

farm was the only thing he could do, he said, to save his farm and pass it on to his children. He makes no money from his farm, other than to save his farm. This man is 70 years of age.

And the crisis line us busy.

Farmers and farm families deserve a chance, a chance for the dwindling number of farmers and ranchers who feed us, provide us clothes and fiber. We should also make sure they have an opportunity to make a living.

Before the Freedom to Farm bill of 1996, the farm price safety net was a shield against the uncertainty and the fluctuation of commodity prices. When the farm bill was passed, we referred to it as Freedom to Fail. I am sad to report that our admonitions have been far too accurate. We must now correct that error. We must indeed not only provide emergency funds but policies must be changed so we can meet those vulnerabilities.

If we do nothing about the real problems facing these hardworking citizens, they may not be there for us. That in turn will hurt all of us if there are no farmers to feed us and to clothe us.

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFER) who I understand properly claimed my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### HAITI: BRING OUR TROOPS HOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend it was reported that the commander of U.S. troops in Latin America has recommended that troops stationed in Haiti be brought home. For most Americans, it will probably come as a surprise to learn that we still actually have troops in Haiti. Indeed, there has been little public discussion of Haiti in the years since U.S. troops helped end a coup and return President Aristide to office down there. In the years since this dramatic operation, the situation in Haiti has gotten worse and what was once touted as the crown jewel of the Clinton administration's foreign policy is now an utter failure. Haiti has been without an effective government for almost 2 years, the judiciary is weak and the legislative branch has been effectively shut down and boarded up. The Haitian executive branch has taken a number of actions outside the constitution and caused concern to those working to consolidate democracy for our island neighbor. The political situation has grown even more tense in recent weeks following the gruesome political murder

of Haitian Senator Toussaint, the attack on Senator Chery and the attack on a leading rights advocate. These ongoing attacks are the culmination of a long-standing campaign of intimidation and violence against Haitian and American individuals who are working hard in support of the rule of law, free and fair elections and economic improvement in that impoverished country.

In the midst of these troubling developments, there have been two U.S. actions of note: First, the refusal of the Clinton administration to certify Haiti as meeting its obligations in the war on drugs, in other words, they cannot do their job on that. And, second, the recommendation by General Wilhelm that we terminate the U.S. troop presence in Haiti. General Wilhelm had this to say and I quote: "As our continuous military presence in Haiti moves into its fifth year, we see little progress toward creation of a permanently stable internal security environment. In fact, with the recent expiration of parliament and imposition of rule by presidential decree, we have seen some backsliding. Though our military mission in Haiti was accomplished in 1994, we have sustained a presence that on any given day during 1998 averaged about 496 military personnel."

General Wilhelm goes on to say that he would "categorize our presence as being a benevolent one. Through a variety of humanitarian assistance and other local outreach programs, our troops have undertaken infrastructure development projects and provided urgently needed medical and dental care for the impoverished Haitian population. These contributions have been made at a cost to the Department of Defense. By our calculations, our military presence in Haiti carried a price tag of \$20,085,000 for 1998."

The General concludes: "However, at this point I am more concerned about force protection than cash outlays. The unrest generated by political instability requires us to constantly reassess the safety and security environment in which our troops are living and working. I have recommended that we terminate our permanent military presence in Haiti."

General Wilhelm's recommendation was bolstered by General Hugh Shelton, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Shelton has testified before Congress that he was "looking very hard at the Haiti operation and drawing that 350 down to a much lesser number" given the troop commitments around the world and the proposal to deploy U.S. troops to Kosovo.

While Generals Wilhelm and Shelton limited their comments to their area of responsibility, overseeing the deployment and readiness of the U.S. military, it is clear that this issue has far broader implications. Respected columnist David Broder reached the following conclusion: "The lesson is not that we should never be peacekeepers; rather, that there has to be a peace to

keep. Sending in the military to impose a peace on people who have not settled ancient quarrels has to be the last resort, not the standard way of doing business."

Mr. Speaker, many respected individuals are calling on the Clinton administration to get our troops out of Haiti and begin rethinking its efforts to use our soldiers to impose peace on those who do not want it. This is not a good policy. It does not work. I believe the administration would do itself and America credit to heed the advice of these people who I think have made better suggestions that far outpace the Clinton foreign policy.

#### MAKING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TAX CREDIT PERMANENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this week a number of my colleagues in the New Democratic Coalition have come before the House to talk about a very important tax issue, and that is the need to make the R&D tax credit a permanent part of our tax law.

I would like to join with them in urging all of our colleagues to support taking a credit that has been a consistent part of our tax law but is always designed to be eliminated and then at the last minute is extended, to instead make that a permanent part of our tax law.

I have three major points, the first of which is the importance of research and development for all Americans. I think Americans are acutely aware that we live a life that is more wealthy, that we are in better financial position than 90 percent of the world. And most Americans, if asked what is the single greatest reason why Americans live so much better than those in Bangladesh or Honduras would say that it is because of our high levels of education and technology. We must do everything possible to advance our technology further and to advance the education of our workforce.

□ 1800

Perhaps the best example of the importance of research technology and science is illustrated by this chart which focuses on just one industry, an industry that barely existed a decade ago, that did not have a name 2 years ago, and that is the information technology industry. As this chart illustrates, over a third of all of the economic growth in this country came in that one industry, and we now sit at the beginning of a new century, a new century that will be, I think, marked as the Information Age, yet even before we begin this new century over a third of our economic growth is dependent upon an information technology industry that exists in large part because of the research and development conducted by American corporations.

The second point I wish to make is that not everything that is good and desirable is necessarily worthy of a tax credit, but tax credits are particularly appropriate where an activity engaged in by one company or individual provides benefits not only for those who are footing the bill, but benefits to society at large. A company that does research and development benefits not only itself, but our entire society and the world as a whole. Yes, a portion of the benefits of that technology will be reaped by the company that conducts it for they will seek a patent to defend their intellectual property. But many advances in technology achieved by our research projects are not patentable, and even those that are will become owned by the people of the world as a whole when the patent expires.

Furthermore, research project not only leads to a particular patent or a particular technology, it increases the general level of scientific education of those engaged in the project and increases the level of science in our society as a whole. Most economists would agree that where an activity provides such major external benefits, beneficial externalities to use the economics term, it is deserving of societal help, encouragement and, in this case, a tax credit.

Finally, there is the issue of whether we should continue to renew the credit on a yearly or several-years-at-a-time basis or make it a permanent part of our Tax Code. Keep in mind that the purpose of this tax credit is to encourage companies to do more research than they would otherwise. As a CPA and a tax lawyer in private practice for many years, I was witness to the strange process by which a provision in our tax law leads to a change in corporate behavior. Some day sociologists and anthropologists will study this process. It is a process in which a tax expert has to explain to the others in the company what the tax law provision provides and what benefits would be reaped on the tax return from engaging in a particular project, in this case a research project.

There are two types of research and development that are eligible for the credit. The first is the kind of research project that would be done any way. Often research is done and the company is not even aware of the R&D tax credit until the next March or April 15th when they complete their tax return. The other type of research is that research that is conducted because the company is counting on getting the credit. It is that second area where the R&D tax credit actually achieves its purpose.

Yet I repeat my words. The company is counting on getting the credit. How can a company count on getting a tax credit for a multiyear large research and development project if by its very terms the R&D credit is supposed to expire at the end of this year or the end of next year? The R&D tax credit can achieve its purpose, and that pur-

pose is to expand the amount of research done in our country only if companies can count on it.

Now no provision of our tax law is guaranteed to be there forever. But certainly a provision which by its own terms is going to expire in a year or two is particularly ephemeral. If instead we make the R&D tax credit a permanent part of our laws, then companies will rely upon it, their R&D budgets will reflect not only the possibility that the credit might be there in the many years that the R&D project continues, but the extreme likelihood that it will continue to be there since it is a permanent part of our tax law.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward especially in this year when we are enjoying for the first time the fruits of the fiscal discipline that this Congress has exercised, I look forward in this year of surplus to take this step of making the R&D tax credit a permanent part of our law.

#### REDUCING THE NUMBER OF INFANT DEATHS IN ONONDAGA COUNTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the topic that I would like to discuss tonight is an issue of great importance in my home community of Onondaga County in which the city of Syracuse resides and I have represented now for 10 years in the Congress. When I first came to Washington back in 1988, we had the unfortunate distinction of having one of the highest infant mortality rates in the country. In 1987, 87 newborns died before they reached their first birthday. Over the 1987 to 1989 period, an average of 68 infants in the county, or 10 out of every thousand died, again before they reached their first birthday.

These are horrifying statistics, and what makes it even worse, Mr. Speaker, is that the proportion of these deaths fell most heavily upon the minority community.

Last year we through now 10 years of concerted work and effort and coordination and caring, we have some excellent news to report. While even one death is unacceptable, we have succeeded in reducing our infant mortality rate in Onondaga County by over 50 percent. This remarkable change did not happen without a concerted effort. A number of devoted people and organizations contributed. I have always felt that the best government will sponsor a partnership between local, state and Federal governments, and special initiatives undertaken by local communities and the private sector, and in central New York we proved this to be the case. The efforts which have been successful in reducing the number of infant deaths in Onondaga County began in the early 1990's.

As a member of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Fami-

lies, I encouraged and was successful in bringing a former colleague of mine from New York, Mack McHugh, and others to hold a field hearing for that committee in Syracuse back in 1990. We had witness testimony from public health officials, physicians, nurses and parents about strategies for insuring healthy babies in upstate New York. As a result of these hearings, a number of projects were undertaken in the county with the goal of reducing infant death and increasing birth weight at the time of birth.

Since that time, a number of these projects have proved to be very effective in dealing with infant mortality. Dr. Jim Miller and his successors, including Dr. Lloyd Novick, Commissioner of Health in Onondaga County, should be credited for the innovative efforts to address this issue by creating initiatives to reduce the instance of infant mortality and low birth weight babies. One of these programs is called Healthy Start. It works to reduce both infant mortality and adolescent pregnancy. Adolescent pregnancy and infant mortality are interrelated, births to young women who are not physically or psychologically prepared to give birth or to adequately raise the child. Adolescents often cannot provide the care necessary to ensure the health of infants and often get into the system too late. Healthy Start realizes that by addressing the issue of teen pregnancy the instance of infant mortality can be dramatically reduced. Low birth weight, as we know, is a key factor in the health of newborns, and all efforts were targeted toward healthy pregnancies and early intervention.

Healthy Start is dependent on the work of many partners in the local community: hospital staff, university health professionals, case workers, local schools, task forces. All can provide health education and care to adolescents and their parents and must include State, county and Federal health agencies and officials.

Doctor Sandy Lane is the Syracuse Healthy Start project director. She and her staff are to be commended for the committed efforts that they have made. She has been very modest about her program's ability to create the success. She credits involvement of local groups, partner agencies and the help of the Health Department programs and strongly praises the important Federal program, WIC, Women, Infant, Children, the feeding program to provide nutrition for both women and those children.

Syracuse Healthy Start funding is a combination of Federal, State and local funding. Over 4 and a half million dollars of Federal money have come in to the program through the Department of Health and Human Services, the Health Resources and Service Administration. Healthy Start also looks to Blue Cross and Blue Shield and to New York State Department of Health