

few years and then come back to college later." But I think that is ignoring two realities. One is that increasingly the cost of higher education is such that it is not that easy to take time off, and make up the money, and then go back to school; and, secondly, that we are in a world where we are competing with other countries, and, if we have to set up the higher education system where many of our students have to defer going to college for a number of years before they can go because they have to work on the private sphere in order to pay for it, well, we are losing people, a lot of people, who would otherwise receive a higher education and be a productive member of the work force in the career that they have chosen and perhaps that they will be best at.

I also think it ignores the fact that in the last 29 or 30 years many of us were able to take advantage, including myself, of these student loan programs and grants programs, and now we are seeing those of future generations will not be able to take advantage of them. I think it is a mistake on our part to cut back on funding for higher education. You have to think about educating our students and educating our fellow Americans. If we do not provide that commitment that has been traditionally provided for the last generation or two to pay and provide Federal help for higher education the way we have, then it really says a lot about the value of education in our society. It says we do not value it very much.

So, even though both measures, both the budget and the rescission bill passed today; I did vote against both of them in part because of the impact on Medicare and Medicaid on senior citizens, but also in a major part because of the effect on higher education, and the student loans, and the student grants that so many of our students increasingly depend upon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MYRICK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. NORWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE REINCARNATION OF TV MARTI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKAGGS. Madam Speaker, I am certainly not a fan of the Republican budget resolution. But there was one item in it that made a whole lot of sense—the idea of terminating TV Marti. It is long past time we stopped spending \$12 million a year to beam to Cuba in the middle of the night TV programs that nobody sees.

I was pleased when Chairman KASICH took on the powerful Cuban-American

lobby and proposed eliminating their pet project. And on this point, it sure looked like the committee intended to go along with that proposal.

At the markup on May 10th, the Budget Committee had before it both budget figures and a document with policy assumptions on how to meet those budget goals. The policy document listed a decision to "terminate broadcasting to Cuba" as one of the cuts needed to achieve the budget-cutting goals for the international assistance portion of the budget.

The draft committee report circulated on May 12, after the committee passed the budget resolution, stated:

Overseas broadcasting played an important role during the cold war, but has become an expensive anachronism with the advent of global satellite television broadcasting. Likewise, the technology used by Voice of America and WorldNet limits their potential audiences and makes those systems inefficient and expensive. TV Marti has achieved little success broadcasting to Cuba.

Any reasonable person would interpret all this to mean that the Committee supported termination. Many observers of the budget process reached this conclusion. The Federal Page of the Washington Post on May 11 listed "Terminate Voice of America and Radio Marti broadcasts to Cuba" as one of the items in its "'House Republicans' Blueprint to Balance the Budget." (p.A21) The Miami Herald in a May 14 page one story called "Cuban exiles losing clout in D.C." reported, "To help balance the U.S. budget by 2002, the House budget committee called for eliminating funding for (Radio and TV Marti) next fiscal year." (p.1.)

Then a most amazing thing happened. The final version of the committee report that was filed on May 15 reversed the Committee's apparent policy decision to terminate TV Marti. The sentence "TV Marti has achieved little success broadcasting to Cuba" was deleted. All the rest of the paragraph declaring overseas broadcasting "an expensive anachronism" remained intact. But where first appeared the admission that TV Marti was a flop, there now magically appeared the wholly contradictory statement that "Funding, however, is available for Radio and TV Marti."

This is an interesting situation. The report now recommends getting rid of all USIA broadcasting programs—VOA, Radio Liberty, Radio Free Europe—but makes a specific exception for TV and Radio Marti.

What happened over the weekend that resulted in this complete reversal? Who pressured Chairman KASICH to turn around on this and rewrite the report language? And what else in this budget has been changed after the committee vote? This is yet another demonstration of how difficult it is to kill a program, even when the program does not work.

I want to give credit to Chairman KASICH for his effort to go beyond generalities, to details, in his budget resolution. This experience with TV Marti

gives new meaning to that old saw, that the devil is in the details. It also, I am afraid, undermines the credibility of the entire exercise.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce today, along with a number of our colleagues, the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995.

This legislation, which is the product of many months of careful deliberation, would be the first comprehensive refuge reform bill since the enactment of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966. While that landmark statute, which was authored by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL, nearly 30 years ago has served our Nation well, it is time that we update that law and, by so doing, improve the management of our Nation's wildlife refuge system.

At present, the system is comprised of 504 refuges, which are located in all 50 States and the 5 U.S. Territories, totaling about 91.7 million acres. These units range in size from the smallest, the 1-acre Mille Lacs National Wildlife Refuge in Minnesota, to the largest, the 19.3-million-acre Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. In the last decade, 81 refuges and approximately 3.6 million acres have been added to the system.

While millions of Americans engage in various recreational activities each year on public lands within the system, there have been several recent developments that have caused great concern.

For instance, in October of 1993, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service settled a lawsuit filed by the National Audubon Society by agreeing to undertake a comprehensive system-wide "compatibility" study, to expeditiously terminate certain secondary uses, and to redirect their funds away from recreational and wildlife-dependent activities.

In addition, the Clinton administration has recommended that refuge funding be sharply reduced by deferring maintenance projects and upkeep of public use facilities, including trails, observation towers, and information kiosks. This recommendation is worrisome because without proper maintenance, the service may prohibit certain uses on our refuge lands.

While it is appropriate to periodically review the compatibility of certain activities, there is no statutory list of purposes for the national wildlife refuge system and no statutory definition of what constitutes a compatible use of a refuge. Without this guidance, individual wildlife managers have broad discretion to prevent or disallow recreational activities which do not materially affect the purposes of the refuge or the refuge system.

In fact, earlier this week my committee held a hearing on a bill to transfer the management of the Tishomingo National Wildlife Refuge to the State of Oklahoma. The overriding reason for H.R. 1112 was a decision by the local refuge manager to prohibit boating, camping, fishing, and picnicking in portions of the

Tishomingo Refuge. These restrictions will prevent many people from enjoying activities that have occurred since the refuge was created nearly 50 years ago. It is time to manage the refuge system on a nationwide basis and to make compatibility determinations based on clear statutory language and not emotion or individual bias.

Another issue that has caused great concern for many Americans involves the Fish and Wildlife Service's refuge land acquisition policy. When a new refuge is created or additional acreage is added to an existing unit, all traditional activities, including fishing and hunting, are prohibited until a management plan is completed. This can take several years and, in the meantime, millions of Americans are denied the opportunity to enjoy the natural resources that exist on these lands.

Finally, while the number of refuges continues to increase, there is no requirement to complete a conservation plan for each refuge. In my judgment, these plans are essential because they would identify the purposes of the refuge; the fish, wildlife, and plant populations; their habitats; any archaeological values; opportunities for fish- and wildlife-dependent recreation; potential sites for administrative or visitor facilities; and ways to correct or mitigate any problems. The general public would be strongly encouraged to participate in the writing of these plans.

Our Nation's wildlife refuge system must be managed more effectively in the future. This system, which was first envisioned by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1903, needs to have a statutory list of purposes, uniform guidelines to determine what activities are permissible, comprehensive conservation plans, and the enthusiastic support of the American people who finance this system not only with the payment of their tax dollars, but also by purchasing duck stamps and paying excise taxes on fishing and hunting equipment.

These are the goals of the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995. This legislation will build upon and improve current law by: making wildlife-dependent recreation, including fishing and hunting, a purpose of the refuge system; defining the term "compatible use"; allowing historical uses to continue on newly acquired lands unless those uses are determined to be incompatible; requiring conservation plans for each refuge within 15 years; providing that fishing and hunting are permitted unless a finding is made that these activities are inconsistent with either the purpose of the refuge or public safety; and emphasizing a cooperative relationship with the States who have primacy on the management of fish and wildlife.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will restore the wildlife refuge system to the goals and intent of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966. It will ensure that this system is alive and well for all our constituents in the 21st century.

This measure has been endorsed by the California Waterfowl Association, the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, the National Rifle Association, Safari Club International, and the Wildlife Legislative Fund of America. Furthermore, the views of the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and the Wildlife Management Institute have been sought and incorporated into this process.

I would urge my colleagues to join with me, JOHN DINGELL, JIM HANSEN, BILL BREWSTER, JOHN DOOLITTLE, BILLY TAUZIN, PETE GEREN,

SOLOMON ORTIZ, ELTON GALLEGLEY, JIMMY HAYES, KEN CALVERT, BLANCHE LAMBERT LINCOLN, J.D. HAYWORTH, FRANK CREMEANS, BARBARA CUBIN, WES COOLEY, JOHN SHADEGG, and J.C. WATTS in this important effort by co-sponsoring the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. POSHARD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CONTINUATION OF REMARKS ON 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF WORLD WAR II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Speaker, a pretty exciting and historical day today. What I wanted to do was to add to this history by keeping a promise I made last month that I would finish my remarks on what was happening 50 years ago this week. The war in Europe had ended, but the struggle for the small series of islands comprising Okinawa and a smaller group of subsidiary islands was one of the bloodiest fights of the Pacific campaign.

Before I move forward to 1945, let me point out the stories of two friends of mine. Today, 30, years ago, in 1965, my best friend in the Air Force, David Hrdlicka, was shot down over Laos. He was only TDY, down from the wing on that island of Okinawa that so many young men had died on just 20 years before, and during the 20th anniversary of that 1945 struggle there we were taking the first small steps back into combat in Asia. David was in what I thought at the time was the world's greatest aircraft. I was desperately asking the Air Force to recall me to active duty so that I could fly Mach II, the world's only Mach II, twice the speed of sound, aircraft, the F-105 Thunderchief, which was eventually nicknamed after Robert Strange, evil, McNamara's no-win war. It was the thud, semi-affectionately given that name because of the number shot down coming into the Red River Valley, into the target area over Hanoi and Haiphong, the sound of the big F-105 hitting the ground, the thuds. More Republic F-105 aircraft were lost in combat, prorated to the number of planes that flew in Southeast Asia, than any other plane in the war. It carried the major burden of bombing up north along with magnificent efforts on the part of the Navy's A-4's, F-8's, and F-4's, and then eventually A-6 Intruders.

□ 1915

But the 105 was a special airplane. I remember sitting with Dave Hrdlicka in the base theater at George Air Force

base when some test pilots came over from Edwards Air Force Base, our Air Force test center, and threw up on the screen big pictures of the F-105. We had only seen pictures of the Mach-2 F-104 Starfighter a few months ago, but unlike the Starfighter, a tiny airplane, with small, 7-foot wings, the F-105 was the biggest fighter aircraft ever made, longer from the pitot boom and its nose to the tip of its vertical stabilizer than was the World War II four-engine B-17 Flying Fortress.

So there was Dave, having completed with his lovely wife Carol and their little babies, a great tour in England, flying another outstanding aircraft, the F-101 Voodoo. David flew at Bentwaters, which had the only fighter version of the F-101, all the rest were interceptors or reconnaissance versions. A unique situation to have only one Air Force wing of three squadrons in the whole world where they, a two-engine fighter, the predecessor to the four-generation, four-decade Phantom, David, I thought, was leading a charmed life from George Air Force Base in the beautiful Mojave Desert to England with all of its culture, defending Europe from the evil empire, and then home for a while and then to this great assignment at Okinawa. And suddenly here he is, flying over a country that only a few years ago became famous because of a young President's accent talking about chaos in Laos. And Dave gets hit from the ground.

Not a damaging hit to him personally, but hit the rear of the airplane, made a radio call calmly that he was going to have to eject. His wing man saw him come down into a clearing. As he was disengaging from his parachute, trying to come up on his radio, they saw men surround him, probably Communist Pathet Lao soldiers. And he was taken off into the woods at the edge of a clearing.

Years later, a photograph appears in Moscow, reprinted in the Long Beach, CA newspaper and sent to Carol where she had gone home to her family to be near a ranch which was her upbringing with young children. And somebody who knew the Hrdlickas from the Air Force said, I think this is David's picture in this Long Beach newspaper. And they sent it to Carol.

She looked. Sure enough. Dave was very distinctive, stocky, typical fighter pilot, handsome face. And Carol called the Air Force at the closest base, which was probably Lowry and said, "Where is the briefing on my husband? Here is his picture."

They were so embarrassed. I remember Carol telling me that they got the highest ranking officer in the entire area, a brigadier general, a man who knew absolutely nothing about the missing in action cause, and they sent him out to Carol Hrdlicka's house to say something, anything. It was embarrassing for her and for him.

Thirty years later to this very day, Carol is still finding out things from