

Resolution 148, a resolution that states, in part, that "the United States, in accordance with the Taiwan Relations Act and the constitutional process of the United States, and consistent with its friendship with and commitment to the democratic government and people of Taiwan, should assist in defending them against invasion, missile attack, or blockade by the People's Republic of China."

Other key supporters of this resolution include House Speaker NEWT GINGRICH, International Relations Committee Chairman BENJAMIN GILMAN (R-NY), House Majority Leader DICK ARMEY, and House Majority Whip TOM DELAY.

Ronald Reagan once reminded us that "we are a people with a government, not the other way around." The people of Taiwan understand this fundamental truth in a way the aging tyrants in Beijing perhaps never will, which is all the more reason for the United States to uphold our longtime friends on Taiwan.

#### INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO CLARIFY THAT FREQUENT FLIER MILEAGE IS NOT TAX- ABLE

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 19, 1996*

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to clarify that frequent flier mileage is not taxable. I believe that frequent flier miles are not taxable under current law. However, in light of the Internal Revenue Service's recent advice in technical advice memorandum 9547001 and despite the fact that technical advice memorandums only apply to a given taxpayer and set of circumstances, I feel a clarification is necessary.

The technical advice memorandum would require employers that permit employees to use frequent flier miles for personal trips to report as income on workers' W-2 forms the full cost of plane tickets that led to the accumulation of the frequent flier miles. This simply makes no sense.

This is one of those areas where taxation would raise a myriad of questions for which there is no single correct answer such as appropriate timing—would miles be taxed when earned or when used; valuation—is mile earned from a credit card equal to a mile earned by flying a particular airline—what is the correct value of a ticket or a free upgrade in light of the fact that any given flight has a myriad of service classes; segregation—do employees have to try and keep track of which miles were earned for personal travel, which miles were earned for business travel, and which miles are earned from using a credit card, or using a particular long-distance carrier. Taxation of frequent flier miles would only result in mindless complication and paperwork of nightmarish proportions for millions of Americans, the airlines, and the Internal Revenue Service. And the Service should realize this.

At a time when over 15 million Americans are enrolled in frequent flier programs and suspicion that the Internal Revenue Code is not fair and needless complexity is at an all time high, it would be sheer folly for the Serv-

ice to move in this area. They have opened, closed, and reopened several projects to address the tax treatment of frequent flier miles over the years, all to no avail.

I believe that frequent flier miles are not taxable under current law and should remain that way. My bill would simply explicitly say that frequent flier miles are not taxable. I urge my colleagues' support.

#### ROTARY CLUB OF SAN CLEMENTE

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 19, 1996*

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention an organization that has provided 50 years of outstanding service to the city of San Clemente, CA.

Founded in March, 1946, the Rotary Club of San Clemente and its members have provided hundreds of thousands of dollars, equipment, and tens of thousands of manhours in service to the city, the Nation, and the world.

Their accomplishments are numerous. In its many years of service, the Rotary Club of San Clemente has sent thousands of dollars and equipment to De Tiju, Argentina, San Clemente's "sister city". In conjunction with Rotary International, they have taken on the monumental task of eradicating polio in the world by the year 2000. Closer to home, they provide financial support to over 19 San Clemente charities and organizations, as well as, scholarships to local high school seniors.

I would like to commend and thank them for work they so selflessly perform. Their dedication is an inspiration to all.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1561, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1996 AND 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 12, 1996*

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report for H.R. 1561, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, fiscal years 1996 and 1997. This measure dismantles the United States Information Agency [USIA] and, in doing so, amends the Television Broadcasting to Cuba Act and the Radio Broadcasting to Cuba Act. Additionally, the conference report establishes as an urgent priority the development of an appropriate national strategy to respond to emerging infectious diseases. I am interested in these provisions as a general matter, and also as chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

Regarding the Television Broadcasting to Cuba Act, the Committee on Commerce exchanged letters with the Committee on Foreign Affairs when that committee sought to amend the Television Broadcasting to Cuba Act in the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 (Pub. L. 101-246). Furthermore, the Commerce Committee reported its own version of the Radio Broadcasting to Cuba Act (Pub. L. 98-111) on July

29, 1983 (H. Rept. 98-284, Part II). The committee will be interested to see the results of the pilot program to permit advertising on such television and radio broadcasts as provided for in the conference report. I look forward to continued activity on the part of the Commerce Committee in these areas, although I still believe the Television Marti and Radio Marti programs should not be administered through the Voice of America.

Turning to another point of interest in the conference report, this measure requires that the President develop a strategic plan "to identify and respond to the threat of emerging infectious diseases to the health of the people of the United States." In accordance with this committee's jurisdiction over public health and quarantine under rule X of the Rules of the House, I look forward to the opportunity to review the President's recommendations in concert with other efforts made by the Commerce Committee on that front.

Based on the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce over the aforementioned statutes, and on the jurisdiction of the committee over public health, I would like to note our intent to continue in the exercise of our authority in these areas.

#### ESSAY ON FREEDOM BY MICHELLE FUNK OF RICHMOND

HON. DAVID M. MCINTOSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 19, 1996*

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to give my report from Indiana for the week of March 11.

This week I would like to share with you an essay written by a sixth grade girl named Michelle Funk. Michelle is from Richmond, IN, in my district. Her essay won the top school award for sixth grade and first place in a Sertoma Club contest.

Michelle has entitled her essay, "Freedom." I think Michelle describes the God given right of self-determination better than many adults.

Her essay begins.

Imagine this: Johnny and Mark were playing one-on-one basketball when a bully came up to them and said, "Give me that ball!" Johnny said, "I don't have to. It's a free country."

"It's a free country." Many times that just seems like an excuse for not doing things we're told to. But it's true. It is a free country. But what does that mean?

One thing is rights, the rights that are listed in the Constitution. They say that we can go to school, speak our minds, publish our ideas, and believe in whatever and whoever we want to.

A right that is very important is voting. Even though it doesn't apply to me yet, it's still important that we can choose our own leaders instead of having a ruler who's succeeded by his children and their children.

Even though we have a right to freedom, it's still a privilege, and privileges always go with responsibilities. If we are responsible now and in the future, we will make a better life for ourselves and our future families in many ways. If you're responsible, you will do better in school and in your future career. So be responsible!

But then again, you don't have to. It's a free country!

I want to thank Michelle for helping us remember the true nature of freedom. In our Nation, we are blessed with freedoms which people in so many other countries do not enjoy. Michelle reminds us that freedom without responsibility is license. Freedom with responsibility is a virtue.

Mr. Speaker, Michelle's words are an important reminder for our work here in Congress, and they bear repeating. "If we are responsible now and in the future, we will make a better life for ourselves and our future families in many ways". This sixth grader from Richmond, IN is right. Thank you Michelle.

And that is my report from Indiana this week.

#### FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 14, 1996*

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 163, the short-term continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996. This is the 11th short-term fiscal year 1996 stopgap spending measure in 5 months. Who would have thought that 5 months into the fiscal year, and after 29 days of a Republican politically contrived shutdown of the Federal Government which cost the American people over \$1.5 billion, fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills for a number of major Federal agencies upon which the American people depend still have not been enacted?

Now, here we are again, just hours before the current continuing resolution expires, trying to pass an 11th stopgap spending measure to keep the Government operating. In fact, this stopgap measure will not be the last one for fiscal year 1996. Expiring on March 22d, House Joint Resolution 163 will keep the Government operating for only 1 week.

The bill being voted on today still does not address all of my concerns about critical programs under the jurisdiction of the appropriations subcommittee for the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development and independent agencies—on which I serve as the ranking member—or, those under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee for the Departments of Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education on which I also serve. I am pleased, however, that our Nation's veterans will get their hardearned benefits, that our homeless, low-income families, seniors and disabled who depend on Federal housing assistance will retain support for shelter; and that our environment will be safeguarded for at least 1 more week.

Nevertheless, I remain resolute in my opposition to the cuts in these programs including:

The \$1.1 billion cut in title I which will deny over a million disadvantaged children the teaching assistance they require in reading and math;

The \$266 million cut in safe and drug free schools which means that school systems will be denied the resources they need to provide children a safe crime free drug free classroom in which to learn;

The elimination of funding for the Summer Jobs Program which means that over 600,000

young people who need and want to work will be deprived of the opportunity to do so;

The anticrime block grants which will eliminate the successful community policing and crime prevention programs;

The overall cut in funding for the Department of Commerce which will dramatically hinder our Nation's technology advancement effort; and

The irresponsible and unjust slashing of funding for the Minority Business Development Program, the Commission on Civil Rights, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission which will lead to the foreclosing of opportunities for many Americans.

Mr. Speaker, who would have thought that our Republican colleagues would have let their blind desire—to give a tax cut to the wealthy—outweigh the needs of seniors, children, veterans, and families across the country?

This continuing resolution—like the 10 that preceded it—is part of the Republicans' strategy to hold the American people hostage in an effort to force the President to accept their outrageous and lifethreatening cuts in major critical quality of life programs.

Mr. Speaker, this is the ultimate of irresponsibility. House Joint Resolution 163 is not a solution to the politically contrived budget crisis, it is only an interim step to keep the Government temporarily operating while our colleagues on the other side of the aisle decide what political game to play next. No amount of smoke and mirrors can hide the pain and suffering that is contained in the GOP's budget.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to put an end to this piecemeal, part-time approach to operating the Government. Let's go back to the budget negotiation table and restore funding to critical programs and services including education, summer jobs, employment training, student aid, housing, environmental protection, veterans' medical care, heating assistance, meals for seniors, and crime prevention. I urge my colleagues to vote against House Joint Resolution 163.

#### COMPREHENSIVE ANTITERRORISM ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 14, 1996*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2703) to combat terrorism:

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Conyers-Nadler-Berman substitute to H.R. 2703. The substitute is a reasonable and measured attempt to address threats to U.S. citizens posed by terrorism without creating threats to our fundamental constitutional protections.

In this debate, we should stipulate that all of us are concerned about the increase in domestic terrorism and that our thoughts and prayers are with the survivors of the terrible terrorist acts which we have seen perpetrated against U.S. citizens, including the terrorism directed at Federal workers in Oklahoma City. We can and must act against terrorism. At the same time, we must ensure that our actions are effective and within the bounds of the

Constitution, which has safeguarded basic American freedoms for over 200 years.

H.R. 2703 poses serious threats to civil liberties and civil rights. I have a number of concerns about H.R. 2703. The bill expands the use of the death penalty and changes the use of habeas corpus petitions, severely restricting avenues of recourse to the judicial system for people sentenced to death. The death penalty is not a punishment which should be taken lightly. Frankly, I do not believe it should be used at all. But since the death penalty is utilized, we must ensure that people sentenced to death have sufficient opportunity to petition for relief if they have not had a fair trial or competent counsel.

The bill also contains changes to asylum law which threaten our 200-year history of providing refuge for people fleeing persecution in their countries of origin. I agree that we need to be able to exclude terrorists from our shores. I do not agree that we should turn away others who come to the United States seeking haven from persecution. That protection is one of the principles upon which this U.S. standing as an international beacon of freedom and hope is built.

The Conyers-Nadler-Berman substitute addresses many of my concerns. This substitute deletes H.R. 2703's restrictions on habeas corpus appeals. It deletes the expedited asylum procedures contained in H.R. 2703. And, it provides for expedited deportation for terrorists without violating constitutional protections.

The Conyers-Nadler-Berman mechanism for expedited deportation of terrorists is in accordance with procedures for dealing with classified information and preserves a fundamental principle of our justice system which grants accused individuals the right to face their accuser and to confront evidence. Regardless of what we think of individuals and the crimes of which they are accused, we are a nation of laws. The Conyers-Nadler-Berman substitute strikes a balance by allowing for the use of sensitive information in the deportation process while also preserving the right of the accused to mount an adequate defense.

And, the Conyers-Nadler-Berman substitute prohibits foreign terrorist groups such as Hamas from fundraising in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support the Conyers-Nadler-Berman substitute, which increases our ability to stop terrorism while continuing to preserve our precious constitutional protections. We must fight terrorism. If, however, we undermine our civil liberties in that fight, the terrorists win. They succeed not only by sowing terror through their heinous acts, but also by undermining the very system which they claim to be fighting against. The Conyers-Nadler-Berman substitute is the best option before us in this debate and I urge my colleagues to support it.

#### THE STORY OF VARIAN FRY AND THE EMERGENCY RESCUE COMMITTEE

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 19, 1996*

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the following account was written by my wife Annette with the able assistance and research of Mandi Cohn.