caused by more Potent missile forces and the resultant urgent interest in American assistance for missile defense systems.

This Member urges his colleagues to read the entire *Economist* editorial on this important set of related developments.

[From the Economist, Feb. 20, 1999]

CAUSING OFFENCE

TALK ABOUT MISSILE DEFENCES IS A SYMPTOM OF EAST ASIA'S TENSIONS, NOT THE CAUSE

Are America and China heading for another bust-up? The ''strategic dialogue'' inaugurated by Presidents Bill Clinton and Jiang Zemin has been shrilly interrupted, this time by Chinese concern about America's discussions with Japan and others of possible missile defences in East Asia, and by American worries about Chinese missiles pointed at Taiwan (see page 37). The row threatens to sour preparations for the visit to America in April of China's prime minister, Zhu Rongji. Handled sensibly, the missile tiff need not produce a crisis. Yet it goes to the heart of what divides China from America and most of its Asian neighbours: China's pursuit of power by at times reckless means.

China may never be a global power to rival America. It is, however, an increasingly potent regional power, with territorial scores to settle. It makes plain that it intends to recover sovereignty over Taiwan, to extend jurisdiction over almost all the rocks and reefs of the South China Sea, and ultimately to displace America as East Asia's most influential power.

Until recently, events had seemed to be moving China's way. Recognising China's extreme sensitivity on the Taiwan issue, on a visit to China last year Mr. Clinton made clear that America did not support independence for the island, despite the protective arm America throws round it at times of military tension with the mainland. Meanwhile China had skilfully used the region's economic turmoil to reinforce its claims in the South China Sea, blame rival Japan for not doing enough to aid regional economic recovery and play on sharp economic differences between America and Japan. Hence China's fury that the question of missiles and missile defences could blow a hole in these stratagems.

The launch of a North Korean rocket over Japan last August reminded the Japanese of the importance of their alliance with America, and persuaded the government to set aside China's objections and start discussions on missile defences. Without such defences in a dangerous neighbourhood, America had worried and China had calculated that pressure would eventually grow in Congress to pull back the 100,000 or so American troops in Japan and South Korea. China's reaction has been all the shriller for knowing that any missile defences eventually deployed to protect America's troops and close allies from rogue North Korean missiles could be used to help protect Taiwan from China.

With its missile, North Korea was thumbing its nose as much at China as at Japan and America. Yet the success of its engineers owes at least something to past Chinese collusion. North Korea felt it could take such missile liberties in part because China has stoutly opposed all international pressure on North Korea to curb its nuclear and missile activities.

The Taiwanese had their reminder of the potential value of missile defences three years ago, when it was China lobbing missiles, these ones falling near the island's shipping lanes in a crude effort to intimidate voters before Taiwan's first democratic presidential election. China now has snazzier missiles. Its belligerence drove Taiwan to seek better defences, not, as China would have it, the other way around.

There is still time to calm tensions over Taiwan, and still time for the regional powers to talk over the problems raised by any future (limited) missile defences. Yet these issues give a new tilt to East Asia's uneasy balance of power. If this tilt upsets China, it has mostly itself to blame.

INDIA-UNITED STATES MULTILATERAL TALKS

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1999

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank and congratulate United States Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbot and Indian Minister of External Affairs Jaswant Singh for their efforts in the most recent phase of bilateral talks between India and the United States. Though the full details of the talks remain undisclosed, as they should, all reports are that much progress is being made in strengthening relations of the two countries.

I fully acknowledge and support the United States' foreign policy principle of opposing nuclear proliferation, but I would also like to take this opportunity to recognize that exceptions to that principle may occasionally be warranted Such exceptions should be based on the security needs of a nation, the entirety of that nation's relationship—economic, cultural, and diplomatic—with the United States, and the nation's willingness to participate in international arms control efforts.

Based on such criteria, I assert that India is a good candidate for such an exception to United States non-proliferation policy and would like to voice my hope that Mr. Talbot is working hard to lift remaining multilateral sanctions against India, especially the remaining World Bank lending sanctions. Again, I would like to express my thanks to Mr. Talbot and Mr. Singh for their hard work in this vital arena, congratulate them on their success thus far, and wish them the best in the future negotiations.

SUPPORT FOR THE DISASTER MITIGATION COORDINATION ACT

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1999

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with Chairman TALENT, Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ and the Small Business Committee in support of the Disaster Mitigation Coordination Act. This legislation is a sensible, smart addition to the disaster loan program.

The Disaster Mitigation Coordination Act will add a valuable pro-active measure to the Small Business Association's Disaster Loan program. If enacted, this legislation will save money for taxpayers, communities and small businesses.

By adding the availability of pre-disaster mitigation loans to small businesses located in FEMA's ''Project Impact'' zones, we will be allowing small businesses to avoid or at least reduce the damages they suffer from unpredictable natural disasters. By helping these businesses to prepare for and react to disasters better, we are also ensuring they are able to continue providing needed goods and services to the communities that depend on them.

Given the unpredictability of their frequency and the severity of natural disasters, this approach seems more than reasonable. A 5 year pilot program authorizing up to $15 million a year in mitigation loans will permit the Small Business Administration to evaluate this approach to see if it is a less costly way of mitigating disasters than other fully subsidized federal disaster relief.

This legislation makes sense. By making available low interest, long term pre-disaster mitigation loans that will be paid back to the treasury, we will be reducing the amount of emergency grants necessary to respond to disasters. Furthermore, by offering pre-disaster assistance, we will be supporting the efforts of small businesses that want to act responsibly and pro-actively. Pre-disaster assistance means saving taxpayer money, secure small business communities and a healthy economy.

Mr. Speaker, this will surely be a welcome alternative to small businesses in our state of Illinois which has received the fifth highest amount of disaster loan money nation wide since 1989. I thank my colleagues for their consideration and urge them to support this valuable piece of legislation.

CONGRATULATIONS TO CHARLES C. BUTT, 1999 BORDER TEXAN OF THE YEAR

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1999

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to rise today to recognize an accomplished individual who is the deserving recipient of this year's Border Texan of the Year Award, Mr. Charles C. Butt, Chairman & CEO of the H.E.B. Grocery Company.

This award is given to individuals whose efforts have improved the quality of life for residents in South Texas. Recipients of this award serve as role models for all Texans. They are an inspiration to others, and they exhibit character as well as display a high standard of ethics.

Charles Butt has been selected by the BorderFest Border Texan of the Year Committee because his contributions to South Texas in the area of employment and economic development are unsurpassed. HEB today stands as one of the nation's largest independently owned food retailing companies. It is the largest private employer in the state of Texas with 45,000 employees, or ''partners,'' and operates 250 stores across Texas, Louisiana, and Mexico. HEB generated sales of approximately $7 billion in 1998. In 1971, Mr. Butt became HEB's Chairman and CEO. At that time 4,500 individuals were employed, and revenues were approximately $250 million.

These facts and figures merit mention because they reflect the strengths of someone who is a true leader, someone whose vision and work ethic has made a successful company even more dynamic.

Moreover, HEB has always had a practice of reaching out to the community. Never just a policy, but always a tradition, the practice of helping those in need has only become stronger under the leadership of Charles Butt. Time and time again, he has been there to help communities in need. When flood-waters ravaged the small city of Del Rio, Texas in August, HEB was there. Within hours of this tragedy, HEB tankers carrying 5,500 gallons of water were stationed at the Del Rio stores around the clock, and construction experts with the company were on site helping this city to rebuild. Charles Butt personally was on the scene to assist in whatever way he could.

The spirit of HEB can be seen not only in times of crises, but in everyday programs that reflect the company's desire to feed the hungry. HEB has revolutionized the food banking efforts with its support of twenty food banks—eighteen in Texas and two in Mexico. Since 1983 HEB supported food banks have shared more than 150 million pounds of donated food and merchandise with some 6,000 organizations. The list of charitable works goes on and on.

Again, I want to say how delighted I am that Charles C. Butt has been selected to receive this recognition. He is a man who represents the best in our country—a personal devotion to service, a professional commitment to excellence, and a visionary grasp of the opportunities open to all Americans.

Thank you for all your contributions, and I am glad to have this opportunity to add my accolades to this well-deserved honor. Congratulations, Mr. Border Texan!

THE GIFT OF LIFE CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL ACT OF 1999

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I are proud to introduce the ''Gift of Life Congressional Medal Act of 1999.'' This legislation creates a commemorative medal to honor organ donors and their survivors.

There is a serious shortage of available and suitable organ donors. Over 50,000 people are currently waiting for an organ transplant. Because of low donor rates, over 4,000 people die each year for lack of a suitable organ. Some patients also wait significantly longer for a transplant depending on where they live. In some parts of the country, the typical wait for an organ transplant is close to 100 days. In other parts of the country, the wait is closer to 1,000 days. We need to use every possible option to increase the number of donated organs for all Americans. The Gift of Life Congressional Medal Act draws attention to this life-saving issue, and sends a clear message that donating one's organs is a self-less act that should receive the profound respect of the Nation.

The legislation allows the Health and Human Service's Organ Procurement Organization (OPO) and the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network to establish a non-profit fund to design, produce, and distribute the medals. Funding would come solely from charitable donations. The donor or family member would have the option of receiving the Congressional Gift of Life Medal. Families would also request that a Member of Congress, state or local official, or community leader award the medal to the donor or donor's survivors.

According to the United Network for Organ Sharing (UNOS), an average of 5300 donations per year were made between 1994 and 1996. Research points to a clear need for incentive programs and public education on organ donation. These efforts can increase the number of organ donations by more than 80 percent.

Physicians can now transplant kidneys, lungs, pancreas, liver, and heart with considerable success. The demand for organs will continue to grow with the improvement of medical technologies. Without expanded efforts to increase the supply of organ donation, the supply of suitable organs will continue to lag behind the need.

This is a non-controversial, non-partisan legislation to increase organ donation. I ask that our colleagues help bring an end to transplant waiting lists and recognize the enormous faith and courage displayed by organ donors and their families.

A copy of the legislaiton follows.

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Gift of Life Congressional Medal Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL

The Secretary of the Treasury shall design and strike a bronze medal with suitable emblems, devises, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, to commemorate organ donors and their families.

SEC. 3 ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any organ donor, or the family of any organ donor, shall be eligible for a medal described in section 2.

(b) DOCUMENTATION.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall direct the entity holding the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network (hereafter in this Act referred to as ''OPTN'') to contract to—

(1) establish an application procedure requiring the relevant organ procurement organization, as described in section 371(b)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 273(b)(1)), through which an individual or their family made an organ donation, to submit to the OPTN contractor documentation supporting the eligibility of that individual or their family to receive a medal described in section 2; and

(2) determine, through the documentation provided, and, if necessary, independent investigation, whether the individual or family is eligible to receive a medal described in section 2.

SEC. 4 PRESENTATION.

(a) DELIVERY TO THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall deliver medals struck pursuant to this Act to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(b) DELIVERY TO ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall direct the OPTN contractor to arrange for the presentation to the relevant organ procurement organization all medals struck pursuant to this Act to individuals or families that, in accordance with section 3, the OPTN contractor has determined to be eligible to receive medals under this Act.

(c) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), only 1 medal may be presented to a family under subsection (b), Such medal shall be presented to the donating family member, or in the case of a deceased donor, the family member who signed the consent form authorizing, or who otherwise authorized, the donation of the organ involved.

(2) EXCEPTION.—In the case of a family in which more than 1 member is an organ donor, the OPTN contractor may present an additional medal to each such organ donor or their family.

SEC. 5. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services or the OPTN contractor may provide duplicates of the medal described in section 2 to any recipient of a medal under section 4(b), under such regulations as the Secretary of Health and Human Services may issue.

(b) LIMITATION.—The price of a duplicate medal shall be sufficient to cover the cost of such duplicates.

SEC. 6. NATIONAL MEDALS.

The medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of section 5111 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 7. GENERAL WAIVER OR PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS.

No provision of law governing procurement or public contracts shall be applicable to the procurement of goods or services necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 8. SOLICITATION OF DONATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury may enter into an agreement with the OPTN contractor to collect funds to offset expenditures relating to the issuance of medals authorized under this Act.

(b) PAYMENT OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), all funds received by the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network under subsection (a) shall be promptly paid by the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network to the Secretary of the Treasury.

(2) LIMITATION.—Not more than 5 percent of the any funds received under subsection (a) shall be used to pay administrative costs incurred by the OPTN contractor as a result of an agreement establish under this section.

(c) NUMISMATIC PUBLIC ENTERPRISE FUND.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) all amounts received by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (b)(1) shall be deposited in the Numismatic Public Enterprise Fund, as described in section 5134 of title 31, United States Code; and

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury shall charge such fund with all expenditures relating to the issuance of medals authorized under this Act.

(d) START-UP COSTS.—A 1-time amount notto exceed $55,000 shall be provided to the OPTN contractor to cover initial start-up costs. The amount will be paid back in full within 3 years of the date of the enactment of this Act from funds received under subsection (a).

(e) NO NET COST TO THE GOVERNMENT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall take all actions necessary to ensure that the issuance of medals authorized under section 2 results in no net cost to the Government.

SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term ''organ'' means the human kidney, liver, heart, lung, pancreas, and any other human organ (other than corneas and eyes) specified by regulation of the Secretary of Health and Human Services or the OPTN contractor; and

(2) the term ''Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network'' means the Organ