

insulted. Their contributions were ignored, the Army refused to restore their rank and withheld information about the medals they deserve.

As Mr. Wade said about the Army, "When they enticed us to volunteer, they said that the units we were going into would be our permanent units when the war was over." However, this did not happen. Simply put, they were misled.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wade endured years of misinformation and dishonesty by his Army, by his Government. While it is late, it is fitting that last Thursday, the 50th anniversary of President Truman's order to integrate the military, Mr. Wade was finally awarded his Bronze Star and had his rank restored.

I would like to join our military in congratulating and honoring Mr. Wade. I join with a military that has changed for the better because individuals like Mr. Wade proved their worth and ability on the battlefield. Our servicemen and women of color can stand tall and move through their ranks because of people like Mr. Wade. We all offer him our thanks and gratitude. Most importantly, we all join our military in recognizing his being awarded the Bronze Star and being restored to the rank of sergeant.

REGARDING THE UNITED STATES-JAPAN INSURANCE AGREEMENT

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1998

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask to insert into the RECORD the following Memorandum which the American Family Life Assurance Company ("AFLAC"), a Georgia company, has submitted to Ambassador Barshevsky, the United States Trade Representative.

The United States Trade Representative will be leading an interagency review process to consider her decision regarding a violation of the United States-Japan Insurance Agreement.

She has asked that submission be made to her office, and I think it appropriate to share with the House the AFLAC submission, which I know will be of interest to many both inside and outside the insurance industry.

MEMORANDUM

To: Interagency Task Force on Yasuda Fire & Marine's Activities in the Third Sector
From: Alan Wm. Wolff, Charles D. Lake II
Date: July 27, 1998
Re: Scope of Review and Copies of AFLAC's Submissions

Yasuda Fire & Marine Co., Ltd. has entered the third sector and has caused and is causing "radical change" in the business environment of the third sector. Therefore, in response to a request from the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, we are pleased to submit on behalf of American Family Life Assurance Company of Columbus ("AFLAC") additional copies of our submissions regarding Yasuda Fire & Marine's activities in violation of the U.S.-Japan Insurance Agreement.

The interagency review of Yasuda Fire & Marine's activities should be conducted on the basis of the primary object and purpose of the U.S.-Japan Insurance Agreement, which is enhancing U.S. market access in

Japan. The U.S.-Japan Insurance Agreement is designed to promote liberalization of the Japanese insurance market by preserving the third sector until the primary first and second sectors have been liberalized by the Government of Japan. To achieve this objective, the Japanese Government agreed to provide a "stand-still" in the third sector, until the primary first and second sectors have been liberalized.

"Stand-still" means that giant Japanese insurance companies such as Yasuda Fire & Marine are currently not permitted to enter the third sector (i.e., stand-alone cancer or medical market) or cause "radical change in the business environment" of the third sector. This commitment is premised on the fact that these giant Japanese companies have been the principal beneficiaries of the highly protected primary sector in Japan. The basic bargain struck under the agreement is that until companies like Yasuda are forced to face international competition in the primary sector, giant Japanese companies would not be allowed to penetrate the third sector. The U.S.-Japan Insurance Agreement is about one thing and one thing only, that is, access to the Japanese market for the sale of insurance.

It is essential that the interagency task force conduct its review of Yasuda Fire & Marine's activities in the third sector of the Japanese market by examining the evidence based on the object, purpose, and specific requirements of the agreement. A single, narrow focus on the question of whether CIGNA "controls" INA Himawari does not provide an appropriate basis for review of the available evidence and relevant issues. Yasuda Fire & Marine's activities in the third sector pose an unprecedented trade policy challenge to the United States with respect to its ability to enforce its trade agreements. It involves a clever scheme by a giant Japanese company to use its previously unsuccessful joint-venture partner both as a sword and shield to circumvent a trade agreement. Accordingly, we urge the interagency task force to consider the following facts:

Yasuda announced its agreement to buy majority ownership of INA Life, CIGNA's unsuccessful subsidiary, in August 1996.

Yasuda renamed the subsidiary INA Himawari ("Sunflower") to add the Yasuda corporate symbol to the name of the subsidiary to provide public identification of the entity as part of Yasuda.

Yasuda covered INA Himawari promotional materials in sunflowers to further establish in the public's mind that INA Himawari products were Yasuda policies.

Yasuda transferred 10,000 of its agents to INA Himawari to sell third sector products, and there is a potential for approximately 60,000 additional Yasuda agents to be transferred.

Yasuda has linked its proprietary computer sales systems, integrating its new "subsidiary" into its database, thus enabling the two companies to provide a seamless line of insurance products.

Yasuda represented to its agents that INA Himawari was in fact its subsidiary.

Yasuda's agents acting through INA Himawari targeted AFLAC's policy holders for replacement sales.

Yasuda used its keiretsu links to further extend policies into the third sector.

Yasuda cross-subsidized the sale of INA Himawari products by offering its agents special incentives rewarding aggressive sales of INA Himawari products.

Yasuda violated Japanese law in several regards in selling these policies in the third sector. Yasuda agents:

Offered rebates to new policy holders;

Misrepresented INA Himawari as a Yasuda subsidiary;

Conducted inappropriate product comparisons; and

Provided inappropriate information on AFLAC's cash surrender refund amounts.

Without agreeing to sell off their companies, change their corporate names and identities, take on platoons of outside managers, and disclose proprietary information, it is impossible for AFLAC or other foreign companies to enter into similar arrangements with other giant Japanese insurance companies. The transfer of Yasuda's agents to INA Himawari is the direct result of CIGNA's withdrawal from the life sector. It is impossible for other foreign companies dedicated to staying in the Japanese market to commit to such arrangements.

As Yasuda Fire & Marine's penetration of the third sector continues, foreign firms have been and are currently denied opportunities accorded to Yasuda and other giant Japanese insurance companies in the primary life and non-life sectors.

We further urge the interagency task force to consider among other things the following issues:

Are Yasuda Fire & Marine's activities in the third sector consistent with the object and purpose of the U.S.-Japan Insurance Agreement?

Has Yasuda Fire & Marine entered the third sector or has it caused or is it causing "radical change" in the business environment of the third sector?

Does participation in ownership by a U.S. entity in a joint-venture provide a blanket exemption for the Japanese partner from the agreement's provisions?

Has Yasuda Fire & Marine or INA Himawari engaged in activities designed to mislead agents and consumers into thinking that INA Himawari is Yasuda's subsidiary or a functional member of Yasuda keiretsu?

CIGNA is disinvesting from the Japanese market and seeking to increase its exit price by taking advantage of the U.S.-Japan Insurance Agreement. Are CIGNA's actions consistent with the U.S. objective to improve market access?

Does permitting Yasuda Fire & Marine to continue its activities in the third sector through INA Himawari promote U.S. market access to the Japanese insurance market?

When a prima facie case of a trade violation is presented, and a responding company has exclusive possession of certain relevant information, the burden of production should shift to that responding party. Further, if that responding party refuses to cooperate and provide the necessary information to conduct an impartial review, an adverse inference should be used against that party.

The interagency task force's decision should promote market access in Japan and discourage other Japanese companies from using their U.S. joint-venture partner to circumvent U.S.-Japan trade agreements.

CONGRESSIONAL RECOGNITION OF DON HORN

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1998

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Don A. Horn, whose dedication to the labor movement and community of Houston deserve the utmost praise and admiration. From his extended tenure with the AFL-CIO in Harris County to the innumerable charity's and non-profit organizations he faithfully served, Mr. Horn's selfless

resolve to improve his environment serves as an example to us all.

Mr. Horn is most notably recognized for his extended service on the Executive Board of the Harris County AFL-CIO, where he occupied the position of Secretary-Treasurer for over thirty years. During this epoch, Mr. Horn concurrently served on the Texas AFL-CIO Executive Board as a trustee for over a decade.

Mr. Horn's merit, however, cannot be constrained to his mere occupational accomplishments. In the community, Don selflessly served a myriad of underprivileged and needy individuals in a multitude of capacities. Mr. Horn's altruistic efforts ranged from his extended service on the Harris County Hospital Board to his efforts to increase electoral participation among under-represented minority groups. Mr. Horn also volunteered countless hours to the United Way, serving on its Houston Area Board for several years, as well as the local chapter of the Boy Scouts of America. Today, Mr. Horn remains an active member of the community, serving on the City of Houston's Ethics Committee.

I sincerely commend, and thank, Mr. Don Horn on behalf of the city of Houston and its people for his accomplishments, his dedication, and for his efforts to improve his community for posterity.

HONORING BOB VOGEL

HON. JON D. FOX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1998

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute an outstanding citizen of Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District, Bob Vogel, on his selection as a member of the Abington Senior High School Hall of Fame.

Following his graduation in 1962, Bob went on to Princeton and then Yale Law School, following which he has had a distinguished career in business and law. He is currently Vice President and General Counsel of Rohm and Haas Company, whose world headquarters for research is in Spring House, Montgomery County.

Bob was nominated for this honor by his long-time friend, and mine, Ken Davis of Gladwyne, Montgomery County. Ken and Bob went through the Abington Township school system together, following which Ken served with distinction as Administrative Assistant to the late U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania, Hugh Scott. Ken then served as Director of Government Relations for Rohm and Haas Company. He now heads his own government relations consulting firm in Ardmore, Montgomery County, and is President of the Lower Merion Township Board of Commissioners.

I extend my heartiest congratulations to Bob Vogel on this memorable achievement.

PATIENT PROTECTION ACT OF 1998

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1998

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule.

Yesterday, I appeared before the Rules Committee. I urged the Committee to make in order an amendment I proposed to offer to H.R. 4250. My amendment would authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to reimburse veterans enrolled in the veterans health care system for the cost of emergency care or services received in non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities. My amendment is similar to H.R. 3702, the Veterans' Access to Emergency Health Care Act, which I introduced earlier this year.

Under the Evans amendment, veterans enrolled in the VA health care system would be reimbursed for the cost of emergency care they receive from a non-VA facility when there is a "serious threat to life or the health of a veteran."

The legislation we are considering today attempts to write into law certain basic health care protections, including emergency care protections, for millions of Americans not enrolled in the VA health care system. My amendment, which was blocked by the Rules Committee, would have afforded similar protections for the millions of American veterans who receive their health care from the VA.

Yesterday's action by the Rules Committee is a disservice to American veterans, and comes on the heels of another successful—but misguided—Republican effort to strip away compensation benefits from veterans who became addicted to tobacco while in the military. In the apparent view of the Republican leadership, veterans should have known better than to become addicted to nicotine while in the service, despite the obvious role played by our government and the tobacco companies to facilitate smoking by service members.

As yesterday's Rules Committee action suggests, veterans apparently should also have known better than to get sick and require emergency medical care outside a VA hospital.

This Congress has no conscience when it comes to issues of significance to our American veterans. Without my amendment, low-income, or service-connected disabled veterans who rely on VA for their health care needs would be provided no basic protections for emergency medical care. It's just not right, and it's a slap in the face to the men and women who have risked their lives in defense of our nation and the values we hold so dear.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for our veterans and vote against this rule.

FOREIGN AID

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1998

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have printed in the RECORD statements by high school students from my home state of Vermont, who were speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people today. I am asking that you please insert these statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as I believe that the views of these young people will benefit my colleagues.

STATEMENT BY ANGELA DEBLASIO AND LYNNE CLOUGH REGARDING FOREIGN AID

ANGELA DEBLASIO. Foreign aid is an essential part of the United States' annual bud-

et. This aid to less fortunate nations helps to alleviate famine and the effects of disasters. It promotes agricultural and industrial production. It also provides U.S. know-how for basic health, education and housing needs, while rewarding governments for embracing American ideals and interests.

Foreign aid is not just money. The United States aid program consists of development, economic, military and food assistance. Development assistance provides training and advice in all areas. Economic support contributes to the political stability and economic strength. Military aid provides grants and credits for the purchase of weapons, along with training and advice for the forces. Food aid is free or reduced-price agricultural products.

One of the great historical successes of American foreign aid was the Marshall Plan.

LYNNE CLOUGH. World War II left many scars in Western Europe and the United States. Secretary of State George Marshall proposed a plan that would not only help Western Europe overcome poverty and resist temptations of communism, but help Americans keep their jobs and offer more opportunities.

This plan became known as the Marshall Plan. We sent over tons of goods and money to Western Europe. Then, in turn, Western Europe bought our products, which gave Americans jobs. Giving U.S. aid prevented Western Europe from falling under the influence of communism and it gave us protection from the Soviet Union.

Aid to foreign countries has expanded over the past few years.

ANGELA DEBLASIO. For the past 37 years, Peace Corps volunteers have worked together with the people of Africa and other nations around the world. Today, Peace Corps volunteers contribute to grassroots development projects in education, business, the environment and health. They establish forest conservation plans and find alternatives to wood as a source of food.

Volunteers work to involve people in protecting endangered wildlife species and recycling projects. Peace Corps volunteers help individuals in developing nations to learn the skills necessary to help themselves.

The best example of how the United States gains from foreign aid is the country of Russia. The U.S. is currently giving aid to the Russians. The American taxpayers are definitely getting their money's worth. They are helping to bring banking experts, legal experts, business experts, and political scientists to the nation of Russia and create a free democratic society based on free enterprise. Also, American tax dollars are paying to help the nations of the former Soviet Union safely dismantle nuclear weapons once pointed at the United States. American aid is also helping to ensure that the nuclear materials do not fall into the hands of terrorists during these potentially dangerous times.

LYNNE CLOUGH. "Why spend our money on foreign aid?" That is a question many of us ask. As you just heard, foreign aid helps America prosper. Foreign aid is only one percent of our annual budget and is a very good investment. It provides security by aiding our allies and sets up good trading partners. Giving aid is also a way to deal with problems when they are small, and perhaps prevent future conflict.

STATEMENT BY NATALIE ROSS REGARDING STUDENT DRINKING AND DRIVING

NATALIE ROSS. Good afternoon. I will have to be quite honest with you: Many of the issues that I was going to speak about today have already been brought up with the student drinking and driving.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS. That doesn't make them less important for you to bring them up.