

aggressive to correct its problems, especially in light of their magnitude and complexity. The HUD blueprint proposes to consolidate only 60 programs into 3—leaving unanswered the question of what becomes of the remaining 140 programs.

Congress must do a top-to-bottom review of HUD programs. Most require major overhaul—a process that involves rewriting statutes and reducing Federal regulations. Therefore, as part of my review, I intend to find ways in addition to the blueprint, to reform, consolidate, streamline, and if appropriate, eliminate outdated housing programs.

As part of this review, I am looking at new approaches to administering HUD programs in a cost-efficient, yet people-friendly manner so that as many families as possible can get housing. I intend to explore various options to deregulate programs so that States and local jurisdictions are provided with all the authority they require to operate independently—both financially and administratively. It is my feeling that unless localities have unfettered discretion to operate their programs, with the fewest possible attached strings, deregulation is illusory.

Finally, I want to review HUD's budget. Every Member of this House is aware that all Federal agencies must tighten their belts in order to reduce the budget deficit and pay for the middle-income tax cut. HUD cannot be excused from this effort.

It is my intention to work with HUD and with my former chairman, HENRY GONZALEZ, for whom I have great respect, as the committee reviews the proposals in the blueprint, particularly insofar as they are based on Republican efforts over the last 12 years. I welcome many of the blueprint's core ideas as a beginning, but intend to take a hard look at them and to expand upon them, so that they become in actuality what they appear to be in concept.

**RESTRICTED EXPLOSIVES
CONTROL ACT**

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 1995

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce the Restricted Explosives Control Act, a consequential piece of legislation that I sponsored in the 103d Congress.

Not only does my legislation require a Federal permit for all purchases of explosives, it also dictates that all applicants must submit a photograph as well as a set of fingerprints along with their permit application. The bill defines "restricted explosives" as: high explosives, blasting agents, detonators, and more than 50 pounds of black powder.

In addition, the legislation will not unduly burden legitimate explosives purchasers. The bill establishes a 6-month grace period, before the measure is implemented, to enable people to obtain Federal permits from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms [ATF].

During the holiday season of 1993, four mail bombs exploded in western New York—taking five innocent lives. Current law enabled those accused in the murders to buy the deadly dynamite in Kentucky, simply by providing false identification, completing a short form furnished by the ATF, and promising not to cross State lines.

Once this measure is enacted, never again will an individual be able to walk into an explosives dealer's office, quickly fill out a short Federal form, and walk out with dynamite or some other type of high explosive.

The Restricted Explosives Control Act is endorsed by the Institute of Makers of Explosives, the very people who manufacture explosives. The bill also is endorsed by the National Rifle Association.

This legislation is a solid proposal that will prevent such tragedies. The fact is that current law allows for dynamite and other explosives to be sold over the counter. The Restricted Explosives Control Act must be implemented without delay so that we may close that deadly loophole in Federal explosives law.

**HONORING DR. PAUL MICHAEL
KAZAS**

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 1995

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the pleasures of serving in this legislative body is the opportunity we occasionally get to acknowledge publicly outstanding citizens of our Nation.

I rise today to honor Dr. Paul Michael Kazas, a model citizen. I congratulate Dr. Kazas for his recent election as president to the Woodhaven Residents' Block Association. If he brings the same dedication that he has brought to his other pursuits, then there is little doubt that this organization will blossom and grow.

Dr. Kazas belongs to some 20 civic professional organizations, and actively serves on five different board of directors. While others lead and leave the work to others, Dr. Kazas is never afraid to get his hands dirty. He cleans the traffic islands from Park Lane South to 91st Avenue on Woodhaven Boulevard; he was involved with repainting the nearby Interborough Parkway Overpass; he became a certified street pruner so that the community could receive a \$15,000 grant from the New York State Department of Environment Conservation to plant trees on Jamaica Avenue. He is truly a remarkable individual.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in commanding Dr. Kazas for his tireless work. He is worthy of our recognition for making Queens County and the city of New York a better place in which to live.

**NO MORE TAXPAYER SUBSIDY
FOR WESTERN EUROPE**

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 1995

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the biggest single mistake we are making in public policy today is to continue to spend far more on the military than is necessary. We have not responded responsibly to the collapse of the Soviet Union and our victory in the cold war. In particular, we continue to act

as if Western Europe is in need of subsidy for its defense from the American taxpayers.

During our recess, on December 3, Jack Beatty, senior editor at the *Atlantic Monthly*, wrote an excellent essay in the *Boston Globe* pointing out the irrationality of our current policy. I was flattered to read Mr. Beatty's forthright assertion that "NATO is an exorbitant anachronism" and I ask that his very persuasive essay be printed here. I hope that Members will read and think about it as we prepare to vote on the fiscal 1996 budget.

[From the *Boston Globe*, Dec. 3, 1994]

**NATO: IT'S TIME THE EUROPEANS FOUND
THEIR OWN WAY**

(By Jack Beatty)

NATO is an exorbitant anachronism. Widely regretted by columnists and editorial writers, the current rift among the NATO allies over Bosnia should instead be seen as a welcome development, a chance to reorder national priorities. We can no longer afford to defend countries with higher standards of living than our own against a vanished threat. The Cold War is over, but the peace dividend has been swallowed up by NATO.

We continue to spend \$75 billion to \$100 billion annually on the defense of Western Europe—this largely to maintain the 150,000 US troops stationed there. The Clinton administration wants to cut that force by 50,000 by 1999. What is the rationale for keeping 100,000 troops in Europe into the next millennium? To repel any future Russian invasion of Lithuania. Unbelievably, that was the sole European case offered in the seven possible war scenarios leaked from the Pentagon two years ago.

We have no treaty commitments to Lithuania. For 50 years we tolerated the Soviet occupation of Lithuania without harm to our national well-being. Lithuania is to Russia as Haiti is to us, a small country within a big country's sphere of influence. Yet the Pentagon expects US taxpayers to fork over more than \$50 billion every year to preserve a free Lithuania.

Military welfare to Europe should be as hot a political button as domestic welfare to women and children, and perhaps it would be if the British, Danes and Germans we are saving from the costly inconvenience of defending Lithuania all by themselves were—how to put it?—stigmatically nonwhite. But with the elites of both parties under the platitudinous spell of the foreign policy establishment, it will probably take a third party to raise the issue.

Counter-arguments? Two are usually cited. First, we would lose influence within the alliance if we had no ground troops stationed on alliance soil. Second, only isolationists could advocate abandoning the forward-deployment strategy taught by the bitter experience of two Europe-made world wars.

Lose influence within the alliance? What influence? The Clinton administration's fruitless efforts to change alliance policy on Bosnia shows how little influence we have. To be sure, we might have had more if, like the British and French, we had dispatched peace-keepers to Bosnia, a place with no peace to keep. But influence at the price of folly is a bad bargain.

The idea that we should "lead the alliance," that the European powers have grown soft behind the generous welfare states our defense spending has let them afford, has surface plausibility. Certainly the British and French have not shown much spine in Bosnia. But unpack that word "lead" and you'll find it means something like this: If we continue to spend more to defend Europe than the European countries spend to defend themselves, and if we are willing to station

peace-keepers in powderkegs like Bosnia, the allies will suffer us to lead them, yes, but only where they want to go, as Lyndon Johnson discovered over Vietnam. Leadership means pointless, unending subsidy.

Moreover, it is insulting to the Europeans to carry on as if they are cock-a-hoop without us. Just as a welfare check can inhibit your will to work, so being led by others can inhibit your will and weaken your capacity to lead. The Europeans must find their own way.

Is it "isolationist" to leave them to it? No. It is realism. We should trade places with the French: They are the major land power in Europe. Let them lead; it will do wonders for their hauteur. Our political role should be as a French-like kibitzer around the edges of NATO, ready to build up in Europe, if necessary, to answer any buildup from a nationalist Russia. Our proper geostrategic role is offshore, as a maritime power. Walter Lippmann called this the "blue water strategy." Unlike the continuance of forward deployment against a phantom enemy, it has the merit of being sane.

Besides, as conservatives will soon be warning in Congress, we face security threats that the cost of forward deployment in Europe simply won't permit us to address. It is, for example, just a matter of time before some rogue regime or stateless band of terrorists learn how to make and transport nuclear weapons. We have no defense against such threats now. The Republicans want to revive the Strategic Defense Initiative, but even if that celestial Maginot Line could be constructed for less than hundreds of billions of dollars, it would only work against ballistic missile attack. A border patrol scaled to national security dimensions would make far more sense as protection against bomb-carrying terrorists. Estimates are that \$20 billion annually, about half what NATO will cost in the year 2000, would pay for a real military-style border between the United States and Mexico. That would also keep out both illegal immigrants and drug traffickers, which would benefit both our lowest wage earners and inner-city kids. What a novelty that would be: American defense spending defending Americans.

In short, getting Europe out of our pockets is a requirement of both economic and national security. The burden should be on those who want to maintain the somnambulant commitment to NATO.

LESLIE MERLIN CELEBRATES 15TH ANNIVERSARY WITH THE BRICK CHURCH

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 1995

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues a wonderful woman who recently marked her 15th year with the Brick Presbyterian Church in Manhattan.

Since 1979, Associate Pastor Leslie Merlin has devoted her considerable talents and deep compassion to the Brick Church as Associate Pastor. As a parishioner at the Brick Church, I have enjoyed her sermons and been a beneficiary of her wisdom many times.

When she arrived in 1979, Pastor Merlin brought with her to the Brick Church a long-standing commitment to helping others, and a devotion to making the world around her a better place. After graduating from Wagner College in Staten Island, she served as a vol-

unteer teacher in Papua New Guinea. Shortly thereafter, she blended her interest in teaching with a calling to the church by earning a master of divinity at Princeton Seminary. After a brief stay with the Nassau Presbyterian Church in Princeton, she came to the Brick Church, which has enjoyed her presence ever since.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating Leslie Merlin's 15th anniversary with the Brick Church. She has been both a friend and an inspiration to the parishioners of the Brick Church, and I wish her many more years of happiness and joy.

REPEAL NAFTA!

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 1995

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the NAFTA Withdrawal Act, legislation to pull the United States out of the North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA].

When I cast my vote against NAFTA, I did so knowing full well the devastating impact such an agreement would have on U.S. workers. To date, because of NAFTA, over 8,000 American workers have lost their jobs.

Since NAFTA took effect, United States imports from Mexico have been increasing at a rate faster than United States exports to Mexico. This distinction is important because in order to create jobs, United States exports must be expanding faster than imports. This imbalance between imports and exports has cut the United States trade surplus with Mexico down to little more than \$1 billion.

Likewise, from January through July of last year, United States automakers exported about 22,000 vehicles to Mexico. The United States, however, imported 221,000 from Mexico—an imbalance of 199,000 vehicles in Mexico's favor. Moreover, in the short-time since NAFTA passed, Honda, BMW, Volkswagen, Toyota, and Samsung have all announced plans to build new or expanded production facilities in Mexico.

In passing NAFTA, too many of my colleagues failed to see NAFTA for what it really was—a continuation of policies that have undermined the hard won benefits of our Nation's labor movement. Passage of the NAFTA Withdrawal Act is essential if we are to restore justice to the working people of America.

THE ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO VISITORS CENTER

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 1995

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I am today re-introducing legislation to designate the visitors center at the Channel Islands National Park, CA, as the Robert J. Lagomarsino Visitors Center.

In 1980, Bob Lagomarsino successfully guided legislation through Congress which established the Channel Islands National Park in Ventura County, CA. He then worked tirelessly during the next dozen years to obtain land ac-

quisition funds to buy the islands from their previous owners. Because of his efforts, virtually all of the islands are now protected, ensuring that they will remain free of development and in their pristine state which will be open to the public for generations to come.

Unquestionably, without Bob Lagomarsino's perseverance, it's safe to say that the islands would not be protected today. It's only fitting that the visitors center at Ventura Harbor serve as a living monument for the outstanding service Bob Lagomarsino provided to Ventura County residents for almost 35 years in public office.

Identical legislation was passed by the House in the 103d Congress; regrettably it was not considered in the Senate prior to adjournment.

I urge my colleagues to support and to co-sponsor this legislation.

INTERSTATE BANKING REVISITED

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 1995

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, last year, Congress enacted the Riegle-Neal Interstate Banking and Branching Efficiency Act of 1994. This was certainly one of the Banking Committee's most important accomplishments. One provision in the interstate law, the applicable law provision, generated considerable discussion by the conference committee.

The applicable law provision is relevant when a national bank branches into a second State. With respect to four kinds of State laws specified in the statute, the branch is subject to State law as if it were a bank chartered by the host State, unless the State law is preempted. However, we were clear in the language of the statute and the legislative history that the applicable law provision in the interstate law applies only when a bank actually has branches in a second State. If a bank does not branch into a second State, the applicable law provision does not come into play.

Another provision of the interstate law, the savings clause of section 111, is also important in this regard. The savings clause provides that nothing in the interstate law affects section 85 of the National Bank Act and section 27 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act. These provisions, as we explained in the legislative history, authorize banks to make loans, including interstate loans, and the savings clause therefore preserved the preexisting lending authority of banks to collect all lending charges, without regard to the changes in branching authority made by the interstate law.

I believe it is important to reemphasize these points as courts, regulators, and others interpret the applicable law provision and other parts of the new interstate banking law. It has come to my attention that a State court in Pennsylvania recently interpreted the applicable law provision in a decision concerning whether a national bank located in Ohio was authorized by section 85 of the National Bank Act to collect certain credit card charges from Pennsylvania residents. I would certainly hope that all courts recognize that the applicable law provision has no bearing on or relevance