

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## HONOR THE FLAG AND THE CONSTITUTION

HON. DAVID E. SKAGGS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran and an American, I am proud to introduce on behalf of myself and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], a resolution expressing the strong support of the Members of Congress and the American people for what the flag represents: freedom, tolerance, and the right to dissent.

Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming majority of our fellow citizens agree that the American flag, as the symbol of our Nation's values and ideals, commands the deepest respect from all Americans. The flag commands that respect because it stands for a people and a Government strong enough to tolerate diversity and to protect the rights even of those expressing unpopular views. Our strong commitment to these values, not the colors and design of our flag, is what makes our country unique and an international model for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution reaffirms the place of honor the American flag rightly holds in our country and states that respect for the flag should not be mandated, especially at the expense of the first amendment guarantee of free speech.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring our flag and the Constitution by cosponsoring this resolution.

## INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation to ensure that Federal grants for the hiring of local police officers actually result in a net increase in the number of "cops on the beat." I invite all of my colleagues to become a cosponsor of this important legislation.

As a former sheriff, I know that in too many instances Federal law enforcement grants result in the hiring of numerous generals but not enough foot soldiers at the local level. In other words, policing grant funds are often spent hiring clerks and dispatchers instead of hiring uniformed officers to patrol the streets. Specifically, my bill amends the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to ensure that Federal funds made available to hire or rehire law enforcement officers are used to produce a net gain in the number of law enforcement officers who perform nonadministrative public safety services—i.e. street cops. This legislation will ensure that Federal police grants will result in a real increase in the number of street officers on the street fighting crime.

My bill is identical to an amendment I successfully attached to legislation in the 104th Congress, H.R. 728, the "Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants Act," which was passed by the House in February 1995, and the fiscal year 1996 Commerce, Justice, and State appropriations bill. Unfortunately, both bills were vetoed by the President. By reintroducing that amendment in bill form, an important crime-fighting measure can be debated without the politics associated with an all-encompassing bill.

Mr. Speaker, let's help give our communities a fighting chance against crime by putting more police officers on the street than more clerks behind desks. I ask that all members take a look at my bill and give it their full support.

## SUPPORT HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 36: PROTECT THE LIVES AND WOMEN AND CHILDREN WORLD-WIDE

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 36, The International Family Planning Funds Release. This Resolution will right a wrong which Congress created in the high-politics of the fiscal year 1997 Omnibus Appropriations Act. It will also unquestionably help to save the lives of countless women and children world-wide. We have no choice but to support it. This resolution does nothing more than move forward the release date of international family planning funds from July 1, 1997 to March 1, 1997. This resolution does nothing less than save lives.

Unfortunately, there are some among us who have chosen to turn this humble proposal into a battle-ground for one of the most controversial of all policy issues—abortion. It is true that abortion has a role in this resolution. That role can be found in the fact that family planning unequivocally reduces the use of abortion world-wide. The use of abortion is closely associated with the unmet need for contraception and with reliance on less effective methods. Therefore, abortion rates are lower in countries where more effective modern methods of contraception are used than in countries where less effective methods predominate. International family planning funds are used to provide women with access to these much needed alternatives. When women are provided with alternatives to abortion, they use abortion less. This fact has been shown again and again world-wide. In addition, as I am sure all of my colleagues are well-aware, the 1973 Helms amendment of the Foreign Assistance Act prohibits the use of any U.S. funds for abortion, or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortion. Therefore, this resolution is about the reduction of abortion, not its funding.

Most importantly, however, this resolution is about saving the lives of women and children through-out the developing world. According to CARE, family planning is as essential to saving the lives of infants as their programs in immunization, respiratory disease, diarrheal disease, and nutrition. They have also found the scientific evidence to be overwhelming that a woman's ability to space births and avoid births at the extremes of the reproductive years is critical to ensuring child survival. In fact, in many countries, birth spacing alone could prevent one in five infant deaths.

Nearly 600,000 women die each year from pregnancy-related causes—leaving thousand of motherless children behind. Another 18 million women suffer long-term reproductive health complications that are excruciatingly painful and often result in life-long disabilities. According to UNICEF, just meeting the existing demand for family planning in the developing world would reduce unintended pregnancies by one-fifth, which would be expected to prevent at least 100,000 of the 600,000 annual maternal deaths. Put simply, family planning saves lives. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to be on the side of life and vote in favor of House Joint Resolution 36. I can not imagine a better use of this institution's time. Thank you.

## IS THE INS MAKING CRIMINALS OUT OF BOATERS ON THE GREAT LAKES?

HON. STEVE C. LATOURETTE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to correct what are well intentioned, but misguided efforts by the United States Immigration Service to protect our northern border against United States citizens who seek to reenter their own country after a recreational boating trip to Canada.

In what appears to be a federally sanctioned game of waterway robbery, the Immigration Service is willing to forego its legal obligation to inspect all vessels returning to a United States port from Canada, if boaters are willing to pay a \$16 per-person per-year fee to purchase what is known as the I-68 Canadian border boat landing permit. The I-68 permit program was established in 1963 but was not implemented nationally until a few years ago when Congress directed Federal agencies to begin charging a fee for some Federal programs. I have no problem with the fee-for-service approach, but where is the service? The I-68 program would have the boating public paying the INS for the convenience of not inspecting their boats. Its difficult to see how this approach would stem the tide of illegal immigration from Canada on recreational boats, a problem that is not well documented by the INS—if it exists at all. We do know, however, that the number of United States

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.