

tracks strong local will can help local communities have a greater impact in their own regions.

To ensure that this program maintains the sophistication to give support only to those efforts that are truly working, while maintaining the flexibility to permit communities to continue to fashion local solutions, an advisory commission or board of trustees is charged with helping to select the administrator and to overseeing the program. Local community leaders and experts at the national and State levels in the field of substance abuse prevention and treatment will be able to review grant applications, and policies and criteria relating to the program. Those who are working directly in the field—on the front lines of the drug problem—will be able to offer valuable input to those administering the program.

The Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997 is our effort to redirect Federal drug control policy to help support local communities. We believe it is fully consistent with the National Drug Control Strategy, which includes as part of its No. 1 goal, support of community anti-drug coalition efforts. We look forward to working with our colleagues on a bipartisan basis and with the administration to help communities throughout our country reduce substance abuse.

PAYOFFS FOR LAYOFFS CORPORATE WELFARE ELIMINATION ACT OF 1997

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1997

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing bipartisan legislation in conjunction with my colleague, Mr. SANDERS of Vermont, to end a wasteful corporate welfare policy which uses taxpayer money to subsidize defense contractor mergers. This legislation—the Payoffs for Layoffs Corporate Welfare Elimination Act of 1997—will put a stop to the practice of artificially stimulating layoffs with taxpayer funds.

As some of you know, under the guise of an obscure Clinton administration policy change made in July 1993—at the specific request of four CEOs representing America's top defense contractors—DOD began to allow defense contractors to begin charging the taxpayers for the merger-related costs of laying off workers and shutting down plants. The premise behind this policy is as dubious now as it was back then: that unless Uncle Sam dishes out big corporate subsidies, defense contractors would rather remain uncompetitive and risk going out of business than use their own money to pay for mergers and restructuring.

Already, 11 defense contractors have put in 17 requests totaling \$817.3 million, and the meter is running. Lockheed Martin alone could eventually claim \$1.2 billion in merger subsidies, according to statements by their CEO, Norman Augustine. When the Loral, McDonnell Douglas, Rockwell International, Texas Instruments, and Hughes merger subsidy requests come in, this total will skyrocket into the billions.

DOD claims that by paying more money on contracts now, DOD will realize savings due to

lower overhead at some unspecified time in the future. This justification is really nothing more than an updated and more sophisticated version of the old cartoon character adage of "I'll gladly pay you on Tuesday for a hamburger today."

The fact of the matter is that claims of savings are greatly exaggerated. Indeed, the very concept of savings assumes the contractor will put off or delay restructuring unless they are given subsidies. In December 1996, an investigation by CBS's 60 Minutes correctly pointed out that, "Even without the subsidy, defense companies are required by law to pass savings back to the Government when they reduce their overhead."

My legislation does not hinder or prevent mergers from happening. It simply states that mergers should happen on their own and without DOD prompting and use of our tax dollars. I concur with the Honorable Don Yockey, who was Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology during the Bush administration, when he stated "the defense department would be better served if they simply did not discourage acquisition, but stayed at arms length in the encouragement of the business financial process. If the deal does not make sound stand alone business sense the company should not proceed. To rely on Government-subsidized support is the worst of reasons to merge."

While we must always be concerned when government subsidies warps business decisions, equally disturbing is the fact that the so-called savings to be realized from restructuring have thus far been mostly illusory. Not a single weapon system can be truly identified as having a lower cost due primarily to corporate restructuring. The fact of the matter is that DOD's very own report on restructuring stated: "it is not feasible to isolate completely the effect of restructuring from other complex determinants of the difference between projected and actual costs over a long period of time." In plain English, DOD essentially admits that savings cannot be attributed to restructuring.

What we really have here is a policy with unknowable assumptions and unverifiable effects. GAO found that in just one case, contractor estimates of savings fell 85 percent short of initial claims. And that is just the estimates—there is no way of knowing if there will ever be real savings. GAO also has stated on more than one occasion that contractors have been projecting future increases—not decreases—in overhead rates.

While savings cannot be attributed directly to these subsidies, additional layoffs have unquestionably resulted from the policy. In the first merger analyzed by GAO, it found that "the contractor's proposed savings were based entirely on work force reductions."

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues—on all sides of the aisle—to join with me to put a stop to this payoffs for layoffs policy. Not only is this policy not really saving any money, it actually increases the deficit because DOD is spending hundreds of millions of our tax dollars chasing after savings to which it is entitled to receive anyway. This type of corporate welfare is unconscionable and Members with defense contractors in their districts should be especially wary of it. In my district alone, over 3,200 jobs will be lost because of this policy. If you have a plant in your district, you should not have to worry about your own tax dollars being used to encourage it to shut down.

NO PACIFIC NUCLEAR DUMP

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1997

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, when most of us think of Pacific islands, we usually think of a tropical paradise with brightly colored fish swimming in turquoise waters while palm fronds rustle overhead in a warm gentle breeze. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am here to tell you that there is trouble in paradise because there are some people that see a tropical island and think of nuclear dump sites.

As we struggle with the legacy of the cold war and the wastes generated by it, those that trade in these wastes have increasingly looked at isolated atolls, with few if any constituents to object, as likely nuclear dump sites. Several years ago, there was a proposal to store radioactive waste in the Marshall Islands. Fortunately, the Marshallese Government eventually thought better of it and that proposal died. Last year, a group calling itself U.S. Nuclear Fuels was making the rounds in Washington, DC, to drum up support for a proposal to create a nuclear dump site on Palmyra Island, a private owned island in U.S. territory. This proposal prompted the introduction of legislation in both Houses of Congress prohibiting the Federal Government from siting a nuclear waste storage facility outside the 50 States. Now, another group, Nuclear Disarmament Services, Inc., is circulating legislation to authorize the siting of a nuclear dump site on either Palmyra or Wake Island, a U.S. possession. In fact, there is a symposium occurring today at Georgetown University, sponsored by U.S. Nuclear Fuels, to discuss this proposal.

What do all these crazy ideas have in common? One man, Alex Copeson, has been the driving force behind all these proposals and a principal in these companies. And this is not Mr. Copeson's first foray into the waste trade. In the early 1990's, he was the pitch man for a scheme to dump toxic waste on the sea floor, even though this is prohibited under U.S. and international law.

Why does Mr. Copeson think that we should store nuclear waste on Pacific islands? An article in the March edition of Outside magazine offers some insights. Referring to the Marshallese Government and the Bikini Islanders, Mr. Copeson is quoted as saying, "They're all scam artists banging the tin cup in front of the white man. They'd open a whorehouse and sell their daughters and grandmothers for a dollar. They've never lived so good since that bomb, the fat lazy [expletive]. All they want to do is go gambling, drinking, and whoring in the United States. The only contribution they could make to the world is to give someone their islands [for waste] and take a hike—be an absentee landlord for world peace."

Given Mr. Copeson's views of the people of the tropical Pacific and his insensitivity to the economic, social, and environmental injuries inflicted on them by above-ground nuclear testing, it is no wonder that he thinks that we should continue to dump radioactivity in their back yard. And that brings up the most crucial point. Even if one thought that shipping nuclear waste thousands of miles across the stormy Pacific Ocean to store it on geologically unstable coral or volcanic islands in the

middle of the Pacific Ocean's typhoon belt was a good idea scientifically, how could one justify inflicting further nuclear contamination on the people of the Pacific territories? In furtherance of our cold war, many of the people of the Pacific islands have lost not only their traditional way of life, but in some cases their home islands have been rendered uninhabitable.

We need to stop this madness in its tracks. That is why Mr. ABERCROMBIE and I are introducing a resolution today that expresses the sense of Congress that we will not transport to or store nuclear waste on any U.S. territory or possession. Federal law already forbids the siting of a nuclear waste storage facility in U.S. territories or possessions without the express authorization of Congress and passing this resolution will send a clear signal that we do not intend to do so. We need to let the international waste merchants know that the people of the Pacific islands have suffered enough and that we will not insult them further by forcing them to be the caretakers of the nuclear legacy of the cold war. I recognize that this is a terrible problem, but Pacific islanders did not start the cold war, and they should not be asked to finish it.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION
36: THE NEED FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult challenges facing the fledgling democratic governments of Eastern Europe involves learning to treat equally and fairly all of their citizens—regardless of ethnic background—with regard to rights and opportunities. Unfortunately, some of those governments are still seeking to treat their citizens from minority ethnic groups in traditionally nationalistic and counterproductive ways. Rather than working to ensure that all citizens are treated equally, they seek to limit the rights and opportunities of those citizens who do not belong to the majority ethnic group.

Mr. Speaker, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, an independent state since 1991, has so far avoided the ethnic-based conflict that has afflicted several of the other successor states to the defunct Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. There are troubling signs, however, that the Government of Macedonia has yet to take sufficient steps to ensure that those of its citizens from its considerable Albanian minority are provided with adequate opportunities for higher education in the Albanian language. The most worrisome consequence of this lack of educational opportunity is an increasing resentment toward that government among many of its ethnic Albanian citizens. Their frustration has led some ethnic Albanian citizens to attempt to open an Albanian-language university to ensure that opportunities for professional education are readily available to those who have been raised and educated in Albanian at the secondary school level.

In February 1995, a renewed attempt to open such a university in Tetovo, Macedonia

led to a violent clash between ethnic Albanians and Macedonian police. Tragically, 1 individual lost his life and 28 others were wounded in that violent incident.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all of us want to see the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and, in fact, all of the Southern Balkans avoid the kind of ethnic violence that wracked the Northern Balkans for 4 years. We need to encourage the Government of Macedonia to constructively address the issue of fair opportunities for higher education in the language of its Albanian minority. I am, therefore, introducing today House Concurrent Resolution 36, a resolution that focuses specifically on Macedonia and on the issue of proper access to higher education in that country.

This resolution calls on the Government of Macedonia to:

Ensure the fair and equitable treatment of all its citizens, regardless of ethnic background;

Consider all means by which higher education conducted in the Albanian language can be provided, including the possible establishment of an Albanian language university;

The resolution also calls on the President of the United States to:

Express our country's strong support for Macedonian efforts to ensure access to higher education conducted in the Albanian language;

Offer appropriate support for those international organizations that are working to resolve the issue of higher education in the Albanian language in Macedonia, and;

Offer appropriate support for efforts by the Government of Macedonia to ensure access to higher education conducted in the Albanian language, including assistance for establishing curricula and provision of textbooks and related course materials.

Mr. Speaker, I want to strongly encourage my colleagues to join in cosponsoring this timely and important measure.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 36 for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

H. CON. RES. 36

Whereas failure to achieve fair and cooperative inter-ethnic relations often leads to governmental repression and conflict between peoples of different ethnic backgrounds;

Whereas the achievement of fair and cooperative treatment of all citizens, regardless of their ethnic backgrounds, is a serious challenge for all of the states of the Balkans region, including those states that gained their independence after the dissolution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia;

Whereas the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia faces important issues involving the fair and equitable treatment of all of its citizens, regardless of their ethnic background;

Whereas the extraordinary census conducted by the Government of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in June 1994 determined that those citizens of Albanian descent constitute at least 23 percent of the total population;

Whereas Macedonia's citizen of Albanian descent are increasingly concerned to ensure fair and equitable treatment as citizens of the state of Macedonia, including appropriate opportunities for education at all levels of instruction;

Whereas the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia is a member of the Council of Europe, an organization that encourages its

member states to provide the opportunity for educational instruction in the languages of minority groups that constitute the citizenry of those states;

Whereas the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia is a member of the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe, an organization that, in the "Copenhagen Document" of its 1990 Conference on the Human Dimension, noted the need for adequate opportunities for educational instruction in the native languages of citizens from minority groups;

Whereas international documents and conventions recognize the right of persons belonging to national minorities to establish their own educational institutions within the framework of and in conformity with the legislation of the state within which they live;

Whereas levels of admissions of ethnic Albanian citizens of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Universities at Skopje and Bitola are far below the 23 percent of Macedonia's population that is composed of ethnic Albanians;

Whereas higher education for ethnic Albanian citizens of Macedonia is made more difficult by the lack of general usage of the Albanian language at that level of instruction;

Whereas there are increasing reports that ethnic Albanian citizens of Macedonia are concerned that efforts to ensure access to higher education in the Albanian language have met with little success;

Whereas an application was filed with the Ministry of Education of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in October 1994 seeking permission to open an Albanian-language university as part of the established system of education;

Whereas, in the absence of a response to the application filed with the Ministry of Education of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in October 1994, attempts were made in December 1994 to begin university classes in the Albanian language at Tetovo, Macedonia and were prevented by the intervention of police forces; and

Whereas in February 1995 renewed attempts to open an Albanian-language university at Tetovo, Macedonia were again prevented by police forces, with the death of one ethnic Albanian citizen of Macedonia and the wounding of 28 other persons occurring as a result of the related violence: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Government of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia should take all appropriate measures to ensure the fair and equitable treatment of all of its citizens, regardless of ethnic background;

(2) while steps taken by the Government of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to ensure instruction in the Albanian language and the language of other national minorities in Macedonia at the primary and secondary levels of education and the adoption of a law permitting Albanian language instruction at the University of Skopje are commendable, the ethnic Albanian citizens of Macedonia continue to suffer from the lack of opportunity for higher education in their native language;

(3) the Government and Parliament of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia should therefore consider all means by which higher education conducted in the Albanian language can be provided, including the establishment of an Albanian-language university;

(4) the efforts by the High Commissioner for National Minorities of the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Council of Europe, and the Working Group