

In addition, the Secretary would consider whether the foreign country would allow a similar investment in one of its airlines. If so, that would be a plus. On the other hand, if the foreign investor was controlled or subsidized by a foreign government, that would be a minus as it could tend to distort competition.

Another factor the Secretary must consider is the issue of foreign control. I share the desire of many of my colleagues to prevent our airlines from falling under the control of foreign nationals. But I am also mindful that a recent GAO report indicated that continuing the current control restrictions would discourage foreign investment and limit the benefits that might otherwise be achieved by this legislation. The issue of foreign control would be one factor among the others mentioned for the Secretary to consider.

The final factor for DOT to consider would be whether the foreign investor's home country has a procompetitive bilateral with the United States. While this is clearly important, it should not be the controlling factor as it seems to have been in recent transactions. Proponents of open skies should keep in mind that more liberal foreign investment rules may be the best way to achieve their goal. Only when the nationality lines of carriers are blurred so that it is not clear which nation is benefiting from a negotiation will some of the protectionist countries be willing to remove their aviation trade barriers and allow free competition on international routes.

In evaluating these factors, the bill gives the Secretary 90 days. A time limit is important so that investors do not have to deal with the uncertainties of Government approved for an unreasonable length of time.

The issue of national security has also been raised with respect to foreign investment. Clearly we do not want an enemy of the United States taking control of one of our airlines. Moreover, our experience with Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm demonstrated that U.S. carriers play an important role by ferrying troops and supplies to a war zone under the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) program. It is important that the viability of this program be preserved.

My bill would address the national security issue by giving the President 30 days to review a DOT-approved foreign investment. The President could disapprove an investment only on national security grounds such as a transaction that would undermine the CRAF program. Limiting the President's authority in this way is similar to his role in the awarding of international routes under section 801 of the Federal Aviation Act. This portion of my bill is patterned after that provision.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that there are airlines who would like to close the door on foreign investment. Some have already themselves taken advantage of that source of capital and would now deny it to others. Others can still access the U.S. capital markets and would probably be just as happy to see their competitors wither and die.

But I believe they are being short-sighted. The airline industry is becoming increasingly global. I do not think an arbitrary 25 percent limit on foreign investment in U.S. carriers any longer makes sense in a worldwide economy where capital flows freely across borders.

Moreover, it should be noted that foreign investment is nothing new in the airline industry. Several foreign airlines now have substantial financial stakes in U.S. airlines. In addition,

there are foreign banks, leasing companies, and other entities that hold debt obligations or other financial interests in our airlines. In some cases, these interests may be substantial. So we have already crossed the bridge on the foreign investment issue. Now it is time to raise the artificial limit on foreign investments in U.S. airline voting stock so that capital can more freely flow to U.S. airlines.

Accordingly, I am pleased to introduce this bill that would allow foreign investment in airlines up to 49 percent. Perhaps some day we can go further. For now I invite my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE CLEAN WATER AMENDMENTS OF 1995

#### HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 15, 1995*

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, with several of my colleagues, I introduce the Clean Water Amendments of 1995.

The bill is based on last year's draft legislation known as the bipartisan alternative. As many of you know, a large coalition of Members of the Public Works and Transportation Committee developed this alternative in response to other Clean Water Act proposals that were either unnecessary or unnecessarily prescriptive. We worked closely with State and local officials and the regulated community to develop the alternative bill.

Original cosponsors of today's bill include some of the key supporters of the bipartisan alternative. We envision adding many more cosponsors after the bill's introduction and after our series of hearings with the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Let me emphasize the legislation to be introduced today is only a starting point. It does not represent extensive negotiation among or input from all the key interests to reflect new developments or positions since circulation of the bipartisan alternative last year. Nor is it meant to frame the debate in such a way as to prevent other issues or initiatives from arising. Instead, its purpose is merely to start the debate and to focus testimony and input from Members and interests over the coming weeks.

For example, we anticipate significant revisions to the bill's provisions on unfunded mandates, risk assessment, and cost benefit analysis. We developed these provisions before circulation of the Contract With America, H.R. 5, and other proposals pending in Congress. We will certainly want to revisit some of these issues to reflect more current thinking.

We also anticipate significant revisions to last year's provisions on nonpoint source pollution and stormwater. In fact, Mr. Speaker, some of the provisions could be viewed as unfunded or unfunded mandates. We plan to review more comprehensive proposals to overhaul the programs, remove redtape and unnecessary requirements, and increase flexibility for State and local governments.

With regard to wetlands, we have followed the same approach as in last year's bipartisan alternative: Include as a separate title provisions from H.R. 1330, the Comprehensive Wetlands Conservation and Management Act.

This, too, is not meant as the final, consensus approach. We anticipate debate over various alternative approaches and revisions. However, we do not expect meaningful debate over the bill's underlying premise: The current section 404 wetlands program is broken and needs to be fixed.

We also anticipate new proposals and initiatives in other areas. For example, we want to maximize flexibility for State and local governments, minimize Federal redtape and command-and-control regulations, and pursue market-based and risk-based approaches to efficient and effective water quality measures. Innovative technologies and pollution prevention efforts, as well as nonregulatory approaches to watershed planning and protection, also offer great promise.

In the area of funding, we expect various proposals and revisions. We all know the value of clean water and the public and private costs in not having it. We also know the Federal Government has an important role in providing and maintaining this Nation's clean and safe drinking water infrastructure. What we don't know at this point is how best to meet those needs when Federal fiscal constraints are greater than ever before. We hope today's bill will serve as a starting point to identify answers in the end.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation and to become actively involved in the debate. Congress needs to renew and reform the Clean Water Act this year. The Clean Water Amendments of 1995 will get us started. Let me reiterate again, however, that we are not embracing any particular provisions in the bill. We are simply using today's bill as a starting point. All reasonable suggestions and revisions, both large and small, are on the table for consideration.

#### INTRODUCTION OF HOME OFFICE DEDUCTION LEGISLATION

#### HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 15, 1995*

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to restore the home office deduction for taxpayers who work out of their homes. I am pleased to note that this measure is included in the Republican Contract With America and, additionally, has been introduced in the other body of Senator ORRIN HATCH—S. 327.

This legislation is made necessary by a 1993 Supreme Court decision, *Commissioner v. Soliman* (113 S.Ct. 701), that greatly reduced the availability of the deduction. Previously, home office expenses were deductible if the space in the home was devoted to the "sole and exclusive use" of the office; the taxpayer used no other office of business; and, the business generated enough income to cover the deduction. The Court, in effect, added two additional conditions: the customers of the home-based business must physically visit the home office, and the business revenue must be produced within the home office itself.

Clearly, these requirements are excessive and prior law must be reinstated and clarified.

I believe today's bill helps achieve that goal and I look forward to prompt approval of this measure in the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### 150 YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

### HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 15, 1995*

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, February 18, 1995 marks the 150th Annual Greenport Fire Department Celebration. Eastern Long Island is proud of the many years of dedicated service by the 190 volunteers of the Greenport Fire Department, and it is an honor to tell my colleagues in the House about their big day on Saturday. These volunteers are the essence of good citizenship, ready with a helping hand no matter how large the task. Organized in 1845, the department was formed after incorporation of the Village of Greenport and it represents all that is good about Greenport. Today, it is always on call for fires and local disasters. Since the village of Greenport is a waterfront community, the men and women of the department are also well skilled at emergency evacuation. Their selfless work as volunteers has been the backbone of the entire community. The department has held an annual celebration for 150 years, and it includes the inspection of members and equipment, parade, tournament, and firemen's ball.

I take this opportunity to salute the wonderful volunteers of the Greenport Fire Department and extend the respect of the whole community.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERT PRESLEY 36TH SENATORIAL DISTRICT—RIVERSIDE, CA

### HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 15, 1995*

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I take to the floor of the House today to praise a great legislator, a lifelong public servant, a combat veteran, and a personal friend. It may come as a surprise to those listening here in Washington, DC, but I am talking about one man—Senator Robert Presley of Riverside, CA.

Senator Presley represented the 36th State senatorial district of the great State of California. He was first elected to the senate in 1974. To give an idea of the span of his career, I note that I have staff in my office who were just learning to walk then, a first-class stamp cost about 15 cents, and the State budget was at the incredible level of \$20 billion.

Having graduated from the FBI Academy, Senator Presley went on to a successful career in law enforcement. He maintained that interest in protecting and serving the public in the senate by concentrating on anticrime legislation, prison construction, and child-protective services. Though that is not all, Mr. Speaker. Bob authored major legislation on clean air, wildlife conservation, toxic-materials control, education reform, attorney discipline, parks and recreation, and domestic violence.

Known as one of the hardest-working legislators, Senator Presley's committee service was comprehensive. He was chairman of the senate appropriations committee and the senate select committee on children and youth. He served on and was chairman of the senate natural resources and wildlife committee. He sat on the judiciary local government and agriculture and water resources committees. He also headed the joint committee on prison construction and operations. Not only did Bob work hard, he worked openly and fairly with all, regardless of party affiliation. He was, and is, interested in the improvement of California as his first, second and third priorities.

Knowing that the wellspring of leadership is found in the local community, Bob is a member of the Riverside Lions, Elks and Moose lodges, American Legion, Air Force Association, and VFW.

Mr. Speaker, people here in Washington will often be introduced as the member from the "great State of California." Yet, who is it that makes California great? Who is it that makes our State that wonderful place in which we want to raise our families, grow our businesses, build our dreams.

It is citizen leaders like Bob Presley who consistently listen and learn, and then lead our communities to reach their full potential. It is the personal friend who without regard to mere party, will gladly and fruitfully guide younger politicians and community leaders. It is the decorated combat veteran who returns victorious, only to dedicate himself to keeping the peace at home. It is the enlightened legislator who serves his fellow citizens for two decades in the senate. It is Senator Robert Presley, a true original who is worthy of the sincerest form of flattery—imitation. Fortunately, we will still enjoy the expertise and concern of Senator Presley. He is now affiliated with our wonderful University of California, Riverside. We all look forward to working with Bob in this next chapter of his public service.

Thank you Bob for all you've done and the example you've set. All of your neighbors and fellow citizens owe you more than we can say.

#### VOICE OF AMERICA ANNIVERSARY

### HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 15, 1995*

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 24th the Voice of America begins its 54th year on the world's airwaves. From its first broadcast in 1942—begun with the words "The news may be good; the news may be bad. We shall tell you the truth—through to today, VOA has been a beacon of hope and constant source of reliable information to people around the world.

The past year was no exception. From Rwanda to Haiti, Bosnia to Chechnya, Washington Beijing, and from Northridge to Kobe, the Voice of America was there providing a uniquely American perspective in 47 languages. The year also saw the important new connection of VOA and the Internet.

VOA is still needed as democratization unevenly proceeds in several countries. The world is smaller than ever for those on the information superhighway. While CNN reaches some parts of the world, it does not reach

VOA listeners—in places such as Chechnya, Rwanda, Iraq, Iran, Tibet, Nigeria, China, Burma, and North Korea—who don't understand English, have no access to cable or satellite TV, the Internet or fax machines, or for whom democracy remains only a dream.

VOA reaches these people every day, some 100 million each week, in their homes and in their languages. As they have since 1942, these listeners tune in for news of the United States, clear explanations of its policies and information about their own countries. VOA broadcasts are valuable proponents of our democratic values reaching people with the story of America and our own struggle for democracy. These broadcasts are a way to try to promote peaceful solutions through information and bridging of cultures.

Listeners have told VOA that they want practical "how to" advice on grass roots democracy, the free market economy, and the protection of human rights as they nurture their own fledgling democracies. VOA has responded. These are staples of its programming, along with science and health, agriculture, American society and culture, and the enormously popular English teaching programs. And VOA is a promoter of free enterprise, free trade and tourism, in the United States. It reports every day about American products and services.

In an era of turbulence, where the world is torn by ethnic and religious and nationalistic hatred, there is a need for an honest and credible voice of sanity and reason.

At our best that can be our voice. At our best that is the voice of America. I salute the Voice of America as it begins year 54.

#### CONGRATULATIONS NICHOLE HOLMES, MISS USA SECOND RUNNER-UP

### HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 15, 1995*

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Nichole Lynn Holmes of Marion, Illinois. Nichole was named second runner-up in the 1995 Miss USA Pageant which was held in South Padre Island, Texas. One of twelve finalists, Nichole was selected by a panel of celebrity judges from the fields of acting, athletics and psychology. The judges saw what people in Marion have known for years: Nichole is a talented young woman from whom we will hear great things in the future.

Nichole is a graduate of Marion High School, John A. Logan College, and presently attends Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. The people of southern Illinois are proud to have one of the area's best and brightest represent the entire state in this prestigious event. Since being crowned Miss Illinois USA on November 27, 1994, she has been busy fulfilling the duties of her position and preparing for the 1995 Miss USA pageant. Obviously the long hours of preparation and dedication to achieving her goals have paid off for Nichole and her family. She has accomplished this with the continued love and support of her parents, Lynn and Mikie Holmes, who are understandably proud of with Nichole's achievements.