

commuter flights in recent years, we must do everything we can to ensure the safety of those passengers.

Due to the growing competitiveness among airlines, the number of aircraft of all sizes that have entered the market is growing exponentially. At the same time, the limited FAA budget is already strapped. The Aviation Safety Protection Act would enable airline employees to aid the FAA in ensuring air travel remains safe without fear of reprisal.

The checkered safety record of ValuJet Airlines is just now coming to light. One can only wonder if this tragedy could have been prevented if an employee had come forward earlier to report safety concerns.

In light of this American tragedy, I urge Congress to expedite approval of the Aviation Safety Protection Act, so that we can begin to rebuild the public's confidence in our aviation industry.

□ 2115

ELIMINATING THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE IS NOT THE WAY TO GO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHABOT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, the bill that has been under consideration on the floor of the House for the past few hours has been dealing with the defense of our Nation, and no one in this Chamber would think of unilaterally disarming our country militarily. So why is it, then, that the Republican leadership now proposes to eliminate in the budget debates coming up during the next 2 days the Department of Commerce and so unilaterally disarm us economically? Because this Department of Commerce under, first, Secretary Ron Brown and now his successor, this Department of Commerce has been turned into an efficient juggernaut advancing U.S. interests here and abroad economically.

Mr. Speaker, if I were a business leader in this country, a small- or mid-size business leader particularly, but also a CEO of a large corporation, I would be very, very concerned about this move to take the one agency in the Federal Government that has become very effective at promoting U.S. commerce and jobs and exports and dismantling it and eliminating some of its functions and shipping some of the functions off to other agencies and departments where there is not a smooth fit.

For instance, what would be eliminated or phased out? The advanced technology program. Well, certainly we do not need technology in our economy, do we? The manufacturing extension partnerships is like the old agricultural extension program for rural areas. This is manufacturing extension,

and it can be for rural areas but urban areas as well, particularly benefiting small- and mid-size businesses.

They would eliminate the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration. Tourism is becoming one of the fastest growing industries in our country. The National Telecommunications and Information Administration. They would take the Economic Development Administration, which has been crucial in my State of West Virginia as well as every State in this country, they would take it and move it to the Small Business Administration, believing it would take only 25 employees to administer its many millions of dollars worth of grants.

The irony to this of course is the SBA, the Small Business Administration, and the EDA are not a compatible fit. The Small Business Administration deals with small business, and individual small businesses. The EDA, the Economic Development Administration, deals with the infrastructure that is necessary to help businesses grow. But it is not the same function at all.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, the business community should be greatly concerned. It should be greatly concerned at the idea that the International Trade Administration could be greatly phased down. For instance, it is estimated that half the State offices would have to be eliminated. It would reduce the support for the U.S. business community. It would terminate domestic services in one-half the States. It would lessen the ability to protect U.S. industries against unfair practices, such as dumping.

There are many, many areas of the Department of Commerce which would be, of course, either phased out or phased down or eliminated under this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to look at the achievements that the United States Department of Commerce, this department that is now sought to be eliminated over the next couple of days in the Republican leadership budget, I think it is very important to look at some of the accomplishments. Ron Brown was a heck of a leader for the United States and for the Department of Commerce. He created the first-ever national export strategy which brought \$80 billion worth of business deals, that is right, deals, contracts signed, jobs created, on the bottom line. That is what the Department of Commerce has been doing these last 3 years.

He championed the role of civilian technology by entering into \$1.5 billion of public-private partnerships, roughly a 50-50 split, 220 of these, to advance technology, increase the number of manufacturing extension centers in this country from 7 to 60. They benefit small- and mid-size businesses. U.S. merchandise exports went up 26 percent in 3 years, from 1993 to 1995.

He hosted the first-ever White House conference on travel and tourism. This is what you want a Department of

Commerce to be doing. This is what you want a Government agency to be doing, to be working in public-private partnerships, to be bringing home the bacon, to be creating jobs, working with the private sector. That is what our Department of Commerce has been doing.

So, what is the solution? What is the answer? Well, the bean counters on the other side now say eliminate the Department of Commerce, eliminate the Economic Development Administration, which, with its \$2.5 million of assistance to the Swearingen project in Martinsburg, WV, helped leverage \$130 million of investment so that the first jet manufacturing center in this country in many, many years is under construction right now and will create 800 jobs, good-paying jobs, when it is created.

That is what the Department of Commerce can do and is doing across this country. Their answer? Eliminate it, phase it out, break it up, ship it off. We do not like coordinated approaches. We do not like efficiency. We do not like somebody going out and actually bringing home the business. That is what this is about.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the motivations; there are no bad motivations. It may be a philosophical difference. Maybe they do not like success. Maybe it is just that they think that Government should not be involved in this type of activity. Eliminating the Department of Commerce is not the way to go.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER CIA DIRECTOR WILLIAM COLBY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to remind my colleagues and remind the American people of a great American, a spy who has come in from the cold, William Colby. Mr. Colby was memorialized today in a service that I had the honor of attending at the National Cathedral and sitting there among so many hundreds of family members, friends, world leaders, former colleagues of his and probably many average American citizens who had read about him in the newspaper, believed in what he had done, recognized him for the greatness that he embodied and simply came in and attended the memorial service.

As I sat there, I was reminded of the time that I have spent, that I have known Mr. Colby, first as a junior officer for several years during my tenure at the CIA. I had the honor of serving under him during the years that he served as DCI or Director of Central Intelligence. At the time I knew him probably simply by reputation as the boss, the man that headed the agency. I knew him by reputation for the long years of service that he had put in serving his country at the CIA and,

prior to that, in the OSS and in the military during the war. But it was really in the years after I left my service at the CIA, entered the private practice of law in Georgia, served as the U.S. Attorney in Georgia, and now as a Member of Congress that I have really come to know the William Colby that was such a tribute to his country, to his family and to his friends.

Mr. Colby's passing, of course, is the signal of the passing of an era in some ways. The tremendous years, decades of service to his country, the selfless service that he embodied, the service that forsook the lucrative call of private practice for many years, that drew him away from his family for many years, that kept him apart indeed in many ways from his fellow citizens for many years because of the very nature of his work, the secrecy of it, are the sorts of things that we see far too infrequently in public life nowadays.

Mr. Speaker, something else about Mr. Colby that I know from personal experience that is, if not unique, certainly something that we again do not see too often. That is the fact that, despite the man's tremendous intellect, despite the tremendous responsibilities that he continued to carry with him, even after leaving Government service, despite the fact that he could be jetting around the world anywhere at a moment's notice and meeting with world leaders, meeting with business leaders, large and small, he would always, and I emphasize always, find the time to take a call from a friend, to chat for a few minutes, to answer a question, to promise to get back to that old friend, that former junior colleague of his with an answer that might help with providing some information to an American citizen contemplating traveling abroad and who wanted to learn something about the inside scoop on a foreign nation.

In listening to the tributes today at the National Cathedral to my old friend, Bill Colby, I really was struck by the depth of public service embodied in this man. It is something that I cherish very much, and I commend to my colleagues here in this House and to the American people to learn about this man, to study him, to take heart in the selfless public service, the non-partisan public service. In all the years that I knew Bill Colby, and he supported me politically, he supported me in many ways, I never asked him whether he was a Republican or a Democrat, and I do not know. It is not something that he demanded as a litmus test of anybody, and probably most people never demanded it of him.

Mr. Speaker, he responded to me as he responded to American citizens, many of whom he never knew, because he was that kind of man. He was a man that would constantly reach out, give of himself whether it was simply answering a question or whether it was parachuting behind enemies lines in World War II or serving this country

very valiantly for many years in Vietnam. Mr. Colby truly was the professional's professional. He was the patriot's patriot for this country. He has indeed now come in from the cold, for he is now in the bosom of our Lord. I commend him to the American people.

GOLDEN EAGLE AND CORPORATE VULTURE AWARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last month as a cochair of the Jobs and Fair Trade Caucus, I proudly presented our group's first monthly Golden Eagle Award to Malden Mills in Methuen, MA.

If you will recall, the Gold Eagle Award recognizes fine U.S. companies that exemplify the best that is in us as a nation, companies which treat their workers with dignity while making decent profits, companies which contribute to strengthening their communities, companies which charge a reasonable price for their products and remain and prosper in these United States. When all of these practices are undertaken by one company, that company deserves our praise as a Golden Eagle U.S. company.

On the other hand, the Corporate Vulture designation, like the scavenger it represents, is given to a company in need of vast improvement, a company which exploits our marketplace yet downsizes its work force in America and outsources most of its production to foreign countries using sweatshop labor abroad. These firms then import their transhipped products back to the United States while keeping their prices high here at home and maintaining all of the benefits of being called an American company.

□ 2130

Corporate vultures deserve the consumers' disdain. Now, let me acknowledge this month's Golden Eagle company. The March 18 issue of Business Week detailed the unprecedented stock ownership of the company we all know as United Airlines, our Nation's leading airline company. Tonight, the Jobs and Fair Trade Caucus awards the employee owners of United Airlines our Golden Eagle Award and this new U.S. flag flown over the Capitol for your leadership, your rising productivity, and the example you set for all other companies in these United States.

United Airlines and its employee owners fit our description of a golden Eagle company in every respect. In the 18 months since United employees bought 55 percent of their company for \$5 billion, United Airlines has confounded all the skeptics by their success. The Nation's No. 1 airline is outperforming most of its rivals, gaining markets share from the other top two airlines. The company is posting fatter operating margins and higher stock

gains, with the stock price more than doubling since the purchase of the company.

The American workers of United and its chief executive officer Gerry Greenwald have made the company the success it is. By taking a huge risk in accepting pay cuts of 15 percent or more in the short term, United employees have shown that hard work over the long haul pays dividends. Operating revenue per worker jumped by 10 percent last year. Employee complaints, down by over half, have turned into new ideas about how to better work together with management. And unlike many large corporations these days, which relentlessly downsize their work force, United is a job creator, hiring 7,000 new people since the buyout.

In marked contrast to our Golden Eagle Award, this month's Corporate Vulture designation goes to Hershey Foods, a company no longer so sweet to America. Hershey Foods, America's largest producer of chocolate, continues to outsource its production to countries like Mexico and cut its U.S. work force. Last fall, Hershey Foods announced layoffs of approximately 500 workers and then announced the company was moving the production line of its giant kiss from Hershey, PA, to its plant in Guadalajara, Mexico, which employs approximately 260 workers. The U.S. workers laid off were earning \$15.40 an hour, and as one old-timer stated, as a part of that enjoyed health insurance, dental, eye, along with a pension plan.

Hershey's Mexican workers are paid 50 cents an hour with almost no benefits. The chief executive officer of Hershey Foods, Chairman Kenneth Wolfe, says he understands the pain he has caused the workers and their families in Hershey, PA. I frankly find that hard to believe. Chairman Wolfe earned an annual compensation of \$1.2 million in 1994, not counting his stock options. Moreover, Hershey Foods is earning increased profits. The latest annual report shows that Hershey Foods enjoyed a net profit of \$184 million, while total sales have increased to \$3.6 billion. A company and a chief executive officer earning millions of dollars every year have no idea what it means to lose your job and worry about your family's future.

Economists will claim that Hershey's move to Mexico is good for American consumers. After all, when you are only paying your Mexican workers a few cents an hour and earning millions of dollars, your product will be cheaper, right? Take a look at the shelf. Hershey prices on chocolate have gone up in bars. So this evening, this month, Hershey Foods definitely fits the bill as this month's Corporate Vulture, May 1996.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will