license for a 1-year period and fining him the maximum amount, the sum of $3 million on July 8.

Other States, however, are not required to honor Nevada's action. Under our legislation passed by the 104th Congress, States are required to recognize another State's decision to suspend a boxer only if the reasons for the suspension relate to a boxer's medical condition, poor boxing skills, failure of a drug test, or falsification of information. Thus, today, any other State may host a boxing match featuring Mr. Tyson prior to the expiration of his suspension if the State notifies and consults with Nevada Athletic Commission prior to granting approval. Mr. Tyson could conceivably fight in a boxing match somewhere else in the U.S. some time before his suspension in Nevada expires.

The legislation which I introduce today would unequivocally foreclose this possibility. I am proposing that in addition to the existing requirements of the Professional Boxing Safety Act, States must ensure that no boxer is permitted to box while under suspension by any other State due to the boxer's commission of a malicious foul or infraction. A malicious foul or infraction is defined to include intentionally biting any part of an opponent's body or extremities. It also encompasses some of the more common dirty tricks used by boxers, such as intentionally headbutting or hitting below the belt.

Most Americans would be appalled if they knew that Mike Tyson could conceivably fight somewhere outside Nevada within the next year. Many of us cannot imagine this possibility, but the fight game and its promoters are known for unacceptable and brazen actions. The legislation that I propose today ensures that no boxer will be allowed to fight in the ring after any State has imposed a disciplinary suspension on the boxer to punish the boxer's misconduct during a fight. It does so by building upon the comprehensive framework that Congress, with overwhelming bipartisan support, has already wisely enacted.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SONNY BONO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1997

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 29th, I registered my vote on rollcall vote 338, final passage of the Defense Appropriations Act, H.R. 2266. Unfortunately, I did not check the final result of the electronic recordation of my vote, and it ultimately was registered improperly. It was my intent to vote ''aye'' in support of passage of H.R. 2226 and in appreciation of Chairman YOUNG and the Appropriation Subcommittee's hard work.

A SALUTE TO VINCE LOMBARDI

HON. JAY W. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1997

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a man who meant so much to the city of Green Bay, to the State of Wisconsin, and to football fans across the Nation. I rise to honor Vince Lombardi, who coached the Green Bay Packers for nine glorious seasons. He is the Hall-of-Famer who put the ''Title'' in ''Titletown,'' by winning five NFL championships and the first two Super Bowls.

He defined success and dedication and pride because he put a premium on putting forth the effort to win. He once said, ''If you'll not settle for anything less than your best, you will be amazed at what you can accomplish in your lives.'' That lesson still rings true today.

We are remembering Vince Lombardi today, because on August 5, our U.S. Postal Service will issue a new commemorative 32-cent stamp in his honor. I know we are certainly going to have a lot of newly interested stamp collectors in northeast Wisconsin next week.

I know I join all Packer fans in thanking the Postal Service for honoring Vince Lombardi.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO TEMPORARILY SUSPEND THE U.S. IMPORT DUTY ON FERROBORON

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1997

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer legislation that would temporarily suspend, through the year 2000, the rate of duty applicable to imports into the United States of ferroboron. Ferroboron is the key raw material in amorphous metal electrical power distribution transformer cores. Transformers using these cores reduce energy losses and greenhouse gas emissions associated with these losses by 60 to 80 percent when compared to the other transformer core technologies. This is positive both in terms of increasing energy conservation and decreasing environmental degradation in the developing nations that present the most promising market opportunities.

While such benefits are tangible and significant, they and the extensive research and development that has yielded them come at a cost. An amorphous metal transformer has an initial cost 20 to 30-percent higher than the energy-wasting and environmentally unfriendly transformers it seeks to replace. Fortunately, because of its many benefits, the total owning cost of an amorphous metal transformer—over its 20 to 30 year life—is far lower than the initially cheaper competition. Reducing the cost of the end product's most important and costly raw material, by suspending the import duty paid on it, would further help ensure the cost-competitiveness of the end product in the export markets so vital to the product and the American workers behind it.

Furthermore, because there is no substitute domestic product currently benefiting from the present 5 percent duty rate on ferroboron, no adverse impact on the domestic ferroalloy industry is anticipated. I therefore urge my colleagues to support expeditious passage of this bill.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2015, BALANCED BUDGET ACT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1997

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am committed to ensuring that the VA health care system has adequate funds to meet the health care needs of our veterans. Adequate funding for VA has long been an issue. As chairman and earlier, as ranking member, I have long advocated legislation to give VA new mechanisms to supplement the funding provided through the appropriations process.

My goals in this regard have included legislation to allow VA to retain money collected from third-party payers and legislation to allow VA to be reimbursed by Medicare when it provides care to certain Medicare-covered veterans. We have achieved success on the former, but more work needs to be done to give VA the opportunity to demonstrate that it can save dollars for the Medicare Program.

Current law permits VA to retain only the cost of its medical care collections. The remainder, constituting several hundred million dollars annually, must be deposited in the Treasury, in accordance with existing law. That policy fails to compensate VA facilities for the cost of care, and necessarily provides little incentive for achieving full recoveries or efficient collection efforts.

Our budget reconciliation bill effects a historic change in law by permitting the VA to retain money it collects from third parties. This important new provision differs markedly from the collections-retention proposal sent to Congress by the administration earlier this year. First, it specifically establishes a policy that all moneys collected will stay at the network level. With this provision, we create a powerful incentive for individual facilities to collect as much as possible with the knowledge that the funds will be used locally.

Notwithstanding the incentive associated with this new authority, however, many have expressed well-founded concerns that, for reasons beyond VA's control, collections could fall short of target levels. Such a shortfall could materially diminish VA's ability to meet veterans' health care needs. Mr. Speaker, these concerns prompted our committee to develop a contingency funding mechanism, which would be in effect for fiscal year 1998. In essence, the measure establishes a mechanism that would trigger what would amount to an automatic supplemental appropriation if VA collections fall short of Congressional Budget Office projections by more than $25 million. These and other changes to the original administration proposal provide greater assurance that the new policy will foster veterans' interests, rather than place them in jeopardy.

I continue to believe that VA's medical care cost recoveries should supplement, rather than substitute for, appropriated funds. All in all, however, I believe that the third-party retention language passed by the House will help the VA to more effectively care for our veterans, and am extremely pleased that this measure is well on its way to becoming law.

I wish the same could be said for the straightforward legislation our committee developed earlier this session to demonstrate

that VA could save money for the Medicare Program while expanding access to care for many of our veterans. A seemingly fair-minded and straightforward proposal to permit higher income, non-service-connected veterans to use their Medicare benefits at VA health care facilities, was dropped from this bill. This legislation was favorably reported by our committee, had the strong support of all major veterans organizations, had 110 cosponsors, and was adopted by the Senate in a slightly modified form.

I very strongly believe that this legislation—H.R. 1362—is at the very least cost neutral and would likely save Medicare money. I regret that the administration did not make more of an effort to signal its strong support for this legislation and failed to counter the misinformed view that VA is not prepared to mount such a demonstration project.

VA should be given the opportunity to establish a demonstration which can not only expand veterans' access to care but potentially save significant sums for Medicare. In that regard, it is ironic, and troubling, to learn from the recent testimony of the HHS Inspector General that the Medicare Program may pay out considerably more in improper payments than the entire VA medical care budget of $17 billion.

What some refer to as ''VA-Medicare subvention'' is not simply a veterans' issue. It can prove beneficial to the Medicare Program as well. We veterans' advocates will, nevertheless, have to redouble our efforts to highlight that veterans who cannot now gain access to VA health care deserve to be able to use their Medicare benefits at VA facilities. I believe that, as more Members come to understand this issue and realize the positive effect it could have on tens of thousands of veterans nationwide, passage can be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, we've taken an important step in our efforts to provide new revenue streams to fund veterans' health care. New and innovative funding mechanisms should be encouraged, studied and implemented. I am confident that, with congressional support, the VA can thrive as it provides needed care to veterans well into the 21st century.

CONCERNING THE DEAL TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

SPEECH OF

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1997

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am voting ''no''. Here's why:

1. This deal increases the deficit. We should not un-balance the budget now for the sake of balancing it 5 years from now.

The purpose of passing this legislation was supposed to be to balance the budget. I support that goal. In fact, since 1993, when I supported the Clinton budget package against the vote of every Republican in the House, the deficit has been going down. But if we approve this latest budget deal, we will, according to its authors, make the deficit worse, not better, next year.

But that's not all. It has been apparent to me since March that revenue projections used by both the administration and the Congress have grossly underestimated the amount of revenue flowing into the Treasury recently. The deficit for this fiscal year has been re-estimated twice already, reducing it dramatically from over $100 billion to less than $45 billion. We have not seen deficits this low for 20 years. At this rate, the budget will be balanced in 1998, not 2002. In order to ensure that the final budget agreement reflected a true snapshot of current reality, I asked OMB to provide its overdue mid-year estimates before we had to vote on the agreement. OMB refused. OMB finds the truth inconvenient, but the truth is that we have a better chance of balancing the budget without a deal than with one.

Let's not turn our backs on the goal of a balanced budget just as we are about to reach that promised land.

2. The tax cuts go to the wrong people for the wrong purpose.

Targeted tax credits for worthy purposes can be justified, even in the absence of a balanced budget, as long as they are going to people in need. But the vast majority of these tax cuts will go to people who are not needy. Like Pacman, the wealthiest 5 percent of all Americans gobble up half of the benefits. The wealthiest 20 percent gobble up over 70 percent of the benefits. In fact, the lowest-income Americans are expected to pay more, not less, under this bill. Is this fair? Is this moral? Is this wise?

The only justification for fattening the pocketbooks of the very wealthy has been some notion of stimulating the economy by favoring the tax treatment of long-term investments. But we don't need a stimulus. In fact, any artificial stimulus to this very healthy economy is likely to trigger a move by the Federal Reserve Board to raise interest rates. Higher interest rates are a tax on all of us. We should not ask to be thrown into that briar patch.

3. We are cutting deep so the rich can keep.

The more we give back to the wealthiest individuals in this society the deeper we have to cut in spending programs that benefit everyone else. This is a time to ask those with high incomes to shoulder more of the burden of deficit reduction, not less. As many commentators have noted, we have some major decisions ahead regarding the solvency of Medicare and Social Security as our population ages and our employment pool shrinks. Prudence dictates that we devote resources to solving those intractable problems. Today, we compound them.

In short, there are many good things in this package that I support, and it is always difficult to vote against a package that has much good mixed in with the bad. But I cannot in good conscience engage in the pretense of balancing a budget that is already balanced as a vehicle for a tax cut that is so unfair to average Americans.

4. Telecommunications provisions of the budget.

The telecommunications proposals contained in the budget do not represent good telecommunications policy. In fact, they contain appalling precedents, highly-flawed assumptions, and radical departures from established, sound telecommunications policy—all in the name of raising cash for the U.S. Treasury. The blame for this lies with an overzealous desire to appear to balance the budget at any cost—including the use of highly speculative and likely fraudulent spectrum numbers and the disruption of the universal service system. The blame for this lies with the ranks of ''budgeteers'' who have little knowledge of telecommunications issues and apparently no respect for telecommunications policy.

The telecommunications budget proposals accelerate the dumping of more spectrum on the market in the immediate aftermath of having already sold airwave frequencies for PCS, paging and other wireless services. It should be clear that much of the money that is expected from the auctions that we have already had may not ever show up in the Treasury because multitudes of winning bidders are already struggling to find the capital to build out their networks.

In a recent FCC auction forced by budget priorities, many wireless franchises covering entire States sold for a mere dollar. That auction raised only $13 million out of the $1.8 billion it was expected to raise. And today we have another budget-driven proposal that attempts to raise billions and billions more from the sale of the airwaves. It is pure fantasy.

Moreover, this policy will adversely affect our ability to democratize the holding of radio licenses. In the 1993 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act [OBRA 93] we built in provisions to help minorities, women, and entrepreneurs to gain access to the airwaves. By placing the highest societal value on the highest amount of cold hard cash that can be raised at auction we are subverting other important telecommunications policy objectives.

On July 23, eight Democratic members of the House Telecommunications Subcommittee joined me in writing the FCC about this issue. We wrote that we are concerned about the increasing emphasis placed upon spectrum auction revenue to assist in balancing the Federal budget and that that placing budgetary priorities foremost in Commission licensing decisions ultimately shortchanges the American public because spectrum allocation and licensing decisions must encompass a broad interpretation of the public interest, of which taxpayer interests are but one part. In our view, a short-term, temporary injection of cash into the Federal treasury for the purpose of achieving revenue goals for an arbitrary 5-year budget target serves budgetary interests, but it does not necessarily serve the broader public interest.

In particular, we wrote that budget policy pressures may unwittingly work to thwart the ability of women and minority-owned firms to become spectrum licensees. Diversity in mass media licensing has been shown to play an important role in providing programming that reflects the community and its interests. In our letter we noted that this fundamental goal is not only supported by Congress, but also by President Clinton. As he recently said in his commencement remarks at the University of California-San Diego June 14: ''We must continue to expand opportunity. Full participation in our strong and growing economy is the best antidote to envy, despair, and racism. We must press forward to move millions more from poverty and welfare to work; to being the spark of enterprise to inner cities . . . We should not stop trying to equalize economic opportunity.''

Third, I want to mention the spectrum sale and its dubious budgetary numbers. The sale of frequencies from the returned analog broadcast TV channels is scheduled for the year 2001. The actual return of that spectrum to the