

list of those organizations and associations that bestowed awards on Bruce through the years is extraordinary. Among the more notable: in 1986 Los Angeles Children's Museum named Bruce its Man of the Year, 3 years later he was named Man of the Year by the Temple Sinai Jewish Community Center of the Desert. Not to be outdone, in 1993 the Channel Islands Chapter of the Multiple Sclerosis Society named Bruce its Man of the Year.

Bruce's wide range of philanthropic and volunteer interests is truly remarkable. It is hard to imagine how he finds both the time and energy to do so much. For example, Mayor Bradley appointed Bruce to the Los Angeles Fire Commission, where he served as president for 2 years. He is also on the advisory board of Bet Tzedek, a member of the advisory committee of the Los Angeles conservancy, and a member of the executive board of the Will Rogers Hospital.

Finally, Bruce is general partner of the San Diego Padres baseball team, which this year is the surprising leader of the National League's West Division. It would not surprise us if somehow, in some way, he has played a part in the Padres' success.

We ask our colleagues to join us today in saluting Bruce Corwin, as well as his wife, Toni, and sons, Daniel and David. His selflessness in a shining example for us all.

CASH GRANTS UNDER THE COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, 1996, I wrote to Secretary Perry about a proposed cash grant to the Ministry of Defense of Ukraine under the cooperative threat reduction—Nunn-Lugar program. On May 28 I received a reply from Deputy Secretary of Defense John White, and I would like to bring the corresponding to the attention of my colleagues. The text of the correspondence follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,

Washington, DC, April 2, 1996.

Hon. WILLIAM J. PERRY,
Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY PERRY: I write with respect to your letter of March 19, 1996 concerning a proposed obligation of \$10.3 million of the FY95 Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) funding as a cash grant directly to the Ministry of Defense of Ukraine.

As you know, I have been a strong advocate and supporter of the CTR program from the outset. I believe that this program is in the national interest of the United States, and that it has made important contributions to U.S. national security over the past 5 years through the destructive and dismantlement of nuclear weapons systems.

What concerns me is your proposed cash grant. I have consistently opposed, as the State Department well knows, all types of cash grants to NIS states as inconsistent with the authorities of the FREEDOM Support Act. In November 1994, Secretary Christopher wrote to me pledging that no future cash grants from FREEDOM Support Act

funds would go forward. I have also felt that any U.S. assistance must be tied to identifiable reforms.

My views with respect to CTR funds are the same. I would appreciate a detailed explanation of the reasons that you seek to proceed with such a cash grant, and why you cannot achieve your purposes through the U.S. articles or services. I would also like a description of your oversight mechanisms for the monitoring the use of funds from this proposed cash transfer, how you will monitor whether funded activities are accomplished, and what specific reforms this assistance is tied to.

I would respectfully request from you a commitment that this proposed cash transfer is not a precedent for future CTR activities. I would also seek from you a commitment on prior consultation if, at any time, a cash transfer from CTR funds is under future consideration.

With best regards,
Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Ranking Democratic Member.

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, May 28, 1996.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: Secretary Perry has asked me to respond to your letter of April 2, 1996 regarding DOD's proposed obligation of up to \$10.3 million of the FY95 Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) funding as a cash grant directly to the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense. First, let me clearly state that the Secretary and I share your concern about providing CTR assistance in the form of grants: though the authority has existed for some years to use grants, we have given clear direction that grants will not be normally provided. DOD is proposing an exception to this policy in this case because it is required to facilitate the final denuclearization of Ukraine, a paramount national security goal for the United States.

The activities the grant will support involve sensitive activities to include removal of nuclear warheads and nuclear support equipment and the defueling, removal from silos and partial neutralization of SS-19 missiles, as well as road repair and construction on sensitive areas of missile bases. All of these expenditures are non-recurring costs associated with the final removal of all warheads and related equipment from Ukraine. Ukraine's agreement with Russia under which the warheads will be returned prohibits any foreign presence when these activities are underway. Therefore, the U.S. cannot use normal contracting methods.

Although cash grants cannot be audited as closely as goods and services the U.S. provides to Ukraine, I want to assure you that Ukraine will provide invoices, records of payments made, and summary reports for most activities under the Grant. We will verify that the invoices relate to effort covered under the Grant and we will be working with the Ukrainian banks to ensure that payments are actually made by the Ministry of Defense to legitimate third parties. In addition, the invoices and reports will be measured against information available to us from national technical means of surveillance, through which we can determine that the activities for which the assistance has been provided have in fact occurred. Until we have these reports and confirm independently that work has taken place, the full amount of assistance will not be provided to Ukraine.

Let me stress the Secretary approved the use of grants in this instance only because the activities involved are critical to achiev-

ing one of our paramount security goals. This exception is not intended to set a precedent for future CTR activities. DOD does not now envision another exception to our established policy of not providing direct financial assistance to foreign governments under the CTR program. However, I will make sure you are contacted in advance if another exception is considered.

Your support for the CTR program is vital and I want to add my personal thanks for the help you have provided. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

ANDREA JAQUITH ON GANGS AND STREET VIOLENCE

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1996

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I would like to have printed in the RECORD this statement by Andrea Jaquith, a high school student from Brattleboro, VT, who was speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people.

The phenomenon of gangs and gang violence is widespread throughout this country, and is spreading rapidly and fast becoming a societal problem of great magnitude. Some people blame the gang problems on the poverty that this country is struggling with. With the possible exception of some states in the Northeast, every state now has some sort of gang problem. In 1961, there were about 23 cities in the U.S. with known street gangs. Today, there are at least 187 different cities with known street gangs. In 1992, there were an estimated 4,881 gangs in the U.S.

L.A. County in California is the gang capital of the nation. In 1991, there were 150,000 persons in 1,000 gangs in L.A. County. John Pole of *Emergence Magazine* said, "If you could eliminate the narcotics problem tomorrow, you would still have a significant gang problem. If the next day you eliminated the gang problem, you'd still have a significant crack problem."

Guns, "gas traps" or "toolies"—whatever you choose to call them—firearms are a major part of gangs and violence, in general, today with American youths. Gunshot wounds are the leading cause of death for all teenage boys in America. Guns kill 14 kids in America every day. It is estimated that one out of 25 African-American male children now in kindergarten will be murdered with a gun by the age of 18. In a recent survey conducted, it was found that one in five H.S. students carry a weapon with them. The vast majority of juveniles get guns from their own homes, and the majority of accidental shootings occur in homes where kids can easily get guns. In a 1989 poll, nearly three out of five Americans own a gun.

So many youths have firearms because of the perceived absence of any other kind of power necessary to attain status and wealth. 5,000 kids are killed by a gun every year in the U.S. There's a trend that appears to be a weak economy and scarcity of legitimate jobs for these young minority men—that's why they tend to join gangs. Basic needs that kids get by joining gangs are: structure, nurturing, economic opportunity and a sense of belonging. Most kids join gangs because that's what there is to join where they live—there aren't sports teams that they can join,

and there aren't jobs that they can get because of the weak economy—so that's why they turn to gangs.

There are two well-known gangs in Western U.S.; they're known as the "Crips" and the "Bloods;" the Crips and the Bloods are rivals in the Western U.S.—the Crips wear blue and the Bloods wear red. There is a lot of hatred between these two gangs; a Blood will not ask for a cigarette because the word begins with a c, as in Crips. Instead, they ask for a figarrette." Parents are very fearful for their children's lives when they go out to play or go to school; if they are caught wearing the wrong colors, they could be misinterpreted for belonging to a gang, and get hurt or killed. Parents dress their children carefully in brown, yellow or other neutral colors, and they avoid buying British Nike's brand sneakers, because the initials have come to mean "bloodkiller," a sign of disrespect in a Blood neighborhood. Nearly 50% of the Black male population age 21 through 24 is involved in some sort of gang activity. More than 200,000 people live in South Central L.A., and most have turned their homes into what look like jails: heavy metal-grid bars across the windows and doors, their yards turned into military compounds with wrought-iron fences, etc. They do this to protect their property, their family and themselves from gangs involvement.

Solutions to ending the gang problems of the U.S. are difficult to come up with. Trying to attract the interest of teenagers is also hard to do. Some suggestions have been: recreational activities for the students to participate in after school so they can stay off the streets. A way to bring teenagers into the picture of helping out is by way of teacher training. They need training to recognize gang members (signal), and discourage their activities. Other than recreational activities, there should be also an alternative for those nonathletic students. There should be tighter security—security officers at schools to deal with troublesome students; increased discipline would mean stricter enforcement of existing disciplinary rules. Metal detectors are also a way of weeding out weapons, and in some schools there's a truancy court that deals with people with high absenteeism. There is also . . . alternative schools with programs for disciplinary problem children. Former gang members participate in community awareness campaigns. And one last solution would be to control the unemployment by making . . . more jobs available for students and young people.

Congressman Sanders: Andrea, thank you very much; that was excellent. I'd like to ask you a very brief question, one question: in your judgment, has the government or other interests done a good job of controlling or eliminating youth gangs in America?

Answer. I don't think so, because there's a lot of unemployment out there, and that's why these teens are turning to gangs, because they don't have anything to do. So I think that the government should create more jobs for the students to get involved with.

Congressman Sanders: Are you familiar with the Summer Youth Employment Program?

Answer. A little bit.

Congressman Sanders: The Summer Youth Employment Program is a Federal program which allows low- and middle-income students to have summer jobs. It's a very important program, in districts such as you were speaking about in Los Angeles, where unemployment is very high. One of the things that I should tell you, a little bit sadly, is we were fighting this fight, but we think that the leadership in Congress is going to eliminate the funding for the Summer Youth Employment Program, which I

think addresses some of the concerns that you've raised.

REVISION OF UNITED STATES- PUERTO RICO POLITICAL STATUS ACT, H.R. 3024

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1996

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting for the RECORD a revision of H.R. 3024, the "United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act." The purpose of the revised version is to enable Members of Congress to consider the actual language of the political status option which was presented to voters as the definition of the "Commonwealth" political status option in a 1993 plebiscite conducted by Puerto Rican authorities under local law. The local political parties in Puerto Rico formulated the ballot definitions in that plebiscite.

On December 14, 1994, the Legislature of Puerto Rico adopted Concurrent Resolution 62, requesting the 104th Congress, if unwilling to accede to and implement the definition of "Commonwealth" from the 1993 ballot, to state ". . . the specific status alternatives that it is willing to consider, and the measure it recommends the people of Puerto Rico should take as part of the process to solve the problem of their political status." Before responding to Concurrent Resolution 62, on October 17, 1995, the Subcommittee on Native American and Insular Affairs, Committee on Resources, and the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, Committee on International Relations, conducted hearings on the 1993 plebiscite results in which representatives of each principal political party testified and persons of all persuasions were afforded the opportunity to submit statements for the record.

Based on the record of that hearing (see, Joint Hearing Report, Serial No. 104-56 (Committee on Resources)), Chairman DON YOUNG and I introduced H.R. 3024 along with 13 other cosponsors to the request of the Puerto Rico Legislature in Concurrent Resolution 62. H.R. 3024 reflects the best judgment of its sponsors with respect to how Puerto Rico's political status can be resolved consistent with the U.S. Constitution and this Nation's commitment to self-determination. The definition of "Commonwealth" on the ballot in the 1993 plebiscite was not included in the bill as introduced for reasons which include those set forth in the letter of February 29, 1996, from Chairman DAN BURTON and I as the two subcommittee chairmen who conducted the joint hearing on October 17, 1995, signed as well by our respective full committee chairmen. See, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 6, 1996, E299-300.

On March 23, 1996, a comprehensive hearing on H.R. 3024 was conducted by the Committee on Resources in San Juan, PR. Again, all parties were afforded an opportunity to testify or submit written statements. On the basis of the exhaustive record now before the committee and extensive consultations with interested individuals, political parties, and elected officials in Puerto Rico, the Subcommittee on Native American and Insular Affairs is prepared to consider further H.R. 3024.

Obviously, it would be unfair and irresponsible to allow the deliberative process of Congress regarding H.R. 3024 to be held hostage by those who, for whatever reason, may prefer to delay or prevent a considered and unambiguous Federal response to the 1993 plebiscite. However, to accommodate the widest possible range of rational and responsible views on this matter, Chairman YOUNG has taken the time to consider the record carefully, and he has agreed to support revisions to the bill based on comments and recommendations made in hearings and during consultation with some of our colleagues, representatives of the major parties, and other concerned parties.

Thus, for example, we are prepared to ensure that a valid definition of "Commonwealth" consistent with applicable rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court is included in the democratic process under this bill—even though the present status would not have changed under the original version unless the voters approved a new status. In addition, the revised version of H.R. 3024, with the 1993 "Commonwealth" definition prepared by the local political party which supports that status option, is being made available for consideration by the subcommittee and interested Members of Congress.

The constitutional, fiscal, and political obstacles to implementation of both the core elements and most provisions of the 1993 "Commonwealth" definition remain, as indicated in the February 29 letter cited above. Still, Chairman YOUNG has demonstrated exceptional sensitivity toward the difficult issues which arise from the inclusion of this "best of both worlds" definition on the 1993 ballot, and its approval by a slight plurality but less than a majority of the voters. Under the U.S. Constitution only Congress can determine what political status options it is willing to consider as requested by Concurrent Resolution 62, but Chairman YOUNG's decision to present the 1993 definition to Congress for its consideration reflects his commitment to the most open and bipartisan approach possible.

I want to express my admiration for the conscientious and careful approach which Chairman YOUNG has taken in this matter. While some of the people of Puerto Rico and even some Members of Congress may well prefer this legislation not be considered on the merits, there is no credible basis for further delay. The process of hearings and accommodation of the views of others which Chairman YOUNG has overseen has been exceptionally fair, and, by ensuring that people in Puerto Rico know that the 1993 definition of "Commonwealth" is considered by Congress in the original form without alteration, Chairman YOUNG has demonstrated unprecedented flexibility and openness.

That is why some 60 Members, including Democrats and Republicans, are now cosponsors of the United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act, H.R. 3024. That is why we are going to move forward without further delay.

The revision to H.R. 3024 is made by inserting the following language on line 22, page 9, of H.R. 3024 as introduced on March 6, 1996:

(3) A path of Commonwealth, in which—

"(A) the Commonwealth is a mandate in favor of guaranteeing our progress and security as well as that of our children within a status of equal political dignity, based on the permanent union between Puerto Rico