

Welcome to you, Mr. Prime Minister, and to all of my good friends here today from the Polish American Congress.

Today, on the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of 1791, we look back over the troubled history of Poland during the last two centuries.

We remember the Polish nation dismembered by its neighbors.

We see that nation then resurrected, but soon subjected yet again to a horrible fascist occupation.

We recall that the Polish nation was then freed again—only to be taken captive by communism.

Finally, in 1989, the nation of Poland emerged from its suffering and repression—almost two hundred years after the adoption of the May 3rd Constitution.

Keenly aware of this history, the question that has troubled many Poles since 1989 is this:

Will Poland once again fall victim to invasion or dictatorship?

I want to share with you this morning my conviction that the answer is no.

Of course we cannot overlook the threats to democracy and sovereignty that exist even today in Eastern Europe and that can confront any one of the struggling democracies in that region.

One need only look to events now occurring in Belarus, Poland's neighbor, to realize that even today a determined dictator can subvert constitutional democracy.

One need only look to Russia's continuing desire to exercise its power over the states of Eastern Europe and over the states of the former Soviet Union to realize that imperialism and aggression can quickly challenge the stability of much of Europe.

One need only realize that the reunification of Belarus with Russia may well be a real prospect—and an event that, should it occur, could change the face of Eastern Europe overnight.

It is my belief, however, that the policies that Poland has followed since 1989 will overcome those challenges and will, in fact, make Poland an anchor for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe that are also seeking democracy and security.

I have had opportunities in the last few months to speak about Poland's foreign policy at gatherings attended by Polish-Americans and to express my satisfaction with the positive trends I have seen in that foreign policy.

Let me just say this morning that Poland has followed a positive foreign policy to the West by eliminating obstacles to good relations with Germany and seeking integration into the NATO Alliance and the European Union.

It has also followed a positive foreign policy to its East, recognizing that the fate of countries such as Ukraine and Lithuania are vital to its national security and acting to support those countries' integration into European and trans-Atlantic institutions as well as its own.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I also have little fear for the success of Polish democracy.

The Polish people have made it clear that they want and expect Poland to be a mature democracy.

Free and fair elections have been held.

A modern Parliament is now working in Warsaw.

A peaceful and democratic transfer of presidential power has taken place.

And now, as we commemorate the anniversary of the May 3rd Constitution, the Polish people are preparing to decide on a new constitution that will guide their new democracy in the coming years.

Whatever the Polish people's decision on that new constitution may be, we can see

that, ultimately, much of what the framers of the May 3rd Constitution sought for their country has now come to pass:

We see today a peaceful, democratic Poland.

We see a Poland free from the threat of invasion and working to ensure that it remains free.

We see the nation of Poland now free to seek its prosperity as a full member of the European community of nations.

While the Polish Constitution of 1791 was written only shortly before the nation of Poland entered into its two centuries of repression and dictatorship, that document has never been forgotten by Poles, who saw in it the symbol of a resurrected nation.

Today, as Poland has been re-born into a new era of democracy, we see that the promise of the May 3rd Constitution has been fulfilled.

On this important occasion, I extend my best wishes to the Polish nation as it moves forward to a bright future of peace, democracy and prosperity.

### SUPPORT GROWS FOR NATIONAL SPORTS SUMMIT TO COMBAT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT

**HON. BERNARD SANDERS**

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 3, 1997*

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman CONNIE MORELLA and I introduced legislation—House Concurrent Resolution 29—in February calling for a national summit of sports, government, business, and academic leaders along with nonprofit community organizations that serve victims of domestic violence and sexual assault and advocate on their behalf. Since then, support for such a groundbreaking summit has been growing steadily.

I am pleased to report that since similar legislation was first introduced last summer that we have received endorsement letters from the following concerned organizations and individuals: American College of Nurse-Midwives; American Psychological Association; AYUDA; Larry Brown, coach of the Philadelphia 76'ers; Catholics for Free Choice; Center for the Study of Sports and Society; Center for Women Policy Studies; Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America; Washington, DC Rape Crisis Center; Domestic Violence Advocacy Project; Joseph Glass of Team Sports; Britt King, Women's Basketball Coach at University of the District of Columbia; Lee McElroy, athletic director at American University; Older Women's League; National Association of Social Workers; National Coalition Against Sexual Assault; Jody Glass with New Waves of Rhode Island; Empowering Women and Confronting Abuse; NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund; Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape; Tom Penders, head basketball coach at the University of Texas; Rhode Island Coalition Against Domestic Violence; National Urban League; Office of Justice Programs within the U.S. Justice Department; Vermont Network Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault; Women's Research and Education Institute; YWCA of the USA; and the Violence Policy Center.

It is a national disgrace that domestic violence is the leading cause of injury to American women, more common than auto acci-

dents, muggings, and rapes by unknown assailants combined. Nearly 4,000 women die every year in our country as a result of domestic violence. In my own State of Vermont, every single murder during a recent year was linked to this criminal behavior.

We simply must find new ways to get a loud and clear message through to all Americans to curb the violence in our midst, especially domestic violence and sexual assault against women and girls. To help carry that message, I believe that our national sport heroes, as role models of profound national influence, can play a crucial role in helping to stigmatize and deter violence against women all across America.

Sadly hardly a day goes by that we don't read about the latest incidents of domestic violence and sexual assault in our local newspapers. Just a few days ago, a local television station in Washington, DC, for example reported on five different sexual assaults that had occurred allegedly involving athletes at Howard University and that had been covered up until now.

But positive action can be taken.

That is why Congresswoman MORELLA and I first wrote to all of the leaders of the major professional and amateur sports leagues in America in January 1996 urging them to join a national campaign and speak out against domestic violence and sexual assault. Since then we have had numerous meetings and entered into a dialogue with representatives of the National Football League, Major League Baseball, National Basketball Association, National Hockey League, National Collegiate Athletic Association, and the College Football Association.

We are pleased that some important follow-ups have been taken. Last fall, several prominent athletes, coaches, and officials of the College Football Association, in conjunction with the Liz Claiborne Foundation, filmed a series of unprecedented antidomestic violence public service advertisements that were broadcast during nationally televised collegiate football games for the first time. Similarly, the National Football League and star players like Steve Atwater of the Denver Broncos joined forces to air public service announcements against domestic violence during ABC's Monday Night Football show and other televised games.

Certainly I am not suggesting in any way that athletes are statistically any more prone to domestic violence and sexual assault than any other sector of our population. But there is no doubt that organized sports touch the lives of so many Americans and our families and that star athletes are idolized by many Americans of all ages. Hence, our identification with our sports stars provides a powerful means to combat domestic violence and sexual assault. There is much to be gained in our constant national campaign if we can enlist our sports leaders in spreading the word that rough and tumble, hard-nosed physical competition stops when athletes leave the playing arena and that there is absolutely no excuse for domestic violence or sexual assault in any walk of American life.

Similarly we need to do more to teach our young people who are so interested in sports that domestic violence and sexual assault are serious crimes. In this regard, I intend to press for education against domestic violence and sexual assault to be included in the regular instruction that thousands of young Americans

between 10 and 16 years of age receive through taxpayer-funded programs like the National Youth Sports Program which the National Collegiate Athletic Association has received tens of millions of tax dollars to administer every summer for more than 20 years.

# CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1998

SPEECH OF

**HON. VINCE SNOWBARGER**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 1997*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the Congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

Mr. SNOWBARGER. Mr. Chairman, during my campaign for Congress last year I said that my primary goals were a balanced budget as scored by the Congressional Budget Office and permanent tax relief for hard-working families. I stressed that these two goals were not mutually exclusive and that both were desperately needed by the American people. Tonight, I have the opportunity to vote for a budget plan that meets both those goals, and will by 2002—for the first time since 1974—reduce the Federal Government's share of the fruits of our labors to less than 20 percent of the U.S. gross domestic product.

This plan was not my first choice. I first supported a better budget, one introduced by Mr. DOOLITTLE, that would have allowed the American people to retain more of their hard-earned money and significantly reduced the bloated Federal Government. Unfortunately, that budget failed. My choice then, is between the balanced budget agreement and the status quo.

The plan currently contains many things that I gladly support—\$135 billion in tax relief for families and investors over 5 years—\$85 billion net; \$600 billion in entitlement reform over 10 years; reforms to ensure the solvency of Medicare for the next decade; and less Government spending than the President would have us spend.

Of course, since the Republican Congress does not have enough of a majority to override President Clinton's vetoes, the plan also includes his own initiatives, many of which I oppose. These include a new taxpayer-financed health insurance entitlement, college tax credits that I, as a former college teacher, believe will only go to fund tuition increases and grade inflation; and reinstating SSI benefits to certain immigrants. However, the most disappointing aspect of this plan is that it doesn't really deflate the bloated Federal Government. The reduction in the share of the Nation's wealth consumed by the Government is based primarily on the assumption that the Nation's economy will grow a little faster than Government spending. But it is the best we can get with this President in the White House.

The other important thing this plan will do is that it should prevent the President from shutting down the Government again. The President has already signaled his willingness to

shut the Government down—just as he did 2 years ago to prevent spending cuts, and blackmailed Congress into higher spending to avoid a shutdown last year. As long as this agreement is followed in good faith, this option should not be available to him.

I think we will be able to fill out the details of the plan in a way that is acceptable to both parties. I will watch carefully as Congress begins to shape the tax relief package and finalize other areas of the plan. As long as the Congressional Budget Office continues to certify that the plan will balance the budget and provide significant tax relief, I will support it.

# OVERHAULING THE FOREIGN AID ESTABLISHMENT SUPPORT: H.R. 1486

**HON. DAVID DREIER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 3, 1997*

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, later this week the House is likely to consider H.R. 1486, the Foreign Policy Reform Act of 1997. I believe that this important legislation, crafted in a responsible and bipartisan manner by the esteemed chairman of the House International Relations Committee, BEN GILMAN of Middletown, NY, offers a historic opportunity to move our Nation's foreign policy in the right direction.

The legislation reported by the International Relations Committee represents a return to proper congressional authorization procedures. It authorizes spending for the State Department and related agencies, as well as for security, humanitarian, and development assistance at levels agreed to by the House and Senate last week in their votes on the budget resolution, and at levels agreed to by the administration.

David Warsh, a business and economics columnist for the Boston Globe, recently wrote a cogent article putting the bill, and Chairman GILMAN's leadership, in the proper historical perspective. Namely, it is a plan for development aid in the post-cold war era that rivals the shrewdness of the Marshall Plan itself.

## MARSHALL'S INHERITOR

He was a kid sergeant when General George Marshall was Chief of Staff of the Army—an Army Air Corps navigator with 35 missions over Japan. And when Secretary of State Marshall in 1947 announced the ambitious plan for the reconstruction of Europe that has borne his name ever since, Ben Gilman was a GI Bill student at New York University Law School.

Now Gilman, the little-known chairman of the House Committee on International Relations, is acting as Marshall's inheritor—in ways that are as yet little understood.

Next week Congress takes up his Foreign Policy Reform Act. It is billed as the first major overhaul of the foreign aid establishment since 1961.

More to the point, the bill provides a set of tools for the conduct of development aid in the post-Cold War era that are in many ways analogous—opposite in approach but perhaps equal in shrewdness—to the Marshall Plan itself.

Chief among its features is a streamlining of the baroque foreign policy establishment that grew up during the half-century contest with the former Soviet Union.

Merged into the State Department altogether would be the US Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Agency for International Development, which now reports directly to the president, also would go to work for the secretary of state instead. The expansion of NATO to the countries of Eastern Europe and Russia itself is authorized as well.

Thus the dueling strategies that have given the US government's foreign policy some of its worst moments since the Berlin Wall came down would at last be expected to speak with a single voice.

It was one of these smoldering rivalries that burst into flames last month when the Agency for International Development suspended a \$14 million contract with a unit of Harvard University that has been consulting to the Russian government on various privatization programs.

The reason: The significant others of the two lead advisers—the wife of one, the girlfriend of the other—had been investing heavily in Russian ventures for personal gain.

Harvard economics professor Andrei Shleifer and Moscow program director Jonathan Hay were fired from its programs last week by the Harvard Institute for International Development. But the suspended contract is expected to be canceled soon, with permanent damage to the Russian faction that has been Washington's brightest hope for reform.

But there were deeper currents. HIID might never have had the contract in the first place but for the rump State Department that was the AID mission to Moscow—something like 300 hard-to-control employees. In fast-moving events after the attempted coup against Mikhail Gorbachev in 1991—and especially after Bill Clinton moved into the White House—the Harvard Institute came to be used as the principal, if unofficial, instrument of US macroeconomic policy in Moscow, responsive to instructions from the White House in ways that the well-entrenched AID mission in Russia never was.

It was amid such back-channel maneuvering that the burgeoning conflicts of interest on the part of the administration's preferred advisers, Shleifer and Hays, went unnoticed—or at least unchallenged.

With everybody in the foreign policy apparatus working for the president—as they would be under Ben Gilman's Foreign Policy Reform Act—such mischief would be far less likely to occur.

Harry Truman called Marshall “one of the most astute and profound men I have ever known.” At a distance of 50 years, it is clear that Marshall understood that with a devastating war just ended but an even more threatening possibility in prospect, a concerted effort by the Americans to rebuild Europe would be required to keep Soviet tanks out of Paris.

Conditioned by the sacrifices of the war, a bipartisan Congress dug deep and came up with money—\$13.5 billion, paltry even at 10 times that sum in current dollars—necessary to jump-start the European miracle. Peace and prosperity—and a strong line of defense against an expansionist Soviet empire—was the result.

Today, the situation is nearly opposite. Instead of a world hobbled by war, the United States looks outward to a world pretty much at peace with itself. Instead of relatively easily repaired physical damage, the harm done to many of the world's great nations—Russia, China, India—has been self-inflicted. It is institutional regeneration that is needed, not spare parts and heating oil.

And, of course, instead of facing a powerful and unpredictable foe, America finds itself alone as a global superpower. It is, however,