

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS
WEEK

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

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, as Members know, this is National Small Business Week. I want to take time out to recognize the thousands of men and women back home in Missouri's Ninth Congressional District who run and own small businesses. I cannot think of a more worthy group to honor.

Small business, as is often said, is the backbone of our economy, accounting for 99.7 percent of the Nation's employers and for 47 percent of all sales in this country. In fact, in the 12 calendar months between December 1994 and December 1995, employment in small business-dominated industries increased 2.7 percent, creating 1.25 billion new jobs, or 75 percent of the total new jobs in the economy.

There are many small businesses back in Missouri's Ninth Congressional District that deserve praise, but tonight I want to highlight one of them, the Twainland Cheesecake Co. and Cafe in Hannibal, MO, owned by Lynn Carr. Twainland Cheesecake Co. and Cafe employs 14 women in a cheesecake-making operation where they make 110 types of cheesecakes. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I have not brought samples for the House. But I would extend a personal invitation for Members to come to Hannibal, MO to try some of Ms. Carr's famous turtle cheesecake. Nonetheless, Lynn Carr is an American success story.

At age 29, Lynn Carr could not read. In the mid-eighties, for a period of time Lynn Carr was homeless. Lynn Carr spent most of her adult life either on welfare or in low-paying jobs. She continued to believe in the American dream. She prayed for a better life. She kept in her heart a ray of hope, a sliver of self-esteem.

Eventually Lynn learned how to read and earned a GED, the equivalent of a high school diploma. She got a loan, she put her talents to work, and the rest is history in the making. She started a cheesecake business in Hannibal, MO's historic downtown.

This is a success story, Mr. Speaker, but there is more. Lynn Carr has decided to launch her own private welfare-to-work program, giving other women a chance to succeed just like she did. Using her words, she says, "Such as I have been given, I want to give back to the community." Lynn knows that some people will never break out of the welfare cycle. "But," she adds, "then you have people who were like myself who are just down on their luck and need a hand up instead of a handout." She went on to say, "If we could just save one or two families and change their lives for the better, then it is all worth it."

To further give back to the community, Lynn Carr plans to open a larger factory employing up to 50 women. She

wants to give jobs to unemployed and undereducated women living in poverty. She hopes to have a learning center and a day-care center on site. Women will enter the program by working in the day-care center, where they can learn parenting and nutritional skills. After several weeks, the women will then divide their time between the cheesecake factory and the learning center. In order to qualify for work, a woman would be required to get a GED certificate. While doing this, Lynn Carr hopes to inspire others with motivational programs.

Mr. Speaker, motivation is not a problem once you get the chance to meet Lynn Carr. Lynn Carr is a living example of how an individual can lift themselves up one rung of the ladder at a time, become a successful business person, and then, to make the picture complete, invest in other individuals living in the community.

Congratulations are in order for Lynn Carr and the thousands of other men and women who are responsible for the thriving small businesses in Missouri's Ninth Congressional District and across this great country.

FLOOD RELIEF AND FLOOD
PROTECTION

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the emergency supplemental flood relief measure with heavy heart. I voted against it even though it had some funds for West Virginia. But the problem was that, as this bill moved along designed to provide flood relief and flood prevention for hard-hit areas, it got loaded up with things having nothing to do with floods.

My constituents sometimes express wonder and confusion and anger at the fact that the Congress can start out with goal A in mind and somehow load it up with not just goal A but goals B, C, and D even though they have nothing to do with goal A, and that is what happened here.

I want flood relief as much as anyone does. The people who already need flood relief, the people who need emergency housing and emergency response, that money is there. This goes to stream bank rehabilitation, assistance to farmers to assist with their crops where fences were damaged, rebuilding streams, that sort of thing.

I want that as much as anybody. But in order to get that, I was going to have to vote for a lot of other extraneous language that had nothing to do with flood prevention and flood rebuilding. I was going to have to vote for controversial language dealing with potential Government shutdowns. So I was faced with a quandary hereof, if I voted for the money to rehabilitate the river bank around flood-hit Herbert Hoover High School, I could in the future be endangering some level of Pell

grants for students attending that high school. That did not make any sense to me.

This bill got loaded up with controversial language about how to conduct the census in the year 2000. We have got floods in 1997, and somebody wants to put in controversial language about conducting a census in this country in the year 2000. We better hurry up and pass this clean flood relief bill or there will not be as many of us to count in that next census if we do not do something about flood prevention.

It is quite clear that the President has already said, and he said weeks ago, that if we load this bill up and do something besides flood relief, he is going to veto it. So this bill, because it has passed the Senate and passed the House, will go to the President hopefully this weekend. He will veto it. It will come back to the Congress right away, and hopefully next week it can be a clean bill, one that deals only with flood relief and flood protection.

I voted 2 weeks ago, maybe more than 2 weeks ago, for a version of this bill as it left the House. And the reason was that I wanted to keep it moving, hoping that in the other body and that in the congressional deliberations that take place between the House and the Senate that it would get cleaned up, the extraneous provisions would be taken off and it would deal with just flood protection and flood relief. Not only were those provisions not taken off, more were added, including the controversial census counting measures.

So Mr. Speaker, it is my great hope that when the bill is vetoed, it will be back on the floor next week, little time will be lost, and it will come back as a clean bill. I was greatly frustrated when, after having voted for this bill just 2 weeks ago, the Congress immediately took a 10-day break over Memorial Day to go home. So where was the sense of urgency that I think was so important?

So Mr. Speaker, it is my great regret that what started out as flood protection and flood relief turned into a vehicle for everybody's wish list, having nothing to do with flooding. Unfortunately there were a lot of provisions that stayed in this bill that had nothing to do with flood relief and flood protection. But the good news is that the Congress can correct that, it ought to be in session this weekend, but the Congress can correct that early next week, pass a clean bill, and get it back to the President.

Mr. Speaker, let us make sure that everyone in this country understands we can have flood protection and flood relief. It should be done immediately. That should be the goal of this Congress. We should debate controversial measures that have nothing to do with flood protection and flood relief; we can debate those other days, other times, when there is not as much urgency around those issues as there is around this one.

I am looking forward, Mr. Speaker, next week to seeing a clean bill so that Republicans and Democrats alike can join in providing what everyone agrees needs to be done, genuine flood protection and flood relief.

□ 1930

AMERICAN TROOPS IN BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the issue of United States troops in Bosnia, I sincerely believe enough is enough. First President Clinton said that America's commitment in Bosnia would only last one year. Then he announced the extension of our military presence in Bosnia until June 1998. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely disappointed to learn that the President has indicated that American troops may be there even longer.

Our troops have been in Bosnia long enough. They should not spend another day in Bosnia. I believe that our soldiers should not be placed in harm's way for a mission that is not in America's vital national interest.

Our troops have been in Bosnia for 2 years and the American public still questions our role. Mr. Speaker, is this mission truly in our national interest? Have we not achieved our goal? When will we be able to bring our troops home?

President Clinton stated this past weekend that progress in Bosnia has been slow. As we all know, the conflict in Bosnia is a regional conflict that resulted from centuries of hate among ethnic groups. It cannot be solved quickly.

The fact is America has already fulfilled our commitment made under the Dayton peace accord. At present, America has dedicated more than \$6 billion to the Bosnia mission. I want to repeat that, Mr. Speaker. At the present time America has dedicated more than \$6 billion to the Bosnia mission.

Every dollar we spend on this mission is a dollar we cannot spend on critical military priorities, like research and development, procurement or troop readiness. The military budget is already being drained and costs like this one in Bosnia only makes it harder.

I hate to think that we are closing military bases due to the shrinking defense budget and yet we continue to spend billions of dollars on a regional conflict in Bosnia. This is not in the best interests of the American people. The United States can no longer afford to be the world's policeman. Although we are the most powerful Nation in the world, the simple fact is we just cannot have American troops peacekeeping between every warring faction around the world.

Although the President is the Commander-in-Chief, Congress has a vital role and a necessary role in determining military policy. President Clinton has misled us long enough about the troops in Bosnia. At this point there is no telling how long he plans to keep our troops in Bosnia.

When the lives of American soldiers are at stake, we in Congress have a responsibility to make our voices heard. For too long our troops in Bosnia have been forgotten. I urge my colleagues to join the bipartisan effort to bring our troops home by the end of this year, 1997.

MFN FOR CHINA

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken out this time to talk about an issue which has come to the forefront. Many people are addressing it, and we apparently will be voting on this issue the week of June 23, most likely the 25th of June, that being whether or not we should renew most-favored-nation status for the People's Republic of China.

There are a wide range of issues that are addressed here, whether it is arms proliferation, human rights, the kinds of things that have come to the forefront, trade issues. I will say that I am very concerned about every single one of them. But I would like to take this few minutes to talk about an issue which has troubled me greatly.

I should say at the outset that, as has been the case in the past, I am very, very strongly supportive of maintaining most-favored-nation trading status for the People's Republic of China because in the 4,000-year history of China, the single most powerful force for positive change in that period of time has been economic reform. Let me say how important that has been and an issue which is of concern to me and many others, and that is the policy of forced abortion that exists in China.

It is terrible to have the so-called one-child policy that exists there. I believe that we should do everything that we can to change that, because that policy cannot be tolerated. Mr. Speaker, not many people know that the policy of engagement and economic reform which has existed in China is undermining the one-child policy there.

There is a young woman, 27 years old, who lives in a tiny town called Dongguan which is in the Guangdong Province which adjoins Hong Kong. Her name is Ye Xiuying. She worked for \$35 a month as a factory worker in this area. A plant was opened up from a U.S. business, and she was able to establish her own small business near this plant. Her income went from \$35 a month to \$1,200 a month, an amazing growth, something that has empowered her.

Because of the fact that she was able to gain such economic strength, she

was able to pay the government the one-time \$1,800 charge, and in fact not suffer an abortion as many of the provinces have imposed in China but in fact have her second child. She in fact had a girl, something that the government opposes. They want to have boys. She was able to have a second child; she was able to have a girl.

As I listen to many of my colleagues talk about the idea of sending a message to the government of China by bringing an end to most-favored-nation trading status, that kind of policy would in fact encourage more abortions in China. As we listen to people regularly claim that we will be able to bring an end to the human rights violations, the saber rattling in the Taiwan straits, the horrible treatment of Tibet, the transfer of weapons, the military buildup in China if we end our contact with them through most-favored-nation trading status, clearly they are wrong.

Because if we look at the recent past in China, during the great leap forward under Mao Zedong, 60 million people were starved. Also under Mao, during the cultural revolution, 1 million people were murdered by the government. And, of course, the world was not made aware of this.

What has happened? As we opened up China, and did in fact what Ronald Reagan said he wanted to have done in Eastern and Central Europe when he said, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall," so that those in Eastern and Central Europe could mingle with the West, the same thing has been happening with China. It would be tantamount to declaring economic and political war with China if we were to tamper with or revoke what is an inappropriate name to describe it, most-favored-nation trading status, which simply means regular trading arrangements that exist there.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at the fact that we have not solved every problem there, and I demonstrate my outrage over the human rights violations, I have talked with dissidents, I marched to the Chinese Embassy following the Tiananmen Square massacre to demonstrate my outrage, I have come to the conclusion that what would happen if we revoked MFN would be that we would not be isolating China from the world but we would in fact be isolating the United States of America from the most populous nation on the face of the earth.

There are many missionaries today who are very involved in China and, yes, there is religious persecution and it is unacceptable, reprehensible and should be addressed. But if we ended MFN, we would clearly jeopardize the chance for those missionaries who are there from the United States and other parts of the world to be successful.

Mr. Speaker, I simply say when this vote comes up in 2 weeks, I urge a vote against the resolution of disapproval so that we can do everything, including undermining the one-child policy.