

revenues. In May 1994, a fourth State, Colorado, reduced its capital gains tax rate to promote increased investment and economic activity. Befitting their role of "laboratories of democracy," each State has reduced the cost of capital in different ways.

Mississippi and Colorado completely eliminated State taxes on capital gains. It is reported that every \$1 million in new investment in Mississippi creates \$2.2 million in economic growth and 120 new jobs. In 1989, South Carolina cut its capital gains tax rate from 7 percent to 4 percent. Since that time, the State has enjoyed stronger than average economic growth and job creation. Wisconsin has encouraged investment in that State by implementing a 60 percent exclusion of the value of any capital gain from taxation.

The third major benefit of a zero capital gains tax rate is the promotion of fiscal responsibility. While the static forecasting model predicted a cumulative \$490 billion revenue loss between 1994 and 2000 as a result of a zero capital gains tax rate, that estimate does not take into consideration additional income, payroll, and excise tax revenues from \$1.65 trillion in added economic growth over the period. As a result of greater economic activity, a zero capital gains tax rate, had it been enacted effective in 1994, would actually produce a net increase of \$25 billion in revenue to the Federal and State governments through the year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, one would think that the combined benefits of tax fairness, economic growth, and increased Government revenues would be too much for Congress and the President to resist. Yet today, we continue to perpetuate an enormously damaging tax myth that virtually every other country with a significant economy has abandoned. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in ending this antifairness, antigrowth, anti-American dream policy by cosponsoring H.R. 2861.

#### HONORING A LIFESAVING HERO

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 5, 1996*

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a real hero. A man, who while driving his truck down a dark interstate far from home, had the courage to stop and lend a hand to save lives.

Mr. Speaker, I speak of Clay County, KY truck driver Ronnie Brown—a man who did just that at 4:40 a.m., December 16.

While traveling down Interstate I-40 in Winston-Salem, NC, the 43-year-old trucker and part-time minister saw a glowing blaze just off the interstate.

With quick and decisive action, Brown called 911 and contacted truck drivers in the area. The truckers collectively laid on their horns to make as much noise as they could.

With horns a-blaazin', Brown then lept from his truck, scampered across a six-lane highway, jumped a fence and ran into the apartment building, pounding on doors.

In the end, the 24 residents of the building escaped unharmed and Brown's heroics garnered the praise and thanks of the residents and management of the apartment complex.

Lawrence Berry, manager of the complex, wrote, "We have classified Brown as a hero

for his gallant efforts and would like to thank him personally."

Brown has a reputation as a Good Samaritan. He often can and will help stranded motorists or people in need—including running into burning buildings.

Ronnie Brown is a real American hero. It is everyday people like Brown who make this country great, and hearing others praise his heroics makes me and all of our great State very proud.

#### CHINA AND TAIWAN: THE OBVIOUS DIFFERENCES

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 5, 1996*

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert for the RECORD this excellent editorial on China and Taiwan from one of my hometown newspapers, the Post Star of Glens Falls, NY.

The editorial alludes to the obvious differences between Communist China and democratic Taiwan in terms of human rights, democratic development, and economic performance. The only area left out is foreign policy orientation. Taiwan is unabashedly pro-Western and pro-United States. Communist China is unabashedly the opposite. It is a rogue regime, an enemy of freedom and yes, an enemy of the United States.

This excellent article points out how pathetic it is that we are currently agonizing over whether or not to give a routine transit visa to the Vice President of our good friend, Taiwan.

[From the Post Star, Dec. 27, 1995]

DEMOCRACY: A TALE OF TWO CHINAS

Anyone pondering the future of China, and we sincerely hope this includes the Clinton administration, should consider the striking contrast between two recent events in Beijing and Taiwan.

One event stood as a proud affirmation of a democratic future. The other an ugly reminder of continued political oppression. It shouldn't be difficult to guess which happened where.

On Taiwan, 9 million voters cast ballots in parliamentary elections that qualified as the freest in China's history. The ruling Kuomintang saw its parliamentary margin pared to just over half of the 164-seat Yuan. The pro-independence Democratic Progressives won 54 seats. The New Party, a dissident Koumintang faction favoring reconciliation and reunification with mainland China, garnered enough votes to give it 21 legislative seats.

For now, expect Taiwan to maintain its policy opposing both reunification with the Communist-ruled mainland and independence. But the larger point here is that Taiwan's prosperous citizens elected a parliament of their own choosing, selected from multiple political parties free to compete for popular support. The final step in Taiwan's full democratization is the presidential election scheduled for March.

Now compare this heartening record of political progress with what happened a few days later in Beijing.

In a one-day show trial closed to the public and the foreign press, China's leading advocate of democracy was sentenced to 14 years in prison. Officially, Wei Jingsheng was charged with attempting to overthrow the government. In fact, of course, his real of-

fense was believing, and saying publicly, that China's people should be as free as Taiwan's citizens to chart their own political future. Wei also believes, and has said publicly, that China's forcible annexation and military occupation of Tibet are wrong.

China's one-party dictatorship justifies its continued suppression of all political freedoms by contending that authoritarian rule is necessary for economic development. Really? Per capita income on democratic Taiwan is 10 times that of mainland China. Japan, the richest country in Asia and the second-ranking economy in the world, has been a fully functioning democracy for nearly half a century.

China won't ever catch up to Taiwan, much less Japan, economically until the mainland autocrats permit the rule of law. That, in turn, must entail political liberalization of the sort that is transforming the rest of Asia.

The Clinton administration shouldn't shrink from saying exactly this, and from reminding Beijing that China will be trusted in exact proportion to the way it treats its own people.

#### HONORING THE 1995 CIF FOOTBALL DIVISION I CHAMPION, BISHOP AMAT MEMORIAL HIGH SCHOOL LANCERS

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 5, 1996*

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the students, coaches, faculty, and parents who make up the 1995 California Interscholastic Federal Southern Section Division I Champion, Bishop Amat Memorial High School football team.

On December 9, 1995, the Bishop Amat Lancer football team defeated Loyola High School in a 14 to 10 win, earning the team its latest in a string of CIF Division I championships before 14,000 fans at the Los Angeles Coliseum.

This year's CIF Division I championship team: Andrew Woolsey, Joey Getherall, Kevin McLaurin, Daniel Bravo, Brendan McMillan, David Bautista, Brian Russell, Gabriel Marichi, Chris Ulibarri, Mike Vermeeren, David Fuentes, Steve Levario, Sean Koelle, Ricky Vargas, Andre Lake, Damon Catania, Chikoski Bell, Ralph Brown II, Chris Sabado, Breon Ansley, Carlos Osorio, Booker Bell, Damon Samuels, David Olivas, Mike Chavez Jeremy Juarez, Emerson Santos, Joaquin Tierney, Raymond Reyna, Anthony Chacon, Abel Montanez, Manuel Duran, Kyle Keene, Eric Calderon, Santiago Vazquez, Trey Sorensen, Frank Gonzalez, Kali Dawkins, Manuel Garcia, Sam Galvan, Nate Sabado, Ruben Torres, Yovany Lainez, Jesus Hernandez, Ron Villa, Preston Wills, Joe Villa, Tom Gomez, Ernie Fierro, Raul Ascencio, Brian Polak, Chris Morales, Alex Perez, Jason Marin, Paul Gonzales, Zino Hessing, David Fernandez, Ray Martinez, Justyn Hayward, Mark Verti, Doug Knight, Brian Adamek, Luigi, Rao, Manuel Porras, John Escalera, Xavier Gomez, Kristopher Guillory, Jerry Lopez, Anthony Salazar, Jeremy Drake, Huber Ayala, John Sheriff, Mike Diaz, and Jesus Lopez.

With the guidance and support of their family, Bishop Amat faculty, and Principal, Monsignor Aidan M. Carroll, and Head Coach Tom

Salter and Assistant Coaches Glenn Martinez, Mike DiFiori, Bill Mulvehill, Richard Ecalera, Stephan Pace, Dechon Burns, Pat Escalera, and Joe O'Connor, the Lancer football team proved that Bishop Amat is a formidable competitor.

This year's championship makes the fifth time Bishop Amat has successfully brought home the CIF Southern Section Division I Championship and their first since 1992. The dedication and commitment demonstrated by these students is commendable and noteworthy. Their practice required many long hours, while maintaining the high academic standards demanded of Bishop Amat students, in preparation for their 14-game championship season.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I rise to recognize these exceptional students, coaches, and parents. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting these accomplished individuals and in extending our congratulations and best wishes for their continued success and commitment to excellence.

#### VA EDUCATION 2-YEAR RULE MODIFICATION

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 5, 1996*

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce H.R. 2851 to amend title 38, U.S. Code to modify the Department of Veterans Affairs' GI bill's 2-year rule to allow easier access for veterans to institutions of higher learning.

The proposed bill waives the current 2-year operating rule for branch campuses of public or other tax-supported institutions. It also waives the rule for proprietary profit or non-profit educational institutions where the branch and parent institution have been in operation for 2 years.

The 2-year rule is an important qualification for schools. It ensures that only quality educational institutions and courses are offered to our Nation's veterans. The rule was originated after World War II and resurfaced after the Vietnam war to negate the impact fly-by-night operations that preyed on veterans, bilking them of their educational benefits.

As a result, veterans did not receive the education and the training they needed and for which the citizens of this country paid with their taxes.

Today, the situation has changed substantially. While we recognize that some low-quality and fly-by-night organizations clearly still exist, the majority of for-profit education institutions offering meaningful, quality coursework. They have default rates well below the Department of Education's standards for continued operation and they are continually monitored for the VA by the State approving agencies.

This proposed legislation does not alter the stringent requirements already in place mandating that the institutions must be degree granting, and be recognized by a Department of Veterans Affairs-affiliated accrediting agency. The institution must be also be licensed by the State in which it operates.

Allowing participation by veterans on new branch campuses of already proven institutions gives necessary flexibility to veteran

beneficiaries of the Montgomery GI bill and I urge its passage.

#### WEST VIRGINIANS SUPPORT HEALTH, SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTIONS

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 5, 1996*

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of this Congress, West Virginians were subjected to a legislative assault of unprecedented proportions as proposal after proposal was advanced by the Republican majority to gut virtually every major environmental, health, and safety law.

From the standpoint of coalfield citizens in particular, 1995 was a year to remember. The protections coal miners receive from the Mine Safety and Health Administration came under siege by one Republican legislative proposal. The health care miners obtain from black lung clinics may no longer exist as a result of the Labor, HHS, and Education appropriation bill. The pensions and health care unionized coal miners receive continue to be jeopardized by another Republican legislative proposal. The ability of coal miners to obtain black lung benefits was threatened by reductions in appropriations that may give rise to the closure of black lung field offices. And, the general welfare of coalfield citizens continues to be threatened by a Republican bill which would eliminate the ability of the Federal Office of Surface Mining to safeguard the coalfield environment, and the safety of coalfield citizens, from illegal surface coal mining practices.

While these are issues particular to the coalfields, West Virginians also feel strongly about the integrity of environmental statutes which affect the Nation as a whole. Last year we saw come out of this body a rewrite of the Clean Water Act that would roll back decades of progress in bringing a better quality of life to our citizens through cleaner lakes and streams. We also saw reported to the full House an Endangered Species Act rewrite that purports to place in the hands of mankind the ability to determine which of the Lord's creatures may live, and which may perish into extinction.

I am pleased at this time to include in the RECORD a summary of a survey conducted last October on the attitude of West Virginians toward environmental issues before the Congress. This survey, conducted by the Mellman Group, Inc., for the Environmental Information Center was recently brought to my attention by the West Virginia Chapter of the Sierra Club. The summary follows:

THE MELLMAN GROUP,  
*October 26, 1995.*

To interested parties.

From the Mellman group.

Re West Virginia voters' attitudes toward environmental protection and regulatory reform.

The Mellman Group, Inc. designed and administered this telephone survey conducted by professional interviewers. The survey interviewed 500 registered voters in West Virginia. The survey was conducted between October 21-23, 1995. The margin of error for this survey is +/- 4.4 percentage points at the 95% confidence level. The margin of error for subgroups varies and is slightly larger.

West Virginia voters are solidly in favor of maintaining current levels of environmental protection. A majority oppose current Congressional efforts to roll back environmental laws and regulations, and they are specifically opposed to loosening clean water regulations and reducing protections for endangered species. These voters object to the notion that they are over-regulated when it comes to the environment. Rather, they believe environmental laws and regulations have successfully protected public health and safety and are worth their cost. Further, West Virginians do not believe that we can afford to loosen environmental standards because of prior success in cleaning up pollution. Instead, these voters believe that if we loosen environmental regulations it will turn back the clock on the advances we have made in pollution control. They oppose a regulatory reform package that would weaken any portions of the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act or the Safe Drinking Water Act. Similarly, these voters believe regulations to protect endangered species are necessary and worth their costs. West Virginians oppose legislation that would reduce protections for endangered plants and animals. As we have seen in other states, this support for environmental laws and standards cuts across partisan, ideological, and demographic lines. Finally, in substantial numbers, West Virginians will retaliate at the polls against candidates who support relaxing environmental regulations.

#### POWER OF THE PURSE

HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 5, 1996*

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that amounts appropriated in the fiscal year 1994 Defense budget are not being spent for the specific purposes for which they were intended.

Central to our debates over appropriations funding in the last several months has been a tacit understanding by both sides of the aisle that the Congress, and the Congress alone, has the constitutional "Power of the Purse." From this power, the Congress—and the Congress alone—specifies the objects of the appropriations funding. This means that the Congress can direct that agencies expend funds at the level, and in the direction, which Congress indicates.

This principal has remained so settled that it has been virtually unchallenged—that is, until relatively recently. In recent litigation before the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, however, The Justice Department has taken the position that the language commonly employed in appropriations acts to direct funding is permissive only, and not mandatory. Specifically, according to the Justice Department, the language "not less than \$40 million shall be made available only for the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences" as employed in the fiscal year 1994 Defense Appropriations Act and the language "not less than \$20 million shall be made available only for the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences" as employed in the fiscal year 1995 Defense Appropriations Act, is not binding on the agency.

The Department has used this interpretation to withhold funding from the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences. As a result, the