

Urban League will hold its Second Annual Equal Opportunity Awards Dinner at the Long Branch Ocean Place Hilton. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Monmouth County Urban League, and its new president Dr. Webster Tremell, for the excellent work that the league has done in lending a helping hand to those in our community who need it most—and to give my strongest encouragement for their future endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, the mission of the Urban League as a nonprofit community-based social service and civil rights organization is to assist African-Americans and other minorities and low-income families and individuals to achieve social and economic equality. The league, whose national headquarters is in New York City, has 114 affiliates across the nation. Working through social work, economics, and the law, the league seeks to secure equal opportunities in all sectors. While seeking to improve the quality of life for racial minorities, the league is also devoted to the goal of building bridges between the races.

The league was founded in 1910 in response to the needs of southern blacks who migrated to New York seeking enhanced economic opportunities, only to be confronted with unemployment, scarce health care, and overcrowded housing. The league was created through the merger of several organizations dedicated to assisting these new arrivals and combatting the racism of that era. In the years since, the league has expanded into a nationwide organization, and many distinguished leaders have presided over the league in the years since, including, Whitney Young, Vernon Jordan, and the current president and chief executive officer, John E. Jacob.

The Monmouth County League has sought to bring together a broad cross-section of public and private sector leaders representing the corporate, banking, legal, government, and educational communities. Among the major goals of the Monmouth chapter of the league are programs to assist unemployed and underemployed people to become self-sufficient through job readiness counseling, job development, job bank and referral services, and entrepreneurial advocacy. The league also works to address the housing needs of the community, through the development of affordable housing and counseling to assist families and individuals who may qualify for various forms of rental or home ownership assistance programs. The league also works in developing leadership through the support of young adults and professionals serving in mentorship and tutorial programs. Efforts also focus on health education and prevention programs.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to pay tribute to the work of the Monmouth County Urban League, and to wish for its continued success in the future.

IN RECOGNITION OF LORIN AND  
ANN WASHER

**HON. BILL BAKER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 4, 1995*

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, recently a couple from my district, Lorin and Ann Washer, needed to cancel a long-awaited trip to the Nation's Capital due to health reasons. It would have been a special trip for them, as

50 years ago this month they met in Washington on a blind date. That night, April 12, 1945, was the day President Roosevelt died. Ann and Lorin had to change their plans to dine out and instead ate at the home of a friend. Obviously the location of their meal was unimportant, as their courtship began in earnest shortly thereafter, and they were married in October 1946.

Mr. Speaker, although Ann and Lorin cannot come to Washington to celebrate the April 12 anniversary of their first meeting. I am pleased to honor them for a relationship that has endured 50 years. It is increasingly rare in our society that a couple exhibits the qualities of loyalty and love demonstrated by the Washers, and I am pleased to draw attention to this outstanding couple as the reminiscence about not only their courtship, but so many years of married life. Couples like the Washers have much to teach and much to remember, and deserve our congratulations on this unique day in their lives.

CLINTON RELISHES HIS  
UNNECESSARY INVASION

**HON. CHRISTOPHER COX**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 4, 1995*

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, the occasion of President Clinton's visit to Haiti is occasion to reflect on the ill wisdom of his policy there. It is "his" policy because, as he did with Mexico, he bypassed the Congress. The following article by Sir Eldon Griffiths is a sobering analysis of the Clinton Haiti policy.

CLINTON RELISHES HIS UNNECESSARY  
INVASION

By the time you read this, U.S. troops in Haiti will be pulling out in favor of a U.S.-led, U.S.-munitioned, and largely U.S.-financed U.N. army. President Clinton is in this tiny speck of an island, ready to pass the baton—I almost said the buck!—to U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, whose thankless task now becomes to hold the ring in Haiti while the smallest, poorest country in the Western Hemisphere struggles to construct a "viable democracy."

I wish the United Nations better luck than its hapless multinational forces experienced after the United States handed over Somalia. Let's also acknowledge that six months—and several billion dollars—after Jimmy Carter brokered his deal and Bill Clinton sent in an air-sea armada with more firepower than all the armies of Latin America combined. Port au Prince is probably less dangerous than it was under the rule of Raoul Cedras and his thugs. With the U.S. embargo lifted, some, though by no means all, of Haiti's services and small firms are back in business. Most of those Haitian boat people intercepted by the U.S. Coast Guard as they tried to get to Florida are being repatriated, many forcibly, from the unsanitary camps that shame America in Cuba and Panama.

Last Tuesday's high-noon murder of a prominent Haitian lawyer who had criticized President Aristide is, however, a reminder that Port au Prince still is riven by dangerous elements, but thanks to the U.S. Marines (and a growing Haitian police force), the situation in the capital has improved to a point where it's less frightening to walk in the streets at night than it is in, let's say, Washington, D.C.

Clinton has every reason to praise the U.S. forces. They did what he told them to do.

But his claim that his Haiti was a "triumph" is none the less as spurious as it is self-deceiving. This version of events may sit well with those Haitians who've done well from Aristide's return; it may also carry the day with the liberal press and what's left of the Black Caucus in Congress. But history, I predict, will judge Clinton's Haitian adventure less generously. More likely it will be seen as an unnecessary, grotesque mismatch of U.S. power to U.S. interests.

Is that too harsh a verdict? If you think so, just ask three questions:

Did Haiti under Cedras (or any other ruler) pose a threat to U.S. security? It didn't. It couldn't. It doesn't. Haiti has no military airfields, no naval ports, no missile sites like those in Cuba that enemies of America might use. Militarily, Clinton's invasion was a classic case of using a billion dollar hammer to crack a 20-cent nut.

Was Haiti crucial to the economic interests of the United States? No, it wasn't. It isn't. It couldn't be. Haiti has no oil, no minerals, no products of any kind the United States needs to earn its living. Trade with Haiti is so insignificant that when the United States imposed a total embargo, few Americans even noticed, outside a few travel agents in Miami.

Were the lives of American citizens at risk in Haiti? No, they weren't. Despite all the efforts of the State Department, not one example was found of Americans suffering oppression or wrongful imprisonment in Haiti. Lacking these or any other reasons of U.S. national interest, President Clinton based his case for invading Haiti on the need to impose—or restore—democracy. But why in Port au Prince, but not—as Ronald Reagan sought to do in the face of Clinton's criticism at the time—in Salvador or Panama or Nicaragua?

Okay, Cedras was a rightwing brute, just as Aristide is a leftwing demagogue. But if Cedras was grinding down the Haitian people to a level that justified U.S. intervention, why didn't Washington first try to overthrow him with the CIA (as it did in Guatemala and Cuba)? And how come, when Jimmy Carter went to Haiti with Colin Powell and Sam Nunn, Carter claimed the U.S. embargo was "shameful" and called Cedras "an honorable man" with whom the United States could do business?

When the full story comes to be told, Haiti, I suspect, will turn out to have been the Unnecessary Invasion. The United States got sucked into it in large part because candidate Clinton publicly broke with George Bush's policy of sending back the Haitian boat people, with the result that hundreds of thousands set off for Florida, creating a problem that Clinton in office found he couldn't handle. Clinton was then humiliated when he sent in the *USS Harlan County* supply ship with a bunch of officials on board who turned tail at the first whiff of grape-shot from Cedras's goons on the dock. And so it came to pass that stopping the flow of refugees (that Clinton himself had invited), and putting Aristide back in Cedras's place, became the leitmotifs of U.S. foreign policy.

Never mind Cuba, where the dictatorship was harsher and the outflow of migrants larger. Forget Rwanda, where millions died, or Angola and all the rest. Haiti was a case of presidential pique and strategic misjudgment, of liberal idealism, and Florida's Democratic politics getting in the way of any objective long-term assessments of U.S. diplomatic priorities and America's true national interests.

So when the president returns to Washington, let's hope he lays aside his mantle of Liberator—or is it Conqueror?—of Haiti.