Starks is also a member of an organization, 100 Plus One Women for Congressman Louis Stokes, which has benefited my congressional efforts. I am proud to have her support of my legislative activities.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Glenora Starks lives by the adage, ''Don't ask God for strength to move mountains—ask Him for strength to climb mountains.'' I take this opportunity to recognize Mrs. Starks for her service to our community. I am proud to welcome her to Capitol Hill as my Congressional Senior Citizen Intern, and I am pleased to salute her on this occasion.

SALUTE TO MR. BRETT J. BUSH

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Brett J. Bush, the 1995 recipient of the Union League's Good Citizenship Award.

Upon his receipt of the Good Citizenship Award, Brett was selected by the Freedom Foundation to be a participant in the 1995 International Youth Leadership Conference with over 250 other Union League Award winners. The conference was held May 11 through May 14, 1995 at the Freedom Foundation headquarters in Valley Forge PA.

Brett is a sophomore at Bishop McDevitt High School in Wyncotte, PA. An honor student and athlete, Brett is involved in numerous extra-curricular activates at Bishop McDevitt High School. Additionally, Brett participates in community volunteer work with the Super Kids baseball program and the Fox Chase Cancer Center.

I join Brett's family, friends and teachers in commending him for his excellent service to his community. Brett is truly an inspiration to us all in demonstrating the importance of hard work and community service. I wish Brett the best of luck in all his future endeavors.

BILL CLINTON RECORD

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, during the more than 2 years that President Clinton has been in office, he has withstood a great deal of criticism from an array of opponents. He has been attacked from all directions. The number of lies that have been told to tarnish the President's record has been astonishing.

But, President Clinton has not only survived the attacks, he has excelled in his duties. This isn't just my opinion. This is the conclusion of an outstanding nonpartisan article published in the May edition of the Washington Monthly.

The article's author, Daniel Franklin, compares President Clinton's record with that of President Truman. Mr. Franklin's conclusion is that, ''Clinton's first 2 years have put Truman's to shame.'' Mr. Franklin cites many of President Clinton's successes including his handling of the economy, the creation of 6 million new jobs, his passage of numerous legislative initiatives from the Family and Medical Leave Act to a domestic Peace Corps, and his foreign triumphs from trade pacts to Haiti to the Middle East peace process.

For those of my colleagues who have taken the time in the past to criticize our President, I urge you to take the time now to read this fair, objective, nonpartisan analysis of the President's first 2 years in office. The article which follows should be a must read for all Americans.

[From the Washington Monthly, May 1995]

HE'S NO BILL CLINTON

(By Daniel Franklin)

It was tough year for the President. Foreign policy errors bogged down his domestic programs; nominations were stonewalled by a hostile Congress; party insiders even considered recruiting a challenger for the Democratic nomination. He was, in the words of one journalist, ''essentially indecisive * * * essentially vacillating.'' Quite simply, Americans began to doubt seriously that he had the character to be the country's top executive.

Yes, 1946 just wasn't Harry Truman's year. But he bounced back, won reelection in 1948, and has received from history a reverence that borders on the Rushmoric. For many Americans now, Truman is seen as a model president—a man of integrity, modesty, and decisiveness. Walter Isaacson of Time called him ''America's greatest common-man president.'' Eric Sevareid said that ''Remembering him reminds people what a man in that office ought to be like * * * . He stands like a rock in memory now.'' So revered is the Man from Independence that in 1992, both parties' nominees fought to be considered ''the Truman candidate.''

Now that Republicans have both houses of Congress for the first time since 1946, Clinton aides are scanning David McCullough's best-selling Truman biography in search of the magic bullet that will hand Bill Clinton a Trumanesque comeback in 1996. Clinton took the Truman title in 1992, but now the country—and the press—is skeptical. ''Bill Clinton,'' wrote historian James Pinkerton in the Los Angeles Times, ''is no Harry Truman.''

That's true, but those White House staffers looking for a magic bullet are missing the point. Clear away the historical fogs and set aside the acerbic press coverage and you cannot escape a startling conclusion: Clinton's first two years have put Truman's to shame. By April 1995, Clinton has accomplished far more for the American people than ''give 'em hell'' Harry had by April 1947. Clinton has guided the economy more successfully. He has enacted more laws with real impact. Yet while Truman is held in near-Jeffersonian regard, Bill Clinton is written off as a Warren Harding in jogging shorts.

Consider one of the core issues of any presidency: the economy. With the war over, the country began the painful conversion to a peacetime economy. Hundreds of thousands of veterans returned from World War II to an economy that had reached record production levels without them. In Chicago alone, at least 100,000 veterans were jobless. Major industries—including coal, railroad, and steel—convulsed with labor strikes that threatened to paralyze the entire country. Truman's response was heavy-handed and ineffectual. He threatened to seize coal mines and draft striking railroad workers into the military. Both measures were rebuffed by the Supreme Court and Congress, respectively, for being blatantly unconstitutional.

The economy grew but the growth was more than overshadowed by inflation rates that soared to 14.6 percent in 1947. There were shortages in many of the products people needed, including housing, automobiles, sugar, coffee, and meat. And with the Great Depression fresh in the American memory, many wondered whether another economic crash, one even greater than before, was just around the corner.

Truman could have prevented the inflation. After the war, Republicans in Congress launched an effort to repeal wartime price controls. Truman saw that decontrol had to be gradual, so that it would not unleash inflation. But, as The New Republic's ''TRB'' columnist wrote in 1946, ''The trouble is, Truman didn't make a real fight. . . . He didn't carry through. . . . He saw and predicted the recession but let Congress and business have their way. Truman won the argument all right, but that isn't quite enough in politics.''

Clinton knows this. He is the first president in the last 30 years to achieve both job growth and low inflation. The ''misery index''—inflation plus unemployment—is currently below nine; under Bush it was above 11; under Truman it was nearly 20.

The key to this achievement is Clinton's budget plan, which passed through Congress in 1993 only after a knock-down, drag-out fight led by the President—a fight won with only the votes of fractious Democratic party, and against a vehement and united Republican front. Phil Gramm was one of the loudest critics, predicting that ''hundreds of thousands of Americans will lose their jobs because of this bill.''

Gramm was dead wrong. By cutting the deficit to $192 billion in 1995, from $290 billion just three years ago, the President has succeeded in bringing down long-term interest rates and encouraging business investment that has stimulated extraordinary job growth. Already, the economy has produced nearly six million new jobs—five million more than it did during Bush's entire term. The unemployment rate, which was 7.6 percent when Clinton took office, has dropped to 5.5 percent.

In his first two years as president, Truman never seemed to have the stomach to enter the ring and fight like Clinton has. In September 1945, Truman delivered a 21-point program to Congress that rivaled the New Deal in its scope. The plan increased federal funding to agriculture, housing programs, and a variety of public works projects. But Truman let nearly every major component of his domestic program go down in defeat without a fight. In a way, says McCullough, that was the point. ''His whole strategy on these domestic issues was to go for the high ground. Be more liberal in the program, and if they knock it down, you'll have something to run on.''

This is fine if your only concern is winning reelection, not so fine if you want to solve the country's problems. Clinton has staked his presidency on the passage of his economic and social programs and fought like a junkyard dog for his victories. Elizabeth Drew recounts in On the Edge that during the battle to pass the North American Free Trade Agreement, ''Clinton threw himself into the fight—meeting members of Congress in one-on-one sessions, making many phone calls to them, giving speeches, meeting with opinion leaders, meeting with individual members. Shortly before the vote, there were White House dinners for undecideds.'' He brought the same energy and conviction to the fight to pass the Global Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Clinton was willing to alienate the labor interests that are among the Democrats' strongest constituents because he believed that the treaty would produce jobs for the country. Regardless of your opinion of these treaties, you must respect