

farmers and ranchers from receiving a loan from the United States Department of Agriculture if a previous loan has been written down. These provisions are causing many farmers and ranchers to go out of business.

Last week, as a part of a conference agreement for the fiscal year 1999 agriculture appropriation bill, we provided some limited relief.

□ 2045

While this response to the provision of the 1996 farm bill is appreciated, it is a feeble response, particularly when compared to the response to the near collapse of the Long-Term Capital Management Hedge Fund.

This hedge fund is unregulated and its activities are not disclosed and virtually unknown, yet its creditors, the New York banks, and the Federal Reserve bailed it out. The bailout was \$3.5 billion, almost as much as the \$4 billion in emergency assistance we provided farmers and ranchers.

Worse, this bailout occurred with little scrutiny, little requirements and conditions imposed against the fund. In fact, the Financial Markets Reassurance Act of 1998 was also included as a part of the conference report. The act prohibits the relevant regulatory agency, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, from proposing or adopting any new regulations until March of 1999, on certain transactions of the over-the-counter derivative market. The hedge fund bailed out by the banks and the Federal Reserve is heavily invested in that market.

When Congress learned of the problems with this hedge fund, a flurry of activity ensued, including emergency hearings. Yet efforts by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to regulate this hedge fund was met with intense opposition and resistance.

Notwithstanding the impact that fund can have on America's economy and the stability of financial markets around the world, the response to help the fund was quick and massive.

Mr. Speaker, I must ask, why not the same or even a similar response for the small farmers and ranchers? Persons who have declared bankruptcy are now treated better than our small farmers and ranchers. Those persons can still get a loan, even after they have defaulted on a previous loan.

By law, this Nation routinely forgives debts for foreign countries, and after forgiving those debts, we allow those foreign countries to create more debt. Credit card account defaults are record high, yet new credit cards are issued to those persons who do not want them. We give just about everyone a chance and a second chance, yet we have been slow in doing the same thing for our small farmers and ranchers.

And socially disadvantaged farmers, including minority farmers, are even at a greater risk. Farmers have been most important to this Nation's past and farmers are vital to this Nation's fu-

ture, especially the small family farmers and ranchers.

In 1862, when USDA was created, 90 percent of the population farmed for a living. Today, American producers represent less than 3 percent of the population.

Mr. Speaker, the least we can do is to treat the problem of small farmers and ranchers with the same kind of urgency we gave to the hedge fund last week.

By 1992, there were only 1.1 million small farms left in the United States, a 45% decline from 1959!

North Carolina had only a little over 39,000 farms left in 1992, a 23% decline.

In 1920, there were over 6 million farms in the United States and close to a sixth—926,000 were operated by African-Americans.

In 1992, the landscape was very, very different.

Only 1% of the farms in the United States are operated by African-Americans. One percent—18,816, is a paltry sum when African-Americans comprise 13% of the total American population.

In my home state of North Carolina, there has been a 65% decline in minority farmers, just over the last 15 years, from 6,996 farms in 1978 to 2,498 farms in 1992.

Again, much of the blame for this decline can be attributed to the credit crunch.

The dwindling number of farmers and ranchers feed and help clothe us, and they do so at prices that are unmatched around the world.

#### AMERICA SHOULD NOT RUSH TO WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, The New Yorker Magazine has just reported that the White House planned bombing raids on Afghanistan and the Sudan without involving four Members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Even worse, since these were supposedly terrorist targets, FBI Director Louis Freeh was also left out.

Worse than that, The New Yorker said that the White House told Joint Chiefs Chairman Hugh Shelton about the raids, but specifically told him not to brief the other four chiefs of the military and not to consult with the Defense Intelligence Agency.

Perhaps worst of all, Attorney General Janet Reno was ignored when she questioned whether our intelligence was good enough to support these raids, according to this Associated Press report.

I did hear a Paul Harvey newscast a couple of days after these raids saying that our intelligence was bad and that we had bombed, among other things, a medicine factory. I know if another nation bombed a medicine factory here, we would be extremely angry, and rightly so.

I do not understand why our intelligence is continually so weak, when we spend so many billions of dollars more than any other nation each and every year on this.

I am sad to say that I, along with almost every Member of Congress, supported these raids when they first occurred. I, along with almost all of my colleagues, said that we have to take the strongest possible reasonable action against terrorists who are killing innocent people. I did say at the time that I was assuming that our intelligence was good, because I just found it impossible to believe that we would rush to war without being very, very certain that we were targeting the actual terrorists.

I know that there were many people who felt that these bombing raids were done to try to draw attention from the President's troubles. However, I did not believe then that anyone would do anything so horrible, and this article is still no proof that that occurred. But the article does indicate a rush to judgment, an eagerness to go to war that should never happen in this country, a Nation that has already prided itself on its efforts to promote peace and freedom around the world.

We should involve ourselves in war and/or take warlike actions only as a very last resort, and only if there is simply no other reasonable choice. We should conduct bombing raids on others only with extreme reluctance and only when forced to do so.

The article in the New Yorker Magazine raises the most serious questions possible about these raids, and if this article is false or inaccurate, then the administration should immediately refute it. We have involved ourselves in recent years in civil wars in Haiti, Rwanda, Somalia, Bosnia, and now I suppose Kosovo, and we have spent many, many millions of taxpayers dollars in the process.

As I have mentioned before, according to The Washington Post, we had our troops in Haiti picking up garbage and settling domestic disputes. I heard another Member say on this floor that we had our troops in Bosnia, among other things, giving rabies shots to dogs.

The great majority of Americans believe that the Haitians should pick up their own garbage and the Bosnians should give their own rabies shots.

President Kennedy said in 1961 that we have to realize that with just 6 percent of the world's population, we cannot right every wrong and there cannot be an American solution to every world problem. Today we are less than 5 percent of the world's population.

We should be very careful about rushing to war in Kosovo. Jonathan Clarke, a former member of the British Diplomatic Service, now with the Cato Institute, wrote in last Friday's Los Angeles Times, "Some of Milosevic's democratic opponents . . . visited Washington last month to warn that bombing would play into Milosevic's hands and undermine their efforts. They made little progress. The 'CNN factor' is too strong, they were told on Capitol Hill.

"This gives the game away. NATO's plans are directed less at resolving the

Kosovo crisis than at making the about-to-be expanded alliance look relevant. As Defense Secretary William Cohen said . . . 'NATO's credibility is on the line.' In effect," Mr. Clarke continued, "we are witnessing a NATO job search and the results are entirely counterproductive. NATO's potential involvement has radicalized all sides in Kosovo . . . In Belgrade, bombing will strengthen the hard men around Milosevic and sound the death knell of the brave Serbs who dare to oppose him."

Mr. Speaker, we should never rush into war, nor should we turn our soldiers into international social workers. We need a strong military for national defense and only for national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the Los Angeles Times article for inclusion in the RECORD:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Oct. 2, 1998]

MILITARY INTERVENTION WOULD MAKE IT WORSE

(By Jonathan Clarke)

In July 1913, the chancellor of the Austro-Hungarian Empire received a written warning from his foreign minister not to try to solve the Serbian question by "force of arms." He ignored the advice. A year later, Austria declared war against Serbia. Four years after that, its empire went out of business.

Today, NATO, another multiethnic, multi-language organization with an identity crisis, is riding a wave of popular revulsion over new atrocities toward military intervention in Kosovo. "Preparations are in full swing," announced a NATO spokesman, making the proposed hostilities sound like a homecoming dance, blissfully oblivious to history's warnings. This is typical of the modern style of diplomacy. Former Sen. Bob Dole, a tireless advocate of American military involvement in the region, dismisses history because it makes things "complicated."

This approach—willful ignorance of local conditions abetted by a canonical belief in the victory-delivering capability of military might—was favored by the top brass in Vietnam. It produced disaster there. Whether NATO can make it work better in Kosovo remains to be seen.

Kosovo is fearfully complicated. This is not merely an excuse offered by opponents of military intervention, but a statement of the obvious fact that rational analysis should precede major decisions. Unless Western policy can resolve the Balkans' inherent complications, intervention risks making matters much worse, especially for the Kosovo Albanian refugees.

Some of the contradictions seem almost technical. For example, bombing is likely to fuel the fires of Kosovo's independence, a goal that the U.S. does not support. Further, NATO intervention in Kosovo directly contradicts the premise of multiethnic principles of the Dayton accords, which veto special treatment on ethnic grounds.

A much more serious objection, however, is that bombing directly serves Slobodan Milosevic, whom Congress earlier this year called "Europe's longest serving communist dictator." What country, when under attack from outside, does not rally to its leader? Look at Saddam Hussein. For Milosevic, the bombs cannot fall too soon. Likewise, he hopes Western sanctions will continue indefinitely. By turning daily life into a struggle for survival, they sap the energies of decent-minded people who might oppose him.

Some of Milosevic's democratic opponents, Bishop Artemije Radosavijevic of Kosovo and former Belgrade Mayor Nebojsa Covic, visited Washington last month to warn that bombing would mine their efforts. They made little progress. The "CNN factor" is too strong, they were told on Capitol Hill.

This gives the game away. NATO's plans are directed less at resolving the Kosovo crisis than at making the about-to-be-expanded alliance look relevant. As Defense Secretary William Cohen said at the Sept. 25 NATO conclave, "NATO's credibility is on the line." In effect, we are witnessing a NATO job search. And the results are entirely counterproductive. NATO's potential involvement has radicalized all sides in Kosovo, as was vividly illustrated by last week's attempted assassination of Sabri Hamiti, a pro-negotiation moderate close to the Kosovo Albanian leadership. In Belgrade, bombing will strengthen the hard men around Milosevic and sound the death knell of the brave Serbs who dare to oppose him.

Earlier this month, NATO leaders counseled Iran against armed intervention in Afghanistan. NATO is administering similarly cautious advice in other conflicts such as Nagorno-Karabakh and Congo. What is so different about the Balkans? Is it to do with the relative value placed on European as opposed to Asian and African lives?

This is not a prescription for inaction. Following the NATO meeting, Cohen went onto the inaugural session of the Southeast European Defense Ministerial. Taking place in the less glamorous but arguably more purposeful surroundings of Skopje, this grouping includes key countries with a real stake in the Balkans, including Italy, Greece, Albania and Turkey. They should be given the lead in delivering immediate humanitarian aid and undertaking the painstaking, low-profile mediation that might achieve a lasting settlement. This would also free NATO to concentrate on its prime mission of strategic defense. This is where NATO's credibility resides, not in TV-driven adventurism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELLER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### PORKY CHEDWICK: "DADDIO OF THE RADDIO"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, we deal in particular in these days on the floor of the House with such weighty matters and such serious issues as warfare and impeachment, health care reform, Social Security, budgets. I rise tonight for a little lighter of an item. I think sometimes we have to talk about these lighter things to give ourselves a perspective on the serious matters that we occasionally talk about.

Mr. Speaker, I stand tonight to really pay tribute to a friend of mine who has been in radio in the Pittsburgh area for the last 50 years. Fifty years in a career that sometimes only lasts a few weeks or months, those who may have been in the radio business.

If one goes to Pittsburgh, PA and talks about "The Boss Man," "Your

Platter-Pushing Papa," "Your Daddio of the Raddio," everybody knows who they are talking about. It is Porky Chedwick, or as he called himself, "Pork the Tork," the "Boss Hoss with the Hot Sauce."

Mr. Speaker, he developed all of these lines of patter back starting in 1948 when really no one in the country was doing anything really strong entertainment wise in radio.

Porky is a white disk jockey. And I mention that because he played what then was known as "race music," the old R&B music, the sweet doo-wop sounds. And for those young people, Mr. Speaker, who may be in the House or watching at home and say what is doo-wop, it is that street corner harmony where you snap your fingers and it sounds so wonderful.

He would play that music that oftentimes was covered by white performers like Pat Boone, but he played it back before people had heard of people like Little Richard and Fats Domino and Bo Diddley. And a lot of those performers pay tribute to Porky Chedwick for giving them their first air play, because back then it was very difficult for black performers to get a wide audience anywhere in the country. There were certainly not many mainline radio stations that would play music by black performers.

Lou Christie, who also comes from the Pittsburgh area said being cool growing up, and Lou Christie had a lot of big records, he said being cool as he grew up meant listening to Porky Chedwick. He says he is still in awe of him, and he still reverts to being a 15-year-old child when he is around him. He will never know how important Porky was to his career. He was the first disk jockey in the country to play "The Gypsy Cried."

Jimmy Beaumont, who has been with the Skyliners around for 40 years playing in the Pittsburgh area and all around the world, Jimmy said he has known Porky for 40 of the 50 years, and he says that growing up hearing that stuff, that is when Jimmy Beaumont of the Skyliners decided he wanted to become a singer and sing that same doo-wop and that same sound that he heard Porky playing on the radio all the time.

There actually is a group in the Pittsburgh area known as P.O.R.C. It is an acronym for Pittsburgh Old Records Club, and one of the members of the club, Jim Sanders, said, "When I was a kid, when you would listen to Porky, you knew you were cool." It goes back to Porky being the very first white disk jockey to program the music. It was a revelation to white teenagers to hear some of this great music.

Porky started out in 1948 on a little radio station, doing a 5-minute sports program, called WHOD in Homestead, Pennsylvania. And he would go back and he says he played the "dusty disks." They were really dusty, 78 RPM records. And because nobody was playing them, the record store owners