrent Resolution No. 118, commemorating the sesquicentennial of Texas statehood. I ask that the full text of House Concurrent Resolution No. 118 be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The resolution follows:

THE STATE OF TEXAS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas, The year 1995 will mark 150 years since the United States of America admitted Texas as the 28th state in the union; and

Whereas, The sesquicentennial of Texas statehood is a truly momentous occasion that allows all Texans to reflect on their state's proud heritage and bright future; and

Whereas, Acting on the advice of President John Tyler, the United States Congress adopted a joint resolution on February 28, 1845, inviting Texas to enter the union as a state with full retention of its public lands; today, a century and a half later, Texas enjoys the distinction of being the only state admitted with such extensive rights; and

Whereas, The citizens of the Republic of Texas were deeply committed to the goals and ideals embodied in the United States Constitution, and, on June 16, 1845, the Congress of the Republic of Texas was convened by President Anson Jones to consider the proposal of statehood; and

Whereas, Texas took advantage of the offer, choosing to unite with a large and prosperous nation that could more effectively defend the borders of Texas and expand its flourishing trade with European countries; by October 1845, the Congress of the Republic of Texas had approved a state constitution, charting a bold new destiny for the Lone Star State; and

Whereas, The proposed state constitution was sent to Washington, D.C., and on December 29, 1845, the United States of America formally welcomed Texas as a new state; the transfer of governmental authority, however, was not complete until February of 1846, when Anson Jones lowered the flag that had flown above the Capitol for nearly 10 years and stepped down from his position as president of the Republic of Texas; and

Whereas, With the poignant retirement of the flag of the Republic, Texas emerged as a blazing Lone Star in the American firmament, taking its place as the 28th state admitted into the union; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 74th Legislature of the State of Texas, Regular Session, 1995, hereby commemorate the sesquicentennial of Texas statehood and encourage all Texans to take note of this historic occasion.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TILLIE K. FOWLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1995

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in the family, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 839. Had I been present I would have voted "yes."

INTRODUCTION OF THE WATER SUPPLY INFRASTRUCTURE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1995

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1995

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Water Supply Infrastructure Assistance Act of 1995, a bipartisan bill that will protect human health and the environment and promote jobs. In the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee the term "infrastructure" means more than just highways, bridges, dams, airports, and other transportation and infrastructure related facilities. It includes environmental infrastructure such as drinking water and wastewater treatment and distribution systems. Because of that, this committee expects to play a major role in debate and passage of legislation to protect and improve our Nation's water supplies.

I am delighted to be joined by JIM OBERSTAR, the ranking Democrat of the committee, the chairman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, SHERRY BOEHLERT and the ranking Democrat of the subcommittee, BOB BORSKI. In addition, over 30 of my

committee colleagues are joining me as original cosponsors.

Today's bill is similar to the bipartisan drinking water bill the Public Works and Transportation Committee approved last Congress. Unfortunately, that bill did not become law. The unfunded Federal mandates and the environmental infrastructure needs remain, however. Today, the need is just as compelling, if not more compelling, to have a reasonable bill that provides funding and flexibility to State and local officials and that builds upon the existing programs and mechanisms of the Clean Water Act.

For example, EPA estimates over \$8.6 billion in capital needs to meet current Safe Drinking Water Act requirements. The Congressional Budget Office also estimates annual costs between \$1.4 billion and \$2.3 billion per year for compliance with current requirements.

The bill continues the committee's commitment to our Nation's environment infrastructure needs in two basic ways:

First, it authorizes new 3-year, \$2.25 billion accounts for improvements to drinking water systems within the existing State revolving funds [SRF's] under the Clean Water Act—specifically, \$500 million for fiscal year 1996, \$750 million for fiscal year 1997, and \$1 billion for fiscal year 1998. The bill would make available the \$500 million in the fiscal year 1996 EPA appropriations bill that is contingent on authorization of a drinking water SRF.

This aspect of the bill is modeled on the existing, successful SRF established under the Clean Water Act. It authorizes grants to States for the establishment of new accounts within the SRF's for funding water supply infrastructure needs. Loans from the accounts would be repaid to the States by operators of water supply systems and the repaid funds would be made available to meet additional needs.

Second, it authorizes the use of a portion of the funds—up to 10 percent—within the new accounts for source water quality protection programs consistent with nonpoint source management programs under the Clean Water Act. This will help prevent pollution and reduce treatment costs downstream, but without the use of any Federal, command-and-control regulations.

Over the coming weeks, we will be working with various stakeholders to further update and improve the bill. We intend to move this important legislation forward while working closely with the Commerce Committee as the House considers Safe Drinking Water Act legislation.

TRIBUTE TO STEWART GREENEBAUM

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1995

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Stewart Greenebaum. On December 10, 1995, Stewart Greenebaum will receive the Humanitarian Award from the Baltimore Zionist District.

Stewart Greenebaum deserves this award because of his strong commitment to his community and to the State of Israel. Stewart has donated his time, effort, and energy to worthy causes.

Stewart Greenebaum has made tremendous contributions to the Baltimore Zionist District. He is currently serving as chairman for Israel Bonds of Maryland, as well as chairman of the Board of the University of Maryland Medical System. In addition, Stewart Greenebaum is the founder and chairman of a scholarship fund for financially disadvantaged medical students and he is the founder and chairman of the Children's House at Johns Hopkins which provides shelter and comfort to families of sick children.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call Stewart Greenebaum's achievements to the attention of my colleagues. By having individuals like Stewart Greenebaum in our communities, our work as public servants in Congress is made that much easier and that much more pleasurable.

ONE COMMON LANGUAGE WILL
KEEP AMERICA ONE NATION

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1995

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to the excellent essay that appeared in *Time* magazine in November, "Quebec and the Death of Diversity." The author, Charles Krauthammer, makes the powerful observation that nations can perish by the sword of cultural diversity. Mr. Krauthammer points to Canada's near divorce with its province of Quebec a month ago as a dire warning for what could happen here in America. Mr. Krauthammer is absolutely right.

Canada's experience is a cautionary tale for our country, the most diverse nation in the history of the world. Their narrow brush with breakup should sound a clarion call to all Americans who dismiss the importance of a common language and culture to a nation.

I do not want to watch the United States unravel the way Canada almost did. I have introduced legislation that seeks to reinforce the common bond that holds our country together: the English language. I hope you will heed Canada's silent warning and join me today in the effort to keep America one nation, one people. Cosponsor H.R. 739, the Declaration of Official Language Act. I ask that the full text of Charles Krauthammer's essay appear in the RECORD at this point.

[From *Time* magazine, Nov. 13, 1995]

QUEBEC AND THE DEATH OF DIVERSITY

(By Charles Krauthammer)

Just hours after the Quebec referendum on separation that came within a whisker of breaking up Canada—and may yet do so—President Clinton pronounced, "Ethnic diversity can be the hallmark of a strong and prosperous society," said his spokesman. "The President has often said that our ethnic diversity here in America is one source of our greatest strength . . . and hopefully it will be for the people of Canada as well."

Now, when commenting on an explosive marital spat occurring next door, it is incumbent on a neighbor to be diplomatic and sympathetic. But must one be fatuous too? Here is Canada, a great neighboring country, choking on cultural diversity, very nearly dying of cultural diversity—and the spokesman for the President of the U.S. offers a mindless, mantra-like homily in praise of the very source of Canada's ongoing agony.

Yes, diversity can contribute to a country's strength by producing a kind of hearty, hybrid culture and provoking new ways of thought and new avenues to genius. But for every such cultural synergy there are 10 cases—from the Balkans to the former Soviet Union, from Africa to Asia and now to North America—of cultural explosion, where the clash of ethnicities yields weakness, conflict, division, even war. Indeed, the bitterness of French Canada's drive to amputate its century-old confederation with English Canada tells us much about the unexamined belief in the strength and beauty of the multicultural mosaic.

In their Oct. 30 referendum, half of Quebecers—and a solid 60% of French speakers—said they want out of their partnership in a culturally diverse Canada. Why? For the answer, Americans might look no farther than Louisiana.

"Cajun" is a corruption of "Acadian," a region of Nova Scotia that was home to many French Canadians until they were expelled by the British in the 1750s and '60s. Many emigrated to Louisiana, then a French possession, where their language and culture withered, evolving into a kind of folk curiosity. Quebecers do not want to go the way of the Cajun. They do not want to end up as some colorful ethnic subculture known for its music or cooking or the odd linguistic twist. Quebecers are driven by a terror of being crushed by an English-speaking continent of 300 million into a mere cultural curiosity. Hence their hunger for political independence.

Oddly, and sadly, the solution does not answer the fear. Politics is no cure for cultural assimilation. A flag and an anthem do not assure cultural vitality. The faith that they will is as desperate as it is sentimental.

The real problem of Quebec is the problem of all small peoples in a world of irresistibly globalized commerce and culture. That separatism may not solve the problem is beside the point. Separatism is a fact, the single greatest political fact of the post-cold war world. With external enemies removed, with hybrid states no longer held together by hegemonic superpowers, the petty annoyances and existential difficulties of living in mixed-ethnic marriages within nation-states has become increasingly intolerable. From the former Yugoslavia to the former Czechoslovakia to the former Soviet Union, from Sri Lanka to Quebec, the tendency to separatism is inexorable.

Nor is the U.S. immune to the attraction of separatism. Look, for example, at the rise of Louis Farrakhan, the leading black separatist in America. Look at the ethnic social policies, the school curriculums, the racially gerrymandered electoral districts that give an official imprimatur to the notion of the primacy of group over nation.

Which is why Quebec's referendum is not the provincial story it seems. The 60% of French-speaking Quebecers who voted to sever their political union with bicultural Canada are a herald of the death of diversity. They are a living refutation of the warm and cozy notion, based more on hope than on history, of multicultural harmony and strength. They are a warning.

After all, as former Toronto Sun editor Barbara Amiel points out, if multiculturalism cannot work in Canada, where can it work? If it cannot work in a country as civil, decent and tolerant as Canada—a country where the majority English speakers have been extraordinarily generous in granting all kinds of cultural protections, subsidies, special rights and privileges to the linguistic minority of French Canada—then where?

And if it cannot work in Canada, where the issue is the co-existence of just two (quite

similar, one might note) cultures, how will it work in, say, Bosnia, where three, or India or America, with dozens? One looks at Canada and wonders whether the current naive and confident American celebration of cultural diversity—with its insistence on group rights over individual rights, sectarian history over American history, ethnic culture over a common culture—is leading us down a path from which there is no escape.

Canada has an escape. By accident of geography, separation is a real option because the different culture inhabit different territories. For a country like America, where the different cultures are thoroughly intermixed, there is no such answer. Canada can break up cleanly; the U.S. cannot.

America is proceeding blithely down the path of diversity and ethnic separatism. America's destination, however, is not Canada, which will find some civil way out of its dilemma. America's destination is the Balkans.

HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN EAST
TIMOR

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1995

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 20th anniversary of Indonesia's occupation of East Timor. The people of East Timor have lived for two decades under a cruel and repressive regime that has killed and starved almost one-third of their population.

Violent crackdowns on peaceful demonstrations in East Timor have continued throughout this occupation. First, innocent protestors are massacred and then the military rounds up and jails the witnesses so that the world will never know what happens.

Indonesia's policy in East Timor is about the oppression of those who oppose Indonesia's right to torture, kill, and repress the people of East Timor. It is about genocide.

Today, Congressman PATRICK KENNEDY and I are introducing the East Timor Human Rights Accountability Act, which will prohibit United States aid to Indonesia from being used to further the occupation of East Timor or to violate the human rights of the East Timorese people.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this repression and violence to end.

TRIBUTE TO WALTER H.
DETTINGER

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1995

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a truly dedicated American, Mr. Walter H. Dettinger, who passed away on November 21, 1995.

In 1936 at the age of 17, Walt embarked upon several years of selfless service to our country when he enlisted in the Ohio National Guard. Upon his discharge in 1939, he joined the Naval Communications Reserve and was called to active duty the following year. His area of expertise, radio communications, led him to service aboard the USS *Worden* in Pearl Harbor, HI. Walt was among the thousands of servicemen there on the morning of