

work to complete the on-load and ready for sea processes. Learn your new ship well . . . trace every piping run, exercise every new piece of equipment, note every detail of each new space. Soon you will again feel the salt spray, the excitement of the hunt, and the thrill of the rescue. That close bond between ship and sailor will serve you well as CGC Resolute assumes her position in the forefront of Coast Guard operations.

Capt. Hested, on behalf of the Commandant, I accept Resolute back into the fleet. At the same time I present Decisive—"the queen of the fleet" for her major maintenance availability.

I pass operational control of Resolute to Commander Atlantic Area and administrative control to Commander Maintenance and Logistics Command, Atlantic.

CDR Bernard, I charge you and your crew to be "Semper Paratus" in carrying out your missions. Do this in the same manner in which you, your crew, and Decisive's crews have done in the past. In closing, to the Decisive I say "good job, we'll see you soon plying the Atlantic waters." To the Resolute, welcome back, welcome to the LANT area.

And we wish you the very best in your endeavors.

CDR Bernard, execute your orders.

ENGLISH AS THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE

HON. THOMAS M. BARRETT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1996

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article by John Gurda, an excellent author and historian in Milwaukee. The article appeared in the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel earlier this year. This article takes an intriguing look at the issue of English as the official language of the United States. It reminds us that most of us have ancestry which stems from outside the United States. It is with this in mind that I provide the following article. [From the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, Apr. 1, 1996]

HOW SOON THE "ENGLISH FIRST" CROWD FORGETS

(By John Gurda)

Their names are Seratti, Skindrud, Zukowski, Ziegelbauer, Gunderson, Goetsch, Buettner, Huebsch and Drzewiecki. They represent some of Wisconsin's leading ethnic groups—German, Norwegian, Polish and Italian—and it is a safe bet that none of their ancestors spoke a word of English when they arrived.

The irony is that the names belong to state legislators who are sponsoring the "English First" bill. Their measure would establish English as the "official language of Wisconsin" and would, with a few carefully worded exceptions, prohibit the use of other languages in "all written expression" by any unit of state or local government.

It seems puzzling, at first, that the bill would get a serious hearing in a state as ethnic as Wisconsin. It seems even stranger that elected officials would deny some current residents a privilege that their own ancestors enjoyed: the right to be addressed in their native tongues.

Linguistic diversity, officially endorsed, is older than the state. When Solomon Juneau became Milwaukee's first mayor in 1846, 1,000 copies of his inaugural address were printed—500 in English and 500 in German. The

same policy was observed when Wisconsin adopted a constitution two years later. In the 1850s and '60s, the state published guidebooks in German, Norwegian, French, Dutch and Swedish, as well as in English, hoping to attract newcomers from Europe.

Immigrants responded by the thousands, making Wisconsin one of the most "foreign" states in the union and dotting the countryside with such settlements as New Glarus, New Holstein, Denmark, Belgium, Poland and Scandinavia. Ethnicity is still one of our hallmarks—a focus of festivals, an anchor of identity and, not least of all, a draw for tourists.

But diversity has always had a dark side as well. Wisconsin has suffered periodic outbreaks of nativism throughout its history; like some modern suburbanites, established residents of every period have tried to pull up the gangplank as soon as they were safely on the boat.

In the 1840s, for instance, when Irish and German immigrants demanded an equal voice in deliberations over statehood, the Milwaukee Sentinel was horrified: "This is going too far. . . . One half of our population consists of foreigners and if this continues they will gain the upper hand and destroy our freedom. This thing is going too far."

Wisconsin's immigrants returned the fire when their rights were threatened. In 1890, a Republican Legislature passed the Bennett Law, making instruction in English compulsory. Supporters of parochial schools were incensed. German, Scandinavian, Irish and Polish voters joined forces at the polls, making George Peck governor; he was the only Democrat to hold the pot between 1876 and 1932.

Intolerance reached a peak of sorts during and just after World War I. Germans were, to put it bluntly, persecuted. Bach, Brahms, and Beethoven were banned from the concert stage. Sauerkraut was rechristened "liberty cabbage." In 1919, the Milwaukee Journal won a Pulitzer Prize for its efforts to root out local Germans who sided with Kaiser Wilhelm.

Soon after the war, nativists broadened their fire to include Poles, Italians, Greeks, Serbs and other "new" immigrants, a group that one bigot dismissed as "historically downtrodden, atavistic and stagnant." Most politicians agreed. In the 1920s, Congress virtually halted the flow of immigration from southern and eastern Europe. The "golden door" lighted by the Statue of Liberty was slammed shut.

Seventy years later, immigrants are once again suspect. The English First campaign of 1996 is only the latest in a long series of attempts to legislate conformity, attempts to legislate conformity, attempts that seem to crest during times of uncertainty. Patriots of every generation have tried, in historian Gerd Korman's choice phrase, "to replace the melting pot with a pressure cooker."

The campaign has been blasted as small-minded, shortsighted and racist by Hispanics, Asians and other language minorities. The English First movement may be all of those things, but it is most of all unnecessary. Anyone who has spent time in the newer ethnic communities will tell you that the pressures to conform are enormous. Through the media, through the schools, through their own children, immigrant families soon learn what America expects of them. If they want a place at the table, if they want even a taste of the American dream, English is mandatory.

Why, then, the current outbreak of nativism? When you cut through all the rhetoric about "uniting" our society, what you sense is fear—fear that America is coming apart at the seams. The country seems to be filling in

with strangers who show no eagerness to join the mainstream. That perception gives rise to a great unspoken question: Why can't they be like us?

It is one of the oldest questions in America. Yankees asked it of the Germans and the Irish, the Germans and Irish asked it of the Poles and Italians, and everyone asks it of Hispanics and Asians. The fact that so many groups once considered "they" have joined the ranks of "us" is, I would suggest, an obvious sign of America's power to absorb differences. But there are always newcomers to question.

And what should they answer? They should, in my opinion, respond that they are challenging the rest of us to live up to an ideal as old as the Republic: a belief that the many can become one without rejecting their ancestors, that unity and diversity can coexist in a creative and energizing tension.

There is only one noun in this country, and that is American. But there are dozens of adjectives: African, Belgian, Croatian, Danish, English, Filipino, German and on down the alphabet. It is our differences, mediated by our essential unity, that give this country its human appeal and its human power.

Those who would stifle diversity are denying themselves an important gift. Those who would insist on "English First" are betraying their own ignorance and their own pettiness, but they display something even more disturbing: a lack of faith in America.

RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF OUR NATION'S ANIMAL SHELTERS

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1996

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's animal shelters and the tens of thousands of dedicated individuals who are employed by or volunteer in these facilities certainly deserve recognition for the work they have done in assisting animals. This Member is pleased that the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), which has provided training and support to local animal shelters and humane organizations for over 40 years, has declared November 3–9, 1996, as National Animal Shelter Appreciation Week.

The idea for a national day of recognition and appreciation for animal shelters actually started with a humane society in this Member's district, the Capital Humane Society in Lincoln, NE. Bob Downey, the executive director of the Capital Humane Society, contacted the HSUS and suggested that they work together to establish a week intended to recognize the positive roles that animal shelters play in their communities; to recognize the staff and volunteers of shelters; and to educate the general public about animal shelters and the work they do.

The services offered by animal shelters are as varied as the communities they serve. Some handle animal control issues, such as controlling dogs running at large or sheltering unwanted or abandoned animals. Some conduct rescue operations by responding to calls regarding injured animals or animals that have fallen through the ice of a frozen lake or pond. Still others assist families who are considering adding a new four-legged member to the family by providing adoption services.

There are many ways that individuals can help our local animal shelters and humane societies. Many shelters, just like the Capital Humane Society, both need and welcome volunteers who perform a variety of tasks such as walking dogs, grooming animals, cleaning cages or assisting with adoptions. Shelters can also use donations of supplies such as blankets and towels to provide bedding, food or cages, or just cash donations to help pay for the costs of daily operations. National Animal Shelter Appreciation Week is an appropriate time for people to visit shelters, thank the people who work there, and volunteer their time.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MARVIN BROWN OF SAVANNAH, GA ON RECEIVING THE GRAND DECORATION OF HONOUR OF THE STATE OF SALZBURG, AUSTRIA

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1996

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Marvin Brown, a resident of Savannah, GA and the First Congressional District of Georgia, joined the ranks of Dwight D. Eisenhower and Winston Churchill when he was recently awarded one of Austria's highest commendations. Mr. Brown's achievements were highlighted in the August 23, 1996 edition of the Georgia Guardian:

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

[From the Georgia Guardian, August 23-29, 1996]

MARVIN BROWN AWARDED AUSTRIAN COMMENDATION

(By Thom Nezbeda)

To read of Marvin Brown's accomplishments with the Georgia Salzburger Society is to be impressed. He may have joined the organization "late in life," as he put it, but what he's lost in time has certainly been more than made up for in performance.

He first joined the Georgia Salzburger Society, the national organization devoted to preserving Salzburger history and heritage, in 1979. "I had been hearing that I was a Salzburger," Brown said. "Jackie [his wife] and I went to a meeting out of curiosity, and that got us involved." He held the position of president for the society from 1990 to 1992. His first trip to "the Old Country" came in 1981, and he's led several tours of the state of Salzburg and other areas of Austria for fellow society members since then.

"We got started [traveling to Austria] back in 1981," said Brown, "just 'babes in the woods'. We were just tourists then."

Subsequent trips as tour guides and opportunities to meet Austrian officials visiting the United States for society activities have raised them above tourist status. "It all fell in place," Brown said in a tone that seems to suggest he and his wife are taking it all in stride. "This is how we became guests of the Austrian government on one occasion: guests of the Roman Catholic archbishop on another occasion. We've really had some wonderful things happen."

Brown's accomplishments don't stop there. Besides being a guest on Austrian television talk shows, and presenting keys to the City of Savannah to two Salzburg governors, Brown and his wife were appointed area coordinators for the Austrian Olympic Sailing Team. As such, they helped coordinate a

wreath-laying ceremony at the Salzburger Monument on Bay Street. Members of the Georgia Salzburger Society, Mayor Floyd Adams Jr., and a delegation of Austrian government and industry leaders took part in the ceremony. After the ceremony, the group retired to a downtown restaurant for a late lunch.

That's when Brown, to his total surprise, received what is probably the largest feather in his cap to date: he was awarded the Grand Decoration of Honour of the State of Salzburg, in appreciation of his efforts to promote good will between Salzburger descendants and the country from which they came.

The honor, one of Austria's highest commendations, was given by Engelbert Wenckheim, the vice president of the Austrian Federal Economic Chamber.

"I really was definitely shocked; there's no other word for it," Brown said.

According to Ulf Pacher of the Austrian Embassy in Washington, D.C., the commendation is the highest decoration awarded by the province of Salzburg. "The medal is pretty exclusive," he said. "It's not given out that often—it's rarely awarded."

By receiving the award, Brown becomes part of an exclusive group of individuals including Winston Churchill and Dwight D. Eisenhower, among others.

IN ORDER TO SAVE THE COUNTRY-SIDE, WE MUST STRENGTHEN OUR CITIES

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1996

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, as recently as the 1960's, Charles Adams wrote in "The City is the Frontier": "In our own era, the world's cities are witnessing their greatest surge in man's history * * * From 1800 to 1950, the proportion of people living in cities with more than 20,000 people leaped from 2.4 to 21 percent. Our civilization is becoming urban, and the advance into the cities is one of the most spectacular social phenomena of our time. The city has become the frontier."

Today, the promise of the urban frontier seems to be little more than reminder of opportunity lost. In the latter half of this century, the Nation's landscape has been transformed by sprawling development and urban decay. The movement of families and businesses from our Nation's cities has reshaped the cities themselves, the suburbs, and the countryside. Much of this change has been positive, as families have built homes and communities, fulfilling the American dream; but a great deal has been lost as well.

It is tragic that so many cities are dying at a time when the countryside is disappearing. The American Farmland Trust estimates that the United States converts to other uses 2 million acres of farmland annually, much of it on the edge of urban America. The USDA natural resources inventory found that developed land increased by 14 million acres between 1982 and 1992.

As the cities are losing their manufacturing industries, 95 percent of the growth in office jobs occurs in low density suburbs. These office jobs accounted for 15 million of the 18 million new jobs in the 1980's.

There are many factors that have contributed to the mass migration away from the

cities: a desire for greater personal safety, better schools, less congestion, and a way of life. The development of the Interstate Highway System, relatively inexpensive community expenses, and tax incentives for homeownership have made it easier for many people to move to the suburbs.

Offsetting some of the costs associated with this trend—urban decay and the loss of open space—will require both private sector and public sector initiative. No single public policy proposal will address all of the problems. Today, I am introducing two bills addressing two of the many factors that contribute to sprawling development.

The first is related to the costs of cleaning up contaminated land and buildings in urban areas so that they can be put to productive use. The rules surrounding the tax treatment of environmental remediation expenses are so convoluted and confusing it is no wonder that a number of businesses decide to sidestep them altogether and invest in previously undeveloped land and newer buildings outside of environmentally distressed urban areas.

Repairs to business property can be deducted currently as a business expense, but capital expenditures that add to the value of property have to be capitalized. This means that some environmental remediation costs are treated as a business expense, but others are treated as capital expenditures, depending on the facts and circumstances of each case.

The administration in its brownfields initiative has proposed to allow an immediate deduction for cleaning up certain hazardous substances in high-poverty areas, existing EPA brownfields pilot areas, and Federal empowerment zones and enterprise communities. This is commendable, as far as it goes, but there is a disturbing trend in urban policy to pick and choose among cities. If expensing environmental remediation costs is good tax policy and good urban policy, and I believe that it is, then it should apply in all communities. The bill I am introducing today would apply this policy to all property wherever located, and would expand the list of hazardous substances to include potentially hazardous materials such as asbestos, lead paint, petroleum products, and radon. This bill would remove the disincentive in current law to reinvestment in our cities and buildings.

My second bill addresses a provision in current tax law that limits the deduction for a gift of appreciated property to 30 percent of adjusted gross income. Under current law, the limit for gifts of cash is 50 percent of adjusted gross income. My bill would raise the cap for qualified gifts of conservation land and easements from 30 percent to 50 percent. Under the bill, any amount that cannot be deducted in the year in which the gift is made can be carried over to subsequent tax years until the deduction has been exhausted. Current law gives the donor 5 years in which to use up the deduction.

Conservation easements are a partial interest in property transferred to an appropriate nonprofit or governmental entity. These easements restrict the development, management, or use of the land in order to keep the land in a natural state or to protect historic or scenic values. Easements are widely used by land trusts, conservation groups, and developers to protect valuable land.

The 30-percent limit in current law actually works to the disadvantage of taxpayers who may be land rich but cash poor.