inspections are completed and weapons destroyed, the world has handed Saddam Hussein a significant political victory. In fact, it would be a serious mistake to ease economic sanctions against Iraq. President Clinton correctly stated in his Pentagon speech that sanctions have already cost Hussein $110 billion, and the President aptly wondered how much stronger Hussein's armed forces would be today without sanctions.

Bellyaching about the U.N.-Iraq Agreement, however, does not serve American interests well. Equally shortsighted is the effort to gear up for some future invasion of Iraq while our stated objective remains limited to the ''substantial reduction'' of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capability. What the United States must do is commit herself to help the Iraqi people liberate their nation from Hussein's dictatorial reign.

The Clinton Administration has incorrectly concluded that the only way to overthrow Hussein is with a massive ground invasion. This assessment grossly overestimates Iraq's military strength. The weaknesses of Iraq's forces were exposed during the Gulf War in 1991, and the Iraqi military is significantly weaker now, in great part because of the cumulative effect of years of sanctions. On the other hand, American intelligence and military preparedness to successfully strike Iraq are significantly stronger.

Several Middle East experts, including Ambassador Paul Wolfowitz, Dean of International Studies at Johns Hopkins, have questioned the notion that only a comprehensive ground invasion by the U.S. can bring down Saddam Hussein. I am convinced that if we take the following steps, in addition to preparing for military action when the next inevitable crisis with Saddam Hussein occurs, we will help to facilitate democracy in Iraq and rid the world of a rogue dictator:

1. Challenge the claim of Saddam Hussein as the legitimate ruler of Iraq. No doubt this goal was made more difficult by the credibility Hussein has garnered through his new international agreement.

2. Make clear the intention of the United States to recognize a provisional government—a Free Iraq—and start with the Iraqi National Congress.

3. Find a mechanism to make the frozen assets of Iraq in the U.S. and elsewhere available to the anti-Hussein forces. The U.S. and U.K. alone have over $1.6 billion in frozen assets which should be used to finance democratic forces in Iraq.

4. Lift economic sanctions from regions in Iraq that are wrested from Saddam Hussein's control, and make oil resources available to the anti-Hussein forces for humanitarian needs and economic development.

5. Provide weapons and logistical support to the resistance, as well as air cover for liberated areas within the Southern and Northern no-fly zones.

Saddam Hussein remains nothing less than an international war criminal who should stand trial for his crimes against humanity. He has broken every agreement he has made with the United States and the world community since the Gulf War. He will no doubt once again subvert this agreement, and when he does, we must be prepared to initiate military air strikes immediately aimed specifically at destroying Saddam's personal power infrastructure, including his communications network and the Republican guard.

Seven years after the Gulf War, Saddam Hussein is still a menace to his own people and to world peace. Only by assisting the Iraqi people to liberate themselves will we prevent Hussein from becoming an even more serious threat seven years from now.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1998

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on 2–25–98 as I was in Central Florida with the President visiting the victims of the horrible tornadoes which struck our community.

Mr. Speaker on Roll Call #19 (the Nadler amendment to HR 1544) I would have voted no.

Mr. Speaker on Roll Call #20 (the Conyers amendment to HR 2181) I would have voted no.

Mr. Speaker on Roll Call #21 (Passage of the Witness Protection and Interstate Relocation Act) I would have voted yes.

Mr. Speaker on Roll Call #22 (the Jackson-Lee (TX) amendment to HR 1544) I would have voted no.

Mr. Speaker on Roll Call #23 (the Jackson-Lee (TX) amendment to HR 1544) I would have voted no.

Mr. Speaker on Roll Call #24 (Passage of HR 1544, Federal Agency Compliance Act) I would have voted yes.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INVESTMENT IN CHILDREN ACT

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1998

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, if there was any doubt about the need to make day care safer and more affordable, it should be erased by one clear statistic: 60 percent of mothers with children under the age of six are now in the workforce; a rate 5 times higher than 50 years ago. Of course, some might say these parents are making the wrong ''choice'' by going to work. But the fact is that many parents don't have a choice. Single mothers obviously have to work to support their children and an increasing number of married couples also both have to work to make ends meet. Rather than ignoring this economic reality, or questioning the role of women in the workforce, we should help these hard-working families find affordable, quality child care.

However, this does not mean we cannot also help families with a parent who stays at home to care for a young child. The debate, after all, is about caring for children, regardless of whether they are in day care or at home.

I am therefore introducing legislation today that focuses on improving child care in six critical areas. The Investment in Children Act would: (1) make day care more affordable for middle-income families by reducing their taxes; (2) provide tax relief to families with a parent who stays at home to care for a young child; (3) help low-income working families receive day care through the current child care block grant; (4) improve child care quality and safety; (5) encourage businesses to provide child care to their employees; and (6) increase the availability of after-school care.

In my home state of Connecticut, day care costs for young children average about $7000 a year; presenting a major financial barrier for many families. To help these families pay for quality child care, my legislation would increase the current Dependent Care Tax Credit (DCTC) for every family earning less than $60,000. This tax cut will help hard-working, middle-income families in Connecticut and throughout the nation afford quality day care for their children. For example, a dual-income family earning $40,000 a year with two children in routine day care would have their taxes cut by almost $2000; double the amount of tax relief now provided by the Dependent Care Tax Credit.

The Investment in Children Act would also help those families with a parent who cares for their young children at home. The legislation would allow families with a child under the age of 4 who do not receive the Dependent Care Tax Credit to file for an expanded Child Tax Credit. This credit would be equivalent to the current $500 Child Tax Credit plus an additional amount equal to the average increase in tax relief provided to two-worker families through the expansion of the DCTC. The provision ensures the same amount of new tax relief for one-worker families caring for a young child at home and two-worker families with a child in day care.

While a tax credit may help many middle-income Americans better afford day care, it may not help low-income working families with limited tax liability. To ensure these families also have access to quality child care, the Investment in Children Act would increase the current Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) by $8 billion over the next 5 years. States would be required to use no less than 70 percent of this new funding to provide subsidies and other assistance to low-income, working families who need child care. While states can already access the CCDBG to help the working poor, most of the funding is dedicated now to welfare families, leaving too little help for those working in low-wage jobs and still trying to afford quality child care.

When they cannot remain at home with their children, every parent has two basic expectations of any child care arrangement: it should be safe and it should provide a stimulating and nurturing environment. To make this expectation a reality, the Investment in Children Act would spend $3 billion over the next five years to help states check the safety of day care facilities and to improve the quality of child care programs. For example, the funds could be used by the states to: increase unannounced safety inspections of child care facilities; improve and expand training of child care providers; promote early learning programs; and reduce staff-to-child ratios.

One way to increase the availability of quality day care programs is to encourage businesses to provide on-site day care for their employees' children or to contract with existing child care providers. This legislation therefore includes the Administration's proposal to provide a 25% tax credit (up to $150,000) for businesses providing child care to their employees. The credit would be available to businesses for building or expanding on-site child care facilities, operating existing on-site child care facilities, or contracting with a licensed child care facility.

Finally, this legislation recognizes the need for more after-school care. Research from the FBI indicates that children between the age of 12 and 17 are most at risk for committing or being victims of violent crime between 3 and 6 pm. Other menacing issues, including teenage pregnancy, also become a problem during this interval between the school bell and the work whistle when an estimated 5 million children go without adult supervision. To provide constructive educational and recreational programs for more children during these perilous hours, the legislation would increase funding for after school programs by almost $4 billion over the next five years. Three billion dollars of this new funding would be sent to the states as a capped entitlement to help them promote a variety of after-school programs. Additionally, the five-year authorization level for the Department of Education's 21st Century Community Learning Center Program, which provides grants to local schools or after-school care, would be increased to $1 billion.

Before I conclude, let me remind all of my colleagues that providing additional tax relief for middle-income families to help them afford day care or care for their children at home will be drastically undercut unless we reform the Alternative Minimum Tax (ATM). Without changes, the AMT will rob 8 million families of the current $500 Child Tax Credit over the next ten years, not to mention any potential new tax credits. The Investment in Children Act therefore includes a provision that would prevent the AMT from hitting middle-income families depending on tax credits.

Taken as a whole, the provisions in the Investment in Children Act would improve the accessibility, safety and quality of child care in America and that represents nothing less than an investment in our future. I urge all of my colleagues to support this effort to provide better care for millions of children across our great nation.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN L. ''JACK'' SMITH, DISTRICT DIRECTOR, CHICAGO DISTRICT OFFICE, U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1998

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John L. ''Jack'' Smith, who is retiring as the District Director, Chicago District Office, of the U.S. Small Business Administration. An event will be held in his honor on Thursday, February 26, 1998, in Chicago, Illinois. Jack began his service to his country in 1951 when he joined the Navy. From 1967 to 1970, Jack worked as a loan specialist for the Economic Development Administration after two years as Director of Financial Assistance for the Business and Job Development Corp. in Pittsburgh. In October, 1973, Jack joined the Office of Minority Business Enterprise of the Department of Commerce as the Midwest Regional Director in Chicago. Jack joined the SBA in November, 1975. As District Director, Jack was responsible for the administration of SBA's loan management assistance, government contract, and advocacy programs for small businesses throughout Illinois. Jack's efforts as Chicago District Director have resulted in several billion dollars in loans and federal contracts on behalf of Illinois' small business community.

Jack's 23 years as District Director and 34 years of federal service have greatly benefited Illinois' small business concerns. However, his service did not end there. Jack has volunteered his considerable expertise to benefit the Heart Association, the Kiwanis Club, United Fund and Boy Scouts of America.

I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring John L. Smith, an outstanding community and business leader and role model. I wish him the best of luck in his retirement. May he continue to share his talent and love of community that he has given to the federal government and the community at large.

WITNESS PROTECTION AND INTERSTATE RELOCATION ACT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2181) to ensure the safety of witnesses and to promote notification of the interstate relocation of witnesses by States and localities engaging in the relocation, and for other purposes:

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2181, the Witness Protection and Interstate Relocation Act of 1997. Although I support the witness notification and relocation provision in this bill as well as the goals of the witness intimidation provisions, I object strongly to the inclusion of the death penalty for witness intimidation that results in death. It is also troubling that the death penalty is again applied for conspiracy offenses. This subjects a defendant to be sentenced to death without tangible evidence of guilt of murder and substantially increases the risk of a mistaken conviction and execution. I cite the report from the Death Penalty Information Center, ''Innocence and the Death Penalty: The Increasing Danger of Mistaken Executions,'' which reports 69 instances since 1973 in which condemned prisoners were released from death row because of wrongful convictions. It did not have figures on how many innocent people were actually executed.

I concur with the American Bar Association's resolution that the system for administering the death penalty in the United States is unfair and lacks adequate safeguards. The Bar Association resolution goes on to declare that a moratorium should be imposed on executions until a greater degree of fairness and due process is in place.

There is compelling evidence from many jurisdictions that the race of the defendant is the primary factor governing the imposition of the death sentence. In the Ocmulgee judicial circuit in Georgia, the district attorney sought the death penalty in 29 cases between 1974 and 1994; in 23 of those 29 cases—79 percent—the defendant was black, although blacks make up only 44 percent of the circuit's population. Another instance of the distorted effect of the death sentence is the evidence emerging under the Federal death penalty for drug kingpins. Of 37 defendants against whom the death penalty was sought between 1988 and 1994, 4 defendants were white, 4 were Hispanic, and 29 were black.

It has been 25 years since the U.S. Supreme Court invalidated the death penalty in *Furman* v. *Georgia;* there is now a large body of evidence to indicate that the death penalty is still imposed in a manner that goes beyond the words of the law. It targets African-Americans in a totally unacceptable way and although I strongly support improving the safety of witnesses and increasing the coordination between the Federal and State governments in protecting and relocating witnesses, I cannot support legislation which imposes an overtly prejudicial death penalty. I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill.

THE PERSIAN GULF VETERANS ACT OF 1998

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1998

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Persian Gulf Veterans Act of 1998. This important legislation offers a framework for compensating veterans suffering from Gulf War illnesses, responds to the need many veterans have expressed for identifying effective models to treat hard-to-define diseases, and addressed other problems Congress has investigated since 1992. Joining with me, as original cosponsors of the Persian Gulf War Veterans Act of 1998, are my distinguished colleagues, Representatives ABERCROMBIE, BISHOP, BLAGOJEVICH, BROWN, CARSON, CLYBURN, FILNER, GUTIERREZ, KENNEDY(MA), MASCARA, ORTIZ, PETERSON, REYES, RODRIGUEZ, and UNDERWOOD. I am also pleased the Persian Gulf Veterans Act of 1998 has the support of the major groups advocating on behalf of Persian Gulf veterans. The American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S. and Vietnam Veterans of America have all expressed support for this measure.

Seven years ago this week, allied ground forces, with air and naval support, countered Iraq's invasion of its neighbor Kuwait. Of the nearly 700,000 American troops who served in the Persian Gulf theatre, about 100,000 have signed onto registries maintained by the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs. The Departments' estimates of those registered who have diagnoses which are not easily treated vary from 10–25 percent. Meeting the needs of those suffering from illnesses, including those which defy ready diagnoses and treatments, is a continuing obligation of our nation—an obligation we must honor. With the current buildup of American troops in the Persian Gulf region, the need for enacting the Persian Gulf Veterans Act of 1998 is even more compelling.

The Persian Gulf Veterans Act of 1998 calls for an independent agency to advise the Department of Veterans Affairs on the appropriateness of the federal research agenda on