country, it is wonderful to see citizens taking the initiative to make their communities better. I am extremely proud of the people of my district, and I encourage them, and citizens across the country, to keep up the good work.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EVA M. CLAYTON
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1996

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, on the week of May 17, 1996 I was unavoidably detained and therefore missed the vote on the Solomon amendment, for the defense authorization bill. Had I been present I would have voted “no” on the amendment.

WHEN IT COMES TO U.S. TRADE POLICY, U.S. TOBACCO MARKET SHARE TRUMPS HEALTH WELFARE

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1996

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. is No. 1. But that’s nothing to cheer about when you’re the No. 1 exporter of tobacco products. According to the World Health Organization [WHO], the U.S. is the top exporter of tobacco products worldwide, yet tobacco products represent less than 1 percent of total U.S. export earnings. Two recent studies by the National Bureau of Economic Research [NBER] and WHO have pointed out some disturbing information about the U.S. role in promoting tobacco products around the world and our international support of this addictive drug.

Since tobacco consumption has decreased by as much as 20 percent in the last 20 years in the U.S. and other highly industrialized nations, tobacco companies have been forced to turn elsewhere to shore up their huge profits. That elsewhere is foreign markets like Taiwan, Thailand, Japan, and South Korea. Since the early 1980s, the tobacco industry has aggressively pressured countries to open their markets to American tobacco products — and using U.S. trade policy to do it. Spurred by the tobacco industry, the U.S. Trade Representative [USTR] and the Commerce Department have successfully persuaded Asian countries to open their heavily restricted cigarette markets to U.S. tobacco products or face retaliatory measures.

The tobacco industry has been extremely successful in its conquest of the world tobacco market. The NBER study found that in 1991, U.S. tobacco market share in four Asian countries that lifted their import curbs was up 600 percent. Since 1975, U.S. cigarette exports have increased by 340 percent, up from 50.2 billion cigarettes in 1975 to 220.2 billion cigarettes in 1994.

But at what expenses to world health? According to the NBER report, the per capita cigarette consumption in Asian countries is almost 10 percent higher than it would have been if markets weren’t open to American cigarettes. In their recent study of world tobacco and health trends, WHO found that, in the early 1990s tobacco products caused an estimated 3 million deaths worldwide per year. In addition, WHO documents that at least one person dies every 10 seconds as a result of tobacco use around the world.

Don’t we have other American products to promote through the U.S. trade Representative? Why are we competing with products that unequivocally kill people when used as intended? The United States has an abundance of other products that the USTR could be promoting. Is opening markets for cancer-causing tobacco products the best allocation of USTR resources?

From smoke-free workplaces to the proposed FDA regulation of tobacco, as the United States continues to enact stricter controls regarding tobacco use, we should set a positive example to the rest of the world by promoting healthy, tobacco-free lifestyles.

How can we continue to strive to reduce tobacco use at home, but continue to promote tobacco use abroad? The U.S. is known as the leader of the free world. We should lead the fight against tobacco use, rather than lead the world in tobacco sales.

Mr. Speaker, VFW Post 7734 today remains a momentous occasion. The first Ulster County Democratic convention that I attended in 1964 featured Joe Resnick as a candidate for Congress against a long-time, seldom-seen Republican incumbent.

During his acceptance speech at that convention Joe Resnick told a story about a conversation with a friend of his in Ellenville, NY. The man expressed his surprise that Joe was a Democrat. You see, back in those days Democrats in upstate New York were outnumbered 3 to 1. Joe went on in his speech, not for a moment defensive or embarrassed by it and said “I’m the best kind of Democrat — the winning kind!” And he was right. And it wasn’t the first or the last time he was right either.

Joe Resnick brought a new style of leadership to the region. He was a very visible public official. Up until that time, Members of Congress in the region didn’t have district offices, but Joe Resnick opening a district office in Kingston, NY. Joe Resnick actually wanted his constituents to know what he was and that he was there to serve them, not the other way around. It used to be that the only way you could get your Congressman to help you was if you had power, money, or good connections. Joe Resnick had a radically new idea — serving the public directly, with dedication, and without discrimination. It all seems so natural to us today to do that, but believe me 30 years ago it wasn’t. His example inspired me to open one of the very first district offices when I was elected to the New York State Assembly in 1976.

Then I first came to Congress in January of 1993, then Speaker Tom Foley told me a wonderful story about his service with Joe Resnick on the House Agriculture Committee back in the 1960s. Joe Resnick was a freshman and the scene was the first day that the committee met. Speaker Foley went on to say, was an old Southern gentleman, very much of the old school as well, speaking in a thick Southern accent, who prodded the popular theory of those days that a freshman Member of Congress should be “seen and not heard” that the kind of treatment that the freshman Members could expect from the committee, and so forth. That was how it was in the old days. Well, Joe Resnick, who as a
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ewhON. VENTO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1996

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, Gaylord Nelson, a former U.S. Senator and the recipient of the Presider Folsom Medal of Freedom, recently wrote an eloquent Independence Day Fourth of July Fourth guest column for the St. Paul Pioneer Press in support of our Nation’s natural treasures. As Senator Nelson points out, our National Parks, National Forests and National Wilderness Areas are among our Nation’s greatest blessings. We Americans must treasure these special places just as we treasure peace, freedom, and democracy.

America’s public lands constitute a historic, natural legacy that belongs to all Americans. We must safeguard them for future generations, and must manage them for the benefit of all. Our children and grandchildren deserve to enjoy the beauty and majesty of their rightful natural inheritance in the years to come.

Today, there are some in Congress who see the control of our Nation’s crown jewels as the province of solely parochial special interests—those who desire to define the use of our parks and wilderness areas to suit their personal convenience and preferences, and even for commercial purposes. Within my home State of Minnesota, some individuals are advocating extending authority to a management council—a new expensive cumbersome bureaucracy of local parochial special interests—for control of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness [BWCAW] and Voyageurs National Park. These proponents also want to enshrine extensive snowmobile use on the pristine Kabetogama Peninsula of Voyageurs National Park and to increase motorized vehicle use within a BWCAW, a national wilderness. Such proposals benefit only a select few at the expense of the 250 million Americans who share common ownership of these national treasures in Minnesota.

I hope all my colleagues will take a few minutes to read Senator Nelson’s insightful July Fourth essay on what it means to be an American. The freedom to say whatever one pleases? Peace? On this Independence Day, all of those are worth celebrating.

But one of our greatest blessings is usually taken for granted. Born in this country instantly becomes a large landowner. He or she holds title to 623 million acres—nearly a million square miles. This acreage includes some of the planet’s most spectacular places: the Grand Canyon, Yellowstone, Yosemite and, closer to home, Voyageurs National Park and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. No other country endows its citizens so richly.

Most of us know about the national parks. But they account for just 12 percent of the lands that all of us enjoy. Three other systems of lands make up the other 88 percent and are less well known. There are 155 national forests including the Chippewa and Superior, 500 national wildlife refuges and 267 million acres of western heritage lands, including ancient Pacific Northwest forests, the California Desert, the Red Rock Canyonlands and the California Desert.

These places offer world-class recreation opportunities and receive 1.4 billion recreation visits a year. They contain 4,000 developable properties. These lands even play a vital economic role. Those 1.4 billion annual visitors create a lot of business for stores and companies located near these lands. Last year, when gridlock in Congress led to the temporary shutdown of our national parks, businesses lost a total of $14 million a day. Other businesses, which have nothing to do with tourism, are attracted to such areas because of their beauty and peacefulness, and thus create jobs in those communities. In addition, the trees, minerals, and other commodities on these lands are tuned into paper and other products.

Ownership of all this land, including 3.48 million acres in Minnesota, carries a duty. "The nation behaves well," President Theodore Roosevelt once said, "if it treats the natural resources as assets which it must turn over to the next generation increased, and not impaired in value."

Unfortunately, various special interests are eager to exploit these lands for maximum short-term financial gain, at the expense of the lands’ many other values. Congress is now considering bills that would promote development of many of these places or give them to the states. One example is legislation to increase motorized activities and development of Boundary waters and Voyageurs. Passage of these proposals would harm the interests of all citizens, present and future.

On this most American of holidays, we should commit ourselves to honoring the vision of those who protected our best places. In our national lands, we must protect the very essence of "America the Beautiful," and we must make sure our grandchildren do, too.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1996

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3755) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the funding measure before us. While Chairman PORTER and the other members of the subcommittee have worked to