knowing, and not wanting to know, the exact number of nuclear weapons in the country's arsenal. '' Mr. President, you should know,'' said Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace. But Truman kept his distance, leaving nuclear arms production to the military and Atomic Energy Commission.

Once again, it is Clinton who has stepped up to plate and explained the extent of the mess: It will take, the administration announced, 70 years and between $230 and $350 billion to clean up the toxic waste produced by the production of nuclear arms.

You do not have to stop at our shores to come to the conclusion that Clinton has thus far outshone Truman. The great foreign policy decisions attributed to Truman, remember, did not come until later in his term. In the spring of 1947, the country was reeling from the succession of communist victories. Every Eastern European country had fallen to communism except Czechoslovakia, which would not be far behind. China's fall to communism was imminent. And with the reckless use of its veto in the United Nations, the Soviet Union was halting American efforts to shape the post-war world. The United States, it seemed, was on the ropes.

Meanwhile, Clinton's foreign policy, though ridiculed mercilessly by Republicans, has been, on the whole, refreshingly successful. The passage of NAFTA and GATT were hard-fought and significant victories. Other successes have been jawdroppers. Answer me this: If you were told two years ago that Israel would sign peace agreements with the PLO and Jordan; that Haiti would have a democratically elected president; that there would be a cease-fire in Northern Ireland; and that the third-largest nuclear power in the world would voluntarily disarm its nuclear capability, what would you say? That's what I thought.

All four developments, to varying extents, can be credited to a foreign policy team that has been derided as hopelessly incompetent. The success has even impressed Owen Harries, editor of the conservative National Interest. ''The charge against the Clinton Administration has been that it is all show and no substance,'' Harries wrote in The New Republic. ''But the opposite may be nearer the mark.... [S]ome sensible decisions have been made and some dangers avoided. It could have been a lot worse if the advice given by many of the people now criticizing Clinton had been followed.''

Take Ukraine, a newborn Soviet successor state with a government considerably less than stable, which suddenly found itself holding the third-largest arsenal of nuclear weapons in the world. Clinton, Gore, and Secretary of State Warren Christopher pressured and cajoled the country to abandon its hopes of becoming a nuclear power. Under this constant pressure. Ukraine agreed last November to dismantle its 1,800 nuclear warheads. Kazakhstan and Belarus, with considerably smaller nuclear forces, followed suit, giving the world three less nuclear nightmares to worry about.

In the Middle East, the first praise for peace accords certainly goes to the major players: Israel, the PLO, and Jordan. But the Clinton Administration deftly walked a very fine line: Israel would never have agreed to the deal without a strong friend in Washington, while the Palestinians and Jordanians would have balked if they felt the administration was one-sided or unfair to their concerns. It is a testament to the trust won from both sides that the peace treaty was signed on the White House lawn.

Most pundits felt that democracy in Haiti was a pipe dream. Bush hemmed and hawed as the military junta settled in and terrorized the Haitian people; thousands fled to the United States. But Clinton's policy, despite messy appearances, has led to the bloodless overthrow of a military dictatorship and the restoration of that country's first democratically elected president.

And in an effort to bring an end to the decades-long fighting in Northern Ireland, Clinton has stood up to England (our ''special relationship'' notwithstanding) to force it to deal with its troubles in Northern Ireland. When in 1993 Clinton agreed to grant a visa to Sinn Fein leader Gerry Adams to visit the United States for the first time, British legislators openly insulted the President, saying that America had betrayed its trust. But over British objections, Clinton has allowed Adams to return twice more to meet with the administration and continue the push for peace. Eight months into the cease-fire, Clinton's persistence has paid off in lives.

True, there is no ''Clinton Doctrine'' by which to measure every foreign policy question that comes down the pike. It would no doubt make things easier if there were. But simple doctrines work in simple worlds. Presidents from Truman to Reagan could vow to fight communism wherever it reared its head. Whether or not they met their promise, they at least had the pose.

Clinton, then, is being penalized because there is no mortal threat to the country. The vast majority of armed conflicts in the world today are either civil wars or ethnic conflicts. No simple formula applies. The process has at times seemed messy, but in a subtle and deft fashion, Clinton has loosened diplomatic knots of Gordian complexity.

Truman went on, of course, to make some the shrewdest and politically courageous decisions of the century: the Marshall Plan in the summer of 1947; the desegregation of the military in 1948; and the Berlin Airlift that same year, which, without provoking war with the Soviet Union, broke the blockade of West Berlin. While pundits hang the lame-duck tag on Clinton, they ignore that if Clinton maintains this pace, and continues to better Truman domestically and abroad, Americans could see an enormously successful presidency.

Similarly, the predictions that Clinton has no chance in 1996 miss a crucial point. Like Truman, Clinton has an uncanny ability to project an empathy with the American people. Truman was profoundly unpopular at this point in his first term. In November of 1946, his approval ratings stood at 32 percent. But in 1948, voters compared the warmth and humility of Truman to the arrogance of Thomas Dewey and chose the man they felt cared most about their problems. By this standard, Bill Clinton will never suffer from comparison to a man like, for example, Phil Gramm. Clinton could still pull off that Trumanesque comeback, and those who wish to make parallels between the Man from Independence and the Man from Hope will have one more comparison to draw.

CLEAN WATER ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. FRANK RIGGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the House approved amendment No. 66 to H.R. 961, the Clean Water Amendments of 1995, without objection. Under its terms, municipal wastewater reuse facilities that utilize advanced treatment will be added to the existing section 404(f) activities not requiring permits. By facilitating the regulatory process for those cities that have treated wastewater to a high degree, the effect of the amendment will be to encourage the use of properly treated wastewater to restore degraded wetlands and create new wetlands.

In specifying municipal wastewater treatment facilities in the amendment, I was not implying that other, nonmunicipal wastewater reuse activities that utilize advanced treatment for similar purposes now require a permit under the act if exempted by other provisions. My amendment does not affect those other provisions of the Clean Water Act. Thus wastewater reuse facilities which have long been exempt, such as those operated successfully by the forest products industry, would continue to be exempt from the permit process.

HONORING ESSAY WINNERS

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the pleasures of serving in this body is the opportunity we occasionally get to recognize truly outstanding and talented citizens of this country. Today, I am especially pleased to recognize the winners of the fifth annual drug avoidance essay contest.

The first place winners are Tracey Barnes of PS 93, Gloria Milan of PS 380, Jessica Schumer of PS 230, Aisha Matthew of PS 138, Danielle Moseley of PS 244, Shameka Jackson-Barrington of PS 214, Michael Falanga of PS 205, Alexis Register of PS 139 Annex, Bryan Small of PS 327, Jennifer Fringo of PS 86K. I am also pleased to acknowledge the runners up: Radiance Salem of PS 11, Latoya Sanabria of PS 257, Iasia Holloway of PS 124, Grace Berry of PS 221, Lauren Stambler of PS 114, Jamece Grey of PS 149, Meghan O'Brien of PS 127, Michael Albala of PS 206, Stacy Adams of PS 298, Joseph Williams of PS 75K, Glenfield Browne of PS 305, Charnise Sutton of PS 297, Enas Ahmed of PS 131, Blas Brown of PS 167, Tristan Brathwaite of PS 268, Giselle Cabon of PS 158, Lyndsay Adesso of PS 204, Jason Wilk of PS 312, Candice McMeans of PS 73, Juan Arcena of PS 384K.

Reading over the essays I cannot help but think of how wise these young students are. They know the terrible cost of drugs on individuals, families, cities and our country. These essays challenge us to do better by out children; they deserve to grow up in a safe, drug-free environment. I know my colleagues in the House of Representatives will join me both in congratulating the winners and runners up of the drug-free essay contest, and in wishing them the best of luck in the future.

RESCISSION BILL VETO THREAT

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, despite his rhetoric, the President obviously cares nothing about balancing the budget. He leaves a conspicuous open seat at the budget cutting

table. After 4 months of silence and no apparent plan of his own to balance the budget, he has issued a completely irresponsible veto threat. Should he win the veto battle, any chance at a early start on deficit reduction this year will be eliminated.

What is more unconscionable than his lack of action on the issue, is his timing. He is attempting desperately to reassert the relevancy of his presidency by playing politics with the rescissions bill. This politicizing threatens to jeopardize the expeditious funding of emergency disaster aid to the victims in California and Oklahoma. The $7.2 billion in emergency appropriations are paid for by cutting wasteful spending elsewhere in the budget. And we did not add more to the taxpayers tab, something virtually unheard of in Washington.

The reasoning for his veto threat is pork in the bill, yet this bill slashes $16.4 billion in spending by eliminating unauthorized programs, consolidating duplicative programs, cutting unspent funds piling up from one year to the next and eliminating funding for wasteful, ineffective programs. Where's the pork? This bill eliminates funding from legislation signed by the President himself. The pork he says we failed to target is the pork he sanctioned.

The President seems to have forgotten the will of the American people. Last November, the citizens of this country voted for change. His lack of attention to the budget and spending cuts continues the status quo and dims the future of our children.

MANDATORY ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFER EXPANSION ACT OF 1995

HON. JIM LIGHTFOOT

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce legislation which will save taxpayer money, reduce theft and fraud of Federal payments and make the Government run more efficiently. I am proud to join Representatives STENY HOYER, BILL CLINGER, PETER VISCLOSKY, and STEPHEN HORN in introducing the Mandatory Electronic Funds Transfer Expansion Act of 1995.

Under this legislation, recurring Federal payments such as Federal salaries and pensions would be issued by electronic funds transfer [EFT] instead of paper checks. The Department of the Treasury's Financial Management Service, the Federal Government's primary disburser, has testified that it costs the Federal Government 43 cents to issue a paper check. But an electronic funds transfer costs just 1.5 cents, saving the Government over 41 cents for nearly every salary or retirement check it issues.

The Government is already realizing savings from the use of EFT. Of the 841 million payments issued by FMS, 49 percent were disbursed electronically. But we can realize additional savings, while making salaries and benefits more convenient for recipients. The savings add up quickly, into the millions of dollars. The extensive use of EFT will reduce Federal spending and diminish the opportunity for theft and fraud.

THE HOMELESS AND COMMUNITY COOPERATION ACT OF 1995

HON. LINDA SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the ''Community and Homeless Cooperation Act of 1995'' which will amend the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act.

The Act was originally designed to make under-utilized or unutilized Federal buildings available for sheltering our Nation's homeless. In Olympia, one of the largest cities in my district, there were plans to make a vacant and dilapidated Federal building into a large shelter for the homeless yet over 30 percent of the beds for the homeless in Olympia's existing shelters went unused. Common sense would dictate that we didn't need another shelter, we needed additional resources for outreach and services for existing shelters.

Recently, Thurston County commissioners in my home State of Washington pointed out to me in a recent letter, ''With the current 'use it or lose it rule', a social service agency has a difficult time saying ''no'' to a free building—even one requiring extensive and expensive upgrades.'' My legislation will allow these buildings to be sold and a portion of the money used to help existing shelters meet their daily funding needs while the remainder will be returned to the Federal treasury exclusively to reduce the deficit. And, for the first time in the 7-year life of this legislation, the homeless and the community will have a voice in the selection of buildings to be used. As the Olympian, newspaper stated, ''* * * location of these services is key.''

The Community and Homeless Cooperation Act of 1995 gives a city and its homeless a sense of community and cooperation in determining what is in their best interest. Through community forums to determine building placement or through making proceeds from sales of these buildings available to increase homeless assistance services on Main Street, we empower the people on Main Street, homeless and homeowner alike.

TRIBUTE TO AMBROSE JOSEPH (JOE) MANLEY

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, It gives me great pleasure to rise today and pay tribute to an outstanding citizen of Indiana's First Congressional District, Mr. Ambrose Joseph (Joe) Manley. On Friday, June 2, 1995, Joe, along with his friends and family, will celebrate his retirement from the Northwest Indiana District Council of Carpenters, Merrillville Union Local No. 1005. This testimonial dinner will take place at the Radisson Hotel celebrity ballroom in Merrillvile, IN.

Joe has dedicated a substantial portion of his life to the betterment of union members and the community of northwest Indiana, as well as the entire State.

Joe's distinguished career in the labor movement has made his community and Nation a better place in which to live. For the past 20 years, Joe has aspired as an important figure in Local No. 1005. Joe has held several position throughout his tenure, but none as important as business manager, a position from which he retired on Dec. 31, 1994.

Moreover, Joe fought for union rights in several other capacities. Joe has been active as past president of the Indiana State Council of Carpenters and past vice-president of the State of Indiana AFL–CIO. These positions have allowed him to fully exercise his fight for labor rights.

As a result of Joe's caring and nurturing nature, he has been spreading his goodwill throughout northwest Indiana by serving on several boards over the past years. Joe is well known in the Indiana State Democratic Party where he was once the vice chairman. During his reign as vice chairman, he was chosen to be a delegate for the State of Indiana to the 1992 National Democratic Convention. Furthermore, Joe served as a past Admiral of the Pirates for Tradewinds Rehabilitation Center. Currently, Joe is a board member for the Arthritis Foundation, Hoosier Boys Town, and the Northwest Indiana Forum, Inc. Joe also is a member of the Hammond Times editorial board.

On this special day, I offer my heartfelt congratulations. Joe's large circle of family and friends can be proud of the contributions this prominent individual has made. His work in the labor movement has made America Work. Those in the movement will miss Joe's dedication and sincerity. Fortunately, the community as a whole will continue to profit from his unselfish involvement to make northwest Indiana a better place in which to live and work. I sincerely wish Joe a long, happy, and productive retirement.

OUR NATION'S FLAG

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I testified before the House Judiciary Committee on an amendment I am proposing to protect our Nation's flag. This matter is very dear to my heart and to the hearts of many Americans. The American flag always brings our nation together, rich or poor, in good times or bad. This symbol is recognized the world over for the good that we have done and will do as long as we have this flag. Do we, as Americans, really believe that the passage of this amendment to protect our national symbol will, in any way, harm or detract from, the Bill of Rights and the U.S. Constitution? I say no, this amendment does not remove rights, it restores them.

I can recall scenes I have seen from Civil War battles where Union soldiers would drop their weapon and pick the Stars and Stripes off the ground from a fallen comrade who had been killed holding up these colors for America. Mr. Speaker, now is our time to pick up the American flag and treat it with the greatest amount of reverence.

I would like to draw your attention to the remarks of one American who has picked up the flag and who is carrying and protecting our flag for many Americans. Ron James, an ex-