

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF END OF WORLD WAR II

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, as we draw to a close of 1995 I thought it appropriate to once again remember the 50th anniversary of World War II. Our Nation owes deep gratitude to the men and women who proudly served our country during its time of need.

One such veteran, a constituent of the Third District of New Jersey, Harold Loeffler, served aboard the USS *Missouri* during World War II. While serving on the *Missouri*, Mr. Loeffler witnessed the signing of the Japanese surrender. In a letter by Mr. Loeffler to my office, he expressed his thoughts on the battleship and the war. I have included his letter and a history of the USS *Missouri*, as it appeared in the commemorative program honoring the battleship, 10-2-95, so that they may help us remember our victory 50 years ago.

WE ARE THE LAST

We are the last. After we are gone there will be no more. No one will follow in our wake. For over 100 years we were the pride of the Navy. We were battleship sailors!!!

We were with Dewey at Manila. We died on the Maine in Havana. We manned the dreadnaughts and sailed around the world in Teddy Roosevelt's Great White Fleet. We patrolled the Atlantic during the "War To End All Wars" as the 6th Battle Squadron in the British Grand Fleet.

As the battleships grew larger we grew with them becoming more technically skilled as improvements in armament, engineering and communications advanced. As technology progressed, we progressed to be the finest sailors in the world. . . . Battleship Sailors!

Then came Pearl Harbor. We gallantly fought off the sneak attack. We saved what we could to fight another day, but our losses were devastating. Every battleship sustained damage. The Arizona became a water mausoleum for her ghostly heroic crew.

Fittingly, when the end came, the surrender instruments were signed aboard a battleship!

Extended life was given battleships with Korea, Nam, the Mid-East and Desert Storm and now they are needed no more. The last were removed from the Naval Registry in August 1995.

We are the last. After we are gone there will be no more. No one will follow in our wake. For over 100 years we were the pride of the Navy. We were BATTLESHIP SAILORS!

HISTORY OF THE U.S.S. MISSOURI (BB-63)

The U.S.S. MISSOURI was built by the Navy Yard, New York, her keel being laid on 6 January 1941. She was Christened by Miss Margaret Truman on 29 January 1944, and placed in full commission by the Commandant Navy Yard, New York on Sunday, 11 June 1944. Captain William M. Callaghan, U.S. Navy, accepted the ship and assumed command.

The ship remained in New York Harbor until 3 August 1944, then operated in Chesapeake Bay until 21 August 1944. On that date the U.S.S. MISSOURI departed for the Gulf of Paria, Naval Operations Base, Trinidad, B.W.I., arriving on 25 August 1944. The ship conducted gunnery, flight, engineering and other shakedown exercises in the area until 17 September 1944. MISSOURI then returned to New York. The ship remained in New York Harbor until final departure with Task Group 27.7 on 11 November 1944 for Cristobal Canal Zone. Transited the Panama Canal and arrived in Balboa on 18 November on which date the ship joined the Pacific Fleet. Departure from the Panama Canal Zone was in company with Task Unit 12.7.1 on 19 November and the ship arrived in San Francisco Bay on 28 November. The U.S.S. MISSOURI escorted by the destroyers BAILEY and TERRY departed San Francisco on 18 December 1944 as Task Unit 12.7.1 and entered Pearl Harbor, T.H. on 24 December 1944. The U.S.S. MISSOURI as part of Task Unit 12.5.9 departed Pearl Harbor on 1 January 1945 headed westward. On 13 January 1945 the MISSOURI arrived at Ulithi, Western Caroline Islands and reported to Commander Third Fleet for duty and on 26 January to Commander Fifth Fleet. The ship operated from Ulithi conducting provisioning and training exercises until 10 February 1945.

10 FEBRUARY TO 5 MARCH 1945

The ship departed Ulithi Anchorage on 10 February 1945 in Task Group 58.2 and operated in Task Force 58 during the period from 10 February to 5 March in preparation for and support of the Iwo Jima operation. As part of Task Force 58 the ship participated in the first East Carrier Task Force strikes against Tokyo on 16 and 17 February 1945. The anticipated opposition to these strikes did not materialize. However, on the evening of 19 February, while steaming off Iwo Jima, several small groups of unidentified aircraft were discovered by radar to be closing the formation. The ship opened fire on one of these targets and an enemy aircraft tentatively identified as a "Helen" burst into flames and crashed for a successful conclusion to the ship's first action against the enemy.

The ship participated as part of Task Force 58 in the 19 to 23 February air strikes in support of the landing forces on Iwo Jima, the 25 February strikes against the Tokyo area and the 1 March 1945 strikes against Okinawa Shima.

5 TO 13 MARCH 1945

As part of Task Force 58, the ship remained at anchor in Ulithi Anchorage engaging in routine repairs and replenishment from 5 to 13 March. On 9 March the ship was reassigned from Task Group 58.2 to Task Group 58.4.

14 MARCH TO 14 JUNE 1945

The ship departed Ulithi Anchorage on 14 March as part of Task Force 59 and following exercises in company with Battleship Squadron Two on 14 and 15 March, the MISSOURI joined Task Group 58.4 on 16 March. As part of Task Force 58 the ship participated in the 18 and 19 March carrier aircraft attacks against Kyushu and the Island Sea area. During the afternoon and night of 17 March enemy aircraft were known to be in the vicinity of the Task Force, however, none closed to within range of the ships of the formation. At 0741 on 18 March an enemy plane succeeded in dropping a bomb on the U.S.S.

Enterprise which was in formation off the MISSOURI's port bow. At 0805 this ship together with others in the formation opened fire at an enemy plane identified as "Nick" or "Helen". The plane burst into flames and unsuccessfully attempted to crash the U.S.S. Intrepid. At 0828 and 0850 the ship opened fire on enemy planes. The first was observed to be damaged when the ship ceased fire and was later splashed by the Combat Air Patrol while the second was downed by gunfire. At 1316 the MISSOURI opened fire at a plane which dropped a bomb near the U.S.S. Yorktown and at 1320 fired upon a plane which approached to 2,500 yards. Both of these planes were destroyed by gunfire. A number of enemy planes remained out of range in the vicinity of the formation until 2115 when the last plane of the day was splashed by a night fighter.

On 19 March eight enemy raids were tracked by radar before sunrise but none closed to within range. At 0708 firing was seen on the horizon and almost immediately a carrier in Task Group 58.2 was seen to burst into flame. This carrier was later identified by TBS as the U.S.S. Franklin. During the balance of the day there were a number of alerts and enemy planes were downed by the Combat Air Patrol but none approached within range of the formation. During the period 19 to 21 March there were numerous reports of enemy aircraft in the area, however, these were either accounted for by the Combat Air Patrol or did not approach within range of MISSOURI's guns.

On 24 March the ship, with others, was detached from Task Group 58.4 to form Task Force 59. As part of Task Force 59 the ship participated in the bombardment of southeastern Okinawa Shima on March 24. This was accomplished at extreme range and accurate assessment of damage was therefore, not possible. Thereafter the ship fueled and rejoined Task Group 58.4 on 26 March 1945 and as part of Task Force 58 the ship continued to operate off Okinawa Gunto and participated in strikes against Kyushu until May 6. During this period there were frequent alerts and enemy aircraft were destroyed by Combat Air Patrol in the vicinity. The ship opened fire on 29 March 1945 on a plane which unsuccessfully attempted to dive upon the U.S.S. Yorktown and on 7 April the ship was with Task Force 58 during the air strikes which sank the Japanese battleship Yamato.

On 11 April 1945, Task Force 58 was engaged in neutralizing sweeps against southern Kyushu airfields. During the morning one enemy raid was destroyed by the Combat Air Patrol. At 1330 several groups of unidentified planes were reported approaching the formation. By 1340 reports had been received that 13 enemy planes had been splashed and that 3 others were approaching the formation at high speed and low altitude. At 1442 the ship opened fire on a low flying "Zeke" and although many hits were observed, the pilot succeeded in crashing the side of the MISSOURI immediately below the main deck at frame 169 on the starboard side. Parts of the plane were scattered along the starboard side of the ship and the pilot's mutilated body landed aboard. One wing of the plane was thrown forward and lodged near 5 inch mount number 3 where gasoline started a fire which was rapidly extinguished. The ship sustained only superficial damage and none

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

of the ship's company was injured. Later during the day the ship unsuccessfully fired upon a twin engine plane which passed approximately 12,000 yards astern of the ship. Enemy planes were known to be in the vicinity during the night and at 2327 the ship commenced firing at a twin engine plane which crashed approximately one minute later. On the next day, ships on the other side of the formation fired upon one enemy plane and enemy snoopers were in the vicinity during the period from 12 to 14 April 1945, but the MISSOURI did not open fire.

On 16 April Task Force 58 was again conducting raids in support of the landing forces on Okinawa Shima and strikes against the Japanese airfields on southern Kyushu. At 0038 the first Japanese planes approached the formation but retired after being fired upon by ships of the screen. From this time until 1303 numerous reports of enemy planes were received but none closed to within range. At 1303 a group of planes which later developed to be Kamikazes were discovered heading for the formation. Shortly after 1326 the ship opened fire on a low flying "Zeke" which crashed close aboard the U.S.S. Intrepid. Two minutes later fire was opened on a second "Zeke" and when hit the pilot of this plane attempted to crash the MISSOURI. The wing tip of this plane struck the ship's aircraft crane on the stern and the "Zeke" crashed a short distance astern exploding violently. Debris was thrown aboard ship but only minor material damage was sustained. At 1335, nine minutes after the ship opened fire on the first plane, a third plane identified as a "Hamp" was fired upon while diving on the ship. The "Hamp" burst into flame, passed over the ship at an altitude of about 300 feet and crashed close aboard off the starboard bow. One minute later two planes dove on the U.S.S. Intrepid. One succeeded in crashing her and the other was destroyed. From 1514 to 1516 the ship fired upon two planes. One of these crashed forward of the Intrepid and the other close aboard a destroyer. Two minutes later a third plane which passed 6,000 yards astern of the ship was fired upon and disappeared over the horizon. Shortly thereafter a plane was observed to crash and burn in that general direction. During the remainder of the afternoon planes were shot down by other Task Groups but none came within range of the ship. At 2050 and 2110 the ship opened fire on planes which came within 5 inch gun range and both immediately withdrew. Enemy planes dropped window in the vicinity during the balance of the night but none closed the formation.

On 17 April a 35 plane raid was destroyed by the Combat Air Patrol approximately 60 miles from the formation. However, no enemy planes closed the formation. During the night the ship had a surface radar contact which was later developed by destroyers of the screen and resulted in a kill on an enemy submarine on the following day. There was no enemy activity from April 23 to April 28.

On 29 April enemy aircraft was reported destroyed by the Combat Air Patrol in the morning. At 1645 the ships of the formation including the MISSOURI fired upon and downed one enemy plane. Later during the early morning of 30 April, night fighters splashed enemy planes in the vicinity of the formation but no ships fired during that day.

On May first, second, and third, no enemy planes were known to be in the area and on May four and five, although Japanese planes were splashed by the Combat Air Patrol, none approached the formation. On 6 May the MISSOURI was detached from Task Group 58.4 and proceeded to Ulithi Anchorage Fleet. The ship arrived in Ulithi on 9 May and remained there until 17 May. On 14

May Captain W. M. Callaghan, USN, was detached from duty as Commanding Officer of the MISSOURI and was relieved by Captain S. S. Murray, USN, the ship departed Ulithi on 17 May and arrived Apra Harbor, Guam on 18 May where, at 1527 Admiral W. F. Halsey, USN, Commander Third Fleet, hoisted his flag aboard the U.S.S. MISSOURI.

The ship and screening destroyers McNair and Wedderburn formed Task Group 30.1 on 21 May and departed Apra Harbor for Hagushi Anchorage, Okinawa Shima, arrived 26 May. While at Hagushi Anchorage on 26 May the ship was twice alerted for air attacks but none developed in the immediate vicinity. The ship departed Hagushi Anchorage in the afternoon of 27 May and conducted a bombardment of targets on southeastern Okinawa Shima in support of the occupying forces, and then proceeded to rendezvous with Task Force 38 off eastern Okinawa Shima. At midnight of 27 May command of all forces of the Fifth Fleet passed to Commander Third Fleet. The MISSOURI rejoined Task Group 38.4 on 28 May. The Task Force remained off Okinawa Gunto with the carriers furnishing air support to the occupation forces. There was no enemy air activity in the vicinity of the Task Force from 28 May to 10 June although during this period the force again conducted strikes on 2 and 3 June against the Kyushu airfields. On 4 June reports of a typhoon 50 miles south southwest of the Task Force were received and the Task Force withdrew from position in the path of the typhoon. Heavy weather was experienced during 5 May and very minor damage was sustained by the ship due to the heavy seas. On 8 June the Force returned to strike southern Kyushu airfields and on 9 and 10 June air strikes were made against the islands of Daito Shoto. On 10 June Task Force 38 commenced retiring to San Pedro Bay, Leyte, P.I., arriving on 13 June 1945. The period 14 June to 1 July was spent in upkeep, provisioning and recreation at Leyte Anchorage.

1 JULY TO 15 AUGUST 1945

The MISSOURI departed Leyte on the morning of 1 July and the first eight days at sea were spent in exercise periods under Unit, Group and Task Force Commanders, while the Task Force was heading in a general northerly direction. On the evening of 9 July a high speed run toward the Tokyo area commenced. At 0400 on the tenth the various air strikes against airfields in the Tokyo area commenced and although enemy aircraft were reported none succeeded in getting through the air patrol. The Task Force proceeded northeast on 11 July and on 13 July was off northern Honshu and Hokkaido prepared for air strikes which it developed could not be made on account of poor weather and low visibility. On the fourteenth the air strikes against northern Honshu and Hokkaido shipping and airfields were made. On 15 July the MISSOURI joined Task Unit 34.8.2 for the bombardment of industrial targets located in Muroran Hokkaido. No opposition developed during the approach, nor was there return fire from shore while the Task Unit shelled the Nihon Steel Works and Wanished Iron Works between 0935 and 1027 (Item) with good results. The MISSOURI rejoined Task Group 38.4 in the evening and proceeded south to fuel on 16 July. The Task Force was in position on 17 July to conduct air strikes against airfields in the Tokyo area. However, the weather was again unfavorable for air operations. In the afternoon of the 17th the MISSOURI again joined Task Unit 34.8.2 and proceeded to bombard the Hitachi area, Honshu. There was again no opposition to the approach of the bombardment group and no return fire during the bombardment of industrial targets in the Hitachi

area from 2315 on 17 July to 0600 on 18 July. The bombardment was conducted in exceedingly poor weather which made spotting or illumination of targets as well as determination of the bombardment results impossible.

On 18 July the MISSOURI rejoined Task Group 38.4 which conducted air strikes against targets in the Tokyo area on that day. During 20, 21 and 22 July the most extensive replenishment of fuel, ammunition and provisions were attempted at sea was completed and on 23 July the Task Force again was en route for strikes against combatant shipping in the Kure-Kobe area of the Inland Sea and although enemy planes were reported in the vicinity none succeeded in evading the Combat Air Patrol. Poor weather had prevailed during these strikes and they were therefore repeated on 28 July, again with no enemy air activity over the Task Force. On the twenty-ninth a return to the Tokyo area commenced and on 30 July aircraft of the Task Force hit the Tokyo-Nagoya area. Again there was no enemy air opposition over the Task Force. The first six days of August were spent in fueling and maneuvers to avoid the paths of two typhoons which moved north along the Japanese coast. On 7 August the Task Force commenced a run to position to strike northern Honshu and Hokkaido, however, on 8 August fog and low visibility prevented flight operations and the Task Force proceeded south in search of more favorable weather. On 8 August Japanese aircraft were encountered by the Combat Air Patrol and on 9 August the picket destroyers of the formation had been under attack and at 1610 a "Grace" was splashed astern of the MISSOURI and close aboard the U.S.S. Wasp. Due to the Missouri's position in the formation the 40 MM guns only were able to fire at this plane. The tenth to twelfth of August were spent in replenishment and many conferences of Task Force and Group Commanders were held aboard the MISSOURI as a result of the information received concerning Japanese surrender proposals.

On 13 August other Task Groups of Task Force 38 were under air attack but no enemy aircraft were over Task Group 38.4. 14 August was spent in getting into position for further strikes against the Tokyo area. These strikes were launched on 15 August but were recalled as a result of an urgent dispatch from CincPac. At 1109, by direction of Commander Third Fleet the MISSOURI's whistle and siren were sounded for a period of one minute while battle colors were broken and Admiral Halsey's personal flag was raised in official recognition of the end of active hostilities against the Japanese Empire. During this day the Combat Air Patrol splashed Japanese aircraft in the vicinity of the Task Force but none penetrated the patrol.

From 15 to 26 August the MISSOURI operated off the coast of Japan awaiting orders to proceed with the occupation of Japan. On 27 August the MISSOURI and escorting destroyers proceeded into Sagami Wan, Honshu, having taken aboard Japanese emissaries and a pilot. The 28th of August was spent at anchor and on 29 August the MISSOURI got underway and entered Tokyo Bay anchoring off Yokosuka Naval Station at 0925.

The ship remained at anchor in Tokyo Bay without incident, until 2 September on which day the formal document of the Japanese surrender was executed aboard the U.S.S. MISSOURI. On that day Fleet Admiral C. W. Nimitz boarded the MISSOURI at 0805 and his personal flag was broken. At 0843 General of the Army Douglas MacArthur came aboard. At 0856 the Japanese representatives arrived and between 0902 and 0906 the Japanese representatives signed the Instrument of Surrender and two minutes later

General MacArthur signed the Instrument. The ceremony was completed at 0925 and the various dignitaries departed the ship. Thereafter the MISSOURI remained at anchor in Tokyo Bay until 6 September 1945, when she departed for Apra Harbor, Guam. Admiral William F. Halsey transferred his flag as Commander Third Fleet to the U.S.S. South Dakota on 5 September 1945. Passage from Tokoyo Bay to Guam was without incident and the MISSOURI arrived in Apra Harbor on 9 September. The ship departed Guam with homeward bound veterans on 12 September 1945 and arrived Pearl Harbor, T. H. on 20 September 1945.

POST WORLD WAR II

On 29 September 1945, MISSOURI departed Pearl Harbor and headed for the Eastern seaboard of the United States. Transiting the Panama Canal, she headed for New York where she became the flagship of Admiral Jonas Ingram, Commander in Chief, United States Atlantic Fleet, on 24 October 1945. On 27 October 1945, the MISSOURI boomed out a 21 gun salute as she was boarded by President Harry S. Truman during Navy Day celebration ceremonies.

After overhaul in the New York Yard, and a training cruise to Cuba, the MISSOURI was on her way to Gibraltar in March 1946. From there she passed into the Mediterranean on a goodwill mission that served also as an impressive demonstration of American military power. Her presence symbolized U.S. support for the rights and freedom of Greece and Turkey, both in danger of being drawn into the Soviet orbit of satellite states.

In Rio de Janeiro, on 2 September 1947, the MISSOURI was again a symbol of American strength in support of its allies against the advances of Communist aggression. The MISSOURI provided the site for President Truman to sign the Rio Treaty which made the Monroe Doctrine a multilateral pact. Business and ceremonial duties concluded, President Truman, accompanied by Mrs. Truman and his daughter Margaret, returned to the United States aboard the battleship. From 23 September 1947 to 10 March 1948, the MISSOURI was in the New York Navy Yard for overhaul and then went on a training cruise to Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. She arrived in Annapolis in June to take on midshipmen for a training cruise to Portugal, France, Algeria and back to Cuba.

On 17 January 1950, heading to sea from Hampton Roads, the MISSOURI ran aground. It was 0825, close to high tide, when the battleship ran aground 1.6 miles from Thimble Shoals Lights near Old Point Comfort. She traversed shoal water a distance of three ship lengths, about 2,500 feet, from the main channel. Lifted about seven feet above the water line, she stuck hard and fast. It took many tugs, pontoons, and an incoming tide to free her finally on 1 February. The incident provided Navy personnel with valuable experience in extensive and diverse salvage work.

KOREA

Until called to support United Nations Forces in embattled Korea in 1950, the MISSOURI trained thousands of naval reserves, midshipmen, and other naval personnel on cruises from New England to the Caribbean and across the Atlantic to English and European waters.

Leaving Norfolk 19 August 1950, MISSOURI became the first American battleship to reach Korean waters just one day in advance of the Inchon landings on 15 September 1950. On arrival off Kyushu, Japan, MISSOURI became the flag ship of Rear Admiral A.E. Smith, and the next day was bombarding Samchok in a diversionary move coordinated with the Inchon landings.

In company with the cruiser U.S.C. Helena and two destroyers, she helped prepare the way for the Eighth Army offensive. In a bombardment of the Pohang area 17 September 1950, Missouri's 16-inch shells assisted the South Korean troops in the capture of that town and their advance to Yongdok.

Her bombardment of the Mitsubishi Iron Works and the airfield at Chongjin on 12 October were a significant factor in the advance of American and other United Nations forces embattled ashore. Her guns did considerable damage to marshaling yards and a strategic railroad bridge on the Tanchon area. She moved on to bombard Wonsan and then moved into Hungnam 23 December 1950. Her powerful guns hit enemy troop concentrations, command posts, and lines of communication, providing cover for the evacuation of the last of the UN troops from Hungnam on Christmas Eve, 1950. In the opening weeks of 1951, MISSOURI continued coastal bombardment aimed at destroying transportation facilities and disrupting the flow of enemy reinforcements and supplies to central Korea. She joined a heavy bombardment group off Kansong on 29 January 1951 in a simulated amphibious assault which provided a diversion some 50 miles behind the enemies front lines.

During the first week of February, she gave fire support to assist the advance of the Tenth U.S. Army Corps in the area of Kangnung. She systematically bombarded transportation facilities and enemy troop concentrations in the vicinity of Tanchon and Songjin. She made similar gun strikes between 14 and 19 March at Kojo Wan, Songjin, Chaho, and Wonsan aimed primarily at transport complexes necessary for the continued reinforcement and supply of enemy forces in central Korea.

Then, on 28 March 1951, MISSOURI was relieved of duty in the Far East and left for the United States and Norfolk, arriving there 27 April 1951. She again joined the Atlantic Fleet to train midshipmen and other prospective naval officers until 18 October 1951 when she entered Norfolk Naval Shipyard for an overhaul which lasted until January 1952. On 4 August 1952, MISSOURI was again in the Norfolk Naval Shipyard for overhaul being prepared for her second tour of the Korean Combat Zone. She stood out of Hampton Roads 11 September 1952, and by end of October, as flagship of the U.S. Seventh Fleet, she was providing seagoing artillery support to Republic of Korea troops in the Chaho area.

Throughout the remaining months of 1952, MISSOURI was on "Cobra Patrol" along the East coast of Korea. She participated in a combined air-gun strike at Chongjin on 17 November and on 8 December was bombarding in the Tanchon-Songjin area. The next day it was Chaho, and 10 December Wonsan felt the power of her guns. During the bombardment of the Hamhung and Hungnam areas MISSOURI lost three of her men when her spotter helicopter crashed into the wintry sea on 21 December 1952. On patrol in early 1953, MISSOURI made repeated gun strikes running swiftly just 25 miles offshore in direct support of troops on land. Missouri sustained a grievous casualty 26 March, when her Commanding Officer, Captain Warner R. Edsall suffered a fatal heart attack while conning her through submarine nets at Sasebo, Japan. Her last fighting mission of the Korean War was on 25 March 1953 was to resume "Cobra" patrol where she bombarded the Kojo area.

The MISSOURI was relieved as flagship on 6 April 1953 and left Yokosuka the following day to return to the Atlantic Fleet. She arrived at Norfolk 4 May 1953 and put out almost immediately for a midshipman training cruise to Brazil, Trinidad, Panama, and

Cuba. She was back again for overhaul in the Norfolk Naval Shipyard from 20 November 1953 to 2 April 1954. In May, she picked up midshipmen from Annapolis and started a training cruise to Europe. Standing out of Hampton Bays, MISSOURI aligned with the other Iowa Class battleships for the one and only time. IOWA, NEW JERSEY, MISSOURI, and WISCONSIN sailed together as the future "Strength for Freedom." MISSOURI visited the ports of Lisbon, Portugal and on 6 June 1954, the Port of Cherbourg, celebrating the 10th anniversary of the Normandy landings or "D-Day." In August she left Norfolk for the west coast and inactivation. MISSOURI traversed the Panama Canal and made ports of call in Long Beach, San Francisco, and Seattle where tens of thousands of citizens visited the ship. The ship then went to the Bremerton Naval Shipyard for mothballing. There she was decommissioned 26 February 1955 and assigned to the Bremerton Group, U.S. Pacific Reserve Fleet.

MISSOURI served as headquarters ship of the Bremerton Group where she was open year round to visitors. As many as 100,000 people a year visited MISSOURI to see the place on her deck where the Japanese surrendered ending the Second World War.

NEW BIRTH

After almost 30 years at rest, MISSOURI, on 14 May 1984 left her berth in Bremerton and was towed to the Long Beach Naval Shipyard for modernization and scheduled recommissioning in June, 1986. MISSOURI was recommissioned in San Francisco and departed on an around-the-world shakedown cruise, the first battleship to circumnavigate the world since President Theodore Roosevelt's "Great White Fleet" of 1907-1909. The ship was home ported in Long Beach, California.

In 1987, MISSOURI journeyed to the troubled waters of the Persian Gulf, supporting operations near the Strait of Hormiz. During 1988, MISSOURI participated in the Rim of the Pacific (RimPac) Exercise off the coast of Hawaii. Following a routine shipyard period in early 1989, MISSOURI returned to sea and later in the year participated in Pacific Exercise (PacEx) '89 and visited Pusan Korean.

PERSIAN GULF

MISSOURI deployed to the Persian Gulf in support of Desert Shield. On the first day of Desert Storm, she fired her 16" guns at Iraqi targets inside Kuwait. The USS Nicholas (FFG-47) escorted her in and she began shelling targets first. From 4-6 February, she fired 112 16" shells, along with Tomahawk missiles. The ship was finally relieved by the USS Wisconsin.

As for the 1990's, MISSOURI is as she was during the 1940's; ready for sea and always ready to answer the call of battle. In November, 1993, MISSOURI departed Long beach for Pearl Harbor, where she was the host ship for the 50th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor. She returned to Long Beach and was decommissioned on March 31, 1992. She was towed to the Bremerton, Washington shipyard where she has rested as part of the Naval Reserve Fleet.

On 2 September 1995, the U.S.S. MISSOURI ASSOCIATION, INC. will hold ceremonies at the ship in Bremerton, WA, honoring those who have served aboard the ship and have passed on, as well as those who have served aboard at the time and are attending the 50th anniversary of the surrender signing.

Upon call, MISSOURI will still be a powerful and fearful dreadnought in the best tradition of the U.S. Navy.

Postscript: On the 5th of January 1995, the Department of the Navy Chief of Naval Operations, by reference of President Clinton and the Board of Inspection and Survey, recommended that the Iowa Class Battleship,

including the U.S.S. MISSOURI, be stricken from the Naval Vessel Register. This was approved by the Secretary of the Navy John H. Dalton on 12 January 1995 and the ships await their final destiny. (2 September 1995)

SALUTE TO ST. LOUIS EARTH ANGELS

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, too often we hear about young people who are involved with drugs or engaged in other criminal activities. Newspaper and television reports about troubled youths and gang violence in cities across the Nation are almost routine stories which can overshadow the achievements of the majority of responsible, hard-working young people. I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a very special group of young St. Louisians, the Earth Angels. These outstanding young innercity residents are committed to protecting the environment and advancing social justice. They are making many positive contributions to our community and deserve recognition.

Earth Angels operates under the auspices of the Guardian Angel Settlement Association of St. Louis and the Missouri Department of Conservation. Originally known as Dolphin Defenders the Earth Angels organization now comprises three environmental clubs with 100 members. The children are dedicated to preserving the natural environment and improving the quality of life for all living things. The Earth Angels have vision and imagination. They look beyond their own personal struggles in life and focus their energies on preserving and nurturing life for other. To this end the Earth Angels have undertaken a number of environmental enhancement projects throughout the St. Louis community. In scores of little ways they are making a big difference.

The Earth Angels have adopted two lakes which the children maintain in St. Louis' Forest Park and at the Busch Wildlife Reserve. They also conduct regular neighborhood cleanup projects. They have studied how ground pollution impacts water systems and the environment and they are working to help end this pollution problem.

Earth Angels children have established a grow lab where they are growing trees from acorns in hopes of establishing a young pin oak grove. They are also engaged in massive recycling efforts. The Earth Angels have: recycled over 350,000 aluminum cans in 6 years, reclaimed and recycled over 49,000 pounds of glass in 2½ years, reclaimed 1,522 abandoned tires in 2 years, recycled over 200 pounds of scrap lead and 500 pounds of cast iron and countless plastic containers. The Earth Angels are now working to establish a battery recycling program.

At the Delmar Metro Link Station the Earth Angels have established a model prairie garden of native Missouri prairie plants. They plan to add a brick walk—using reclaimed bricks—and a small wetland area at the bottom of the garden. This garden is not just an aesthetic enhancement at the light rail station but a place where children are taught more about ecosystems, food chains, and biodiversity.

The Earth Angels have also shown a very special awareness and compassion for young people who are the victims of violence. They have established a Forest of Life project which plants one tree, in a special area of Forest Park, for each child killed by violence in the city of St. Louis.

Earth Angels children are studying science and nature in order to promote life. In their many undertakings, these children are improving both their own life skills and the quality of life around them. The Earth Angels inspire others with their passion for learning and willingness to help solve community problems. These young people are our hope for the future. I congratulate each member of the Earth Angels and wish them every continued success in all their future endeavors.

HIS EMINENCE METROPOLITAN VIKENTIOS HONORED FOR SERVICE TO GREEK ORTHODOX COMMUNITY

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to your attention a terrific community leader from my district in Astoria, Queens.

His Eminence Metropolitan Vikentios was born in Athens, Greece where he received his basic education. After graduation from high school, he enrolled at the Theological School of Jerusalem in Israel and graduated with honors. His educational life then brought him to the United States for further studies. During the past 20 years, he has served in the Greek Orthodox Metropolis, Archdiocese, of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America.

His Eminence has often been recognized for his outstanding contributions to the community, his efforts on behalf of human rights, and his humanitarian services. All this good work has not gone unrewarded. On July 20, 1995, he was elected Metropolitan of Piraeus and Salamis by the Holy Synod of Bishops of the Church of the Orthodox Christians of Greece and the Diaspora.

On July 21, 1995, in the presence of the President and Prime Minister of Greece, he was enthroned in his new position. Astoria misses him very much, but we know he will continue to fight for the citizens of the world and that we truly have a friend in Piraeus. I ask my colleagues to join me in offering him our highest congratulations and best wishes for a wonderful life.

TRADE ACT

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce, with my good friend and colleague Mr. CANADY of Florida, timely legislation to provide trade relief to producers of perishable agricultural products who have been substantially harmed by an increase in imports after the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA].

The Trade Act of 1974 authorizes the President to assist a domestic industry by imposing duties or modifying concessions if it has been determined that an increase in imports has been a substantial cause of or threatens serious injury to the domestic industry. However, domestic industry is currently defined narrowly by the trade act so as not to include the seasonal industries. Consequently, producers of perishable agricultural products who produce their product during a particular growing season are grouped together with all growers of this product during the full calendar year, and therefore these seasonal producers are unable to show the requisite injury needed for an anti-dumping action.

This bill corrects this inequity by expanding the definition of domestic industry to account for the seasonal nature of agricultural products. Specifically, a domestic producer would include a producer that sells all or almost all of the production during the growing season. In addition, during that growing season, demand for the article must not be supplied, to any substantial degree, by other domestic producers. This definition is tailored to provide relief to the seasonal domestic agricultural industry, such as winter tomato producers, who sustained significant injury when they were faced with a significant increase in imports in 1994.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

A TRIBUTE TO PETER G. VELASCO

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I rise today with a great deal of sadness to honor the memory of Peter G. Velasco.

A true labor pioneer, Pete Velasco was among the Filipino-American farmworker leaders whose tenacity inspired Cesar Chavez in the first grape strike in Delano, CA, and provided a strong foundation for what later became the United Farm Workers, AFL-CIO.

Even before his many years of work as an officer in the farmworker movement, brother Pete Velasco was an early and enduring example of the multifaceted contributions of the Filipino-American community to our society. Working first in the Los Angeles food service industry, he went on to distinguished service in the U.S. Army in Europe during World War II before returning to the Central Valley of California as a farmworker.

Not content merely to try to eke out a living in the fields, Pete Velasco helped to organize his fellow workers, forging the first link between farmworkers and the AFL-CIO, which later proved essential to Cesar Chavez' work as president of the new, united organization.

Today we can see a resurgence in the AFL-CIO that has at its roots the contribution of many men and women—among them "Brother Pete"—over many years. May that resurgence provide a way that we can all celebrate the life of Peter G. Velasco and the movement he helped to build.

FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION'S
LAWYER OF THE YEAR

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, December 4, it was my great privilege and pleasure, on behalf of the Federal Bar Association's Transportation Section, to present the "Lawyer of the Year Award" to David A. Heymsfeld, Democratic Staff Director, for the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. I would like to take this opportunity simply to restate my remarks at that very special occasion:

David Heymsfeld's exquisite legislative craftsmanship has defined and given direction to an entire generation of aviation law. His 20 years of service on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; his keen eye for detail; his zest for and command of the broad policy issues of aviation law; his respect for the opinions and concerns of others, and his exceptional ability to meld them into a cohesive whole have left an indelible, constructive imprint on the complete body of aviation law just prior to and since enactment of the watershed Aviation Deregulation Act of 1978.

David has been plying his legislative craftsmanship for so long that Secretary of Transportation Federico Peña was probably still in law school when David joined our committee staff.

David's immersion in aviation law began during his service at the Civil Aeronautics Board with the "father" of aviation deregulation, Chairman Alfred Kahn—but, I think it is fair to say that David has had a more enduring impact on aviation law than Chairman Kahn since then.

His Senate staff counterparts, over the years, have gone on to other pursuits: Phil Bakes to Texas Air; Will Ris to American Airlines; and one, Steven Breyer, made it to the Supreme Court.

Many of his colleagues in the field of aviation law have made important contributions over the years, but David Heymsfeld stands alone, astride the entire compendium of law and regulation in the field of aviation. Every day practitioners of the art and science of aviation law diligently analyze, report on, and make marketplace decisions based upon statutes and their accompanying reports that David Heymsfeld has crafted—and they will do so for generations to come.

David's great gift is his openness, his willingness to work with all segments of the aviation sector, both public and private, and to work collaboratively with his colleagues in both the House and Senate on a truly open, bipartisan basis.

Mr. Heymsfeld received his BA from Columbia College in 1959 and an LLD from Harvard Law School in 1962.

It is now my great pleasure to present the award, which reads: "Transportation Lawyer of the Year Award" to David A. Heymsfeld, Minority Staff Director, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Monday, December 4, 1995.

Congratulations, David, this is an honor richly deserved and truly earned.

LEGISLATION TO HELP LOWER
THE BURDEN OF MEDICARE
PART A BUY-INS

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, Representative ROBERT MATSUI and I are today introducing a bill to help those who, through no fault of their own, were not able to participate in the Medicare Program during their working years and now face over \$3,000 a year in Medicare part A buy-in costs.

Our bill lowers the cost of the monthly part A buy-in for about 216,000 people over age 80 who, for no fault of their own, could not participate in Medicare during their working years, because their employers were not in Social Security. The people in this group are mostly retired teachers, policemen, and firemen over age 80 who worked for State and local governments which elected not to join the Medicare payroll tax system.

These retirees have been stuck in increasingly expensive small public or private insurance policies, and many of them have had to drop insurance coverage because they could no longer afford it on their shrinking pensions. Since most of them could not afford to maintain private insurance, even if it were available, they have been buying into Medicare part A, some for as long as 15 years. The Medicare buy-in monthly premium is set to equal the full actuarial cost of part A, and today premiums are more than \$250 a month and now many of these retirees cannot afford to buy into this basic level of Medicare hospital protection. Many are becoming uninsured—and uninsurable—at the most vulnerable period in their lives.

In the last Congress, Representative BILL THOMAS and I developed an amendment to help this population by lowering the part A buy-in for those who achieved 30 quarters of coverage but not the necessary 40 required for Medicare eligibility.

This has been a help to a few of these retirees, but many of the poorest of these seniors, of course, do not have even 30 quarters of coverage and desperately need help.

Therefore, the amendment Representative MATSUI and I are introducing today would lower the cost of the monthly buy-in by about \$150 a month. Individuals would still have to contribute \$100 per month—and the full actuarial rate for years before their 80th birthday.

Our bill does not include a way to pay for this change, but we expect to be able to offer a funding proposal at such time as the legislation is considered for markup.

I hope other Members will join us in supporting this much needed relief to a group of our older retirees who—to repeat—through no fault of their own, were unable to participate in the regular Medicare Program during their working years.

HONORING TONY M. ASTORGA

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a longtime friend and supporter,

Mr. Tony M. Astorga, on the occasion of his 50th birthday. It is my pleasure to recognize the achievements of Mr. Astorga, and the impact he has had on the people of Arizona.

Mr. Astorga has long been a valuable member of the Arizona community, beginning with his days as a student at Arizona State University. During his time at ASU, he received many honors, including his placement in "Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities," and "Outstanding Young Men of America." He graduated from ASU with a B.S. degree in accounting with high honors, leading to a long and distinguished career in the Arizona business community.

Currently, Mr. Astorga is the senior vice president, chief financial officer and treasurer of Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Arizona and president of AT International, Inc. He has been named the "Professional of the Year" by the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, and received the "Public Service Award" from the Arizona Society of Certified Public Accountants. However, the demands of a highly successful professional career have not kept him from making an impact on the community. He has been a part of the United Way Agency Review Panel, the Blessed Sacrament and St. Joan of Arc Finance Committees, as well as participating in the Manpower Advisory Council and Citizens Task Force to the city of Phoenix.

I take great pleasure in recognizing the efforts and contributions that Mr. Astorga has made during his lifetime in Phoenix, and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the accomplishments of Mr. Tony Astorga.

CAPITALIZING ON AMTRAK

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to establish a new intercity passenger rail trust fund. Serving over 500 destinations across the country, the National Railroad Passenger Corporation [Amtrak] provides 22 million passenger rail trips to Americans every year. With an estimated \$4 billion needed in capital improvements over the next few years, the rail trust fund will provide Amtrak with much needed capital funds to improve rolling stock, cars and locomotives, upgrade maintenance facilities, and prevent the deterioration of track and signal equipment. First introduced by Senate Finance Committee Chairman BILL ROTH, the rail trust fund will be a secure source of capital funding during this time of tight budgetary constraints.

On October 1, the 2.5 cents of the existing 18-cents-per-gallon gas tax that had been going into the Treasury for deficit reduction was shifted back into the mass transit portion of the highway trust fund. This highway trust fund account has a huge balance—estimated at over \$10 billion at the end of fiscal 1996. My bill would direct 0.5 cent of this 2.5 cents into the rail trust fund until September 30, 2000.

The establishment of this rail trust fund will not adversely affect other modes of transport, including mass transit. In fact, special language has been included in the rail trust fund legislation protecting mass transit. If, under the

Rostenkoski rule, the cash balance in the mass transit account were ever insufficient to cover the transit spending for the current year and the following fiscal year, the revenues from the rail trust fund would revert into the transit account.

Amtrak is an essential part of this country's transportation network. Between 1982 and 1994, travel on Amtrak's operating rose 40 percent. This necessary capital funding will cut Amtrak's operating and maintenance costs and improve reliability and performance. In addition, these improvements will reduce air pollution, fuel consumption, highway congestion, and urban parking problems. I urge my colleagues to join me in enacting this measure into law.

COMMEMORATING 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF HELSINKI FINAL ACT

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent the House as a commissioner on the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe and want to bring to the attention of our colleagues the remarks by the Honorable Gerald R. Ford, 38th President of the United States, at Helsinki, Finland, on August 1, 1995, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Thank you for your kind invitation to take part in this historic event whereby we mark the 20th Anniversary of the Helsinki Accords.

The title for my remarks today—"Helsinki: The Unfinished Agenda."

Before the formal signing of the Helsinki Accord, I warned the world and the other heads of state gathered here that "Peace is not a piece of paper . . . peace is a process."

Twenty years later, the process we began here by signing that piece of paper has given us a super power peace—the Cold War is history.

Except for the stubborn ethnic conflict in the Balkans which was already ancient when I was born, the course of history has changed because here in Helsinki we recognized certain basic rights to which all human individuals are entitled.

In 1975 there was considerable opposition in the United States to my participation in the Helsinki meeting. For example, *The Wall Street Journal* advised in its July 23, 1975, editorial: "Jerry—Don't Go," while other American newspapers were equally critical. Some skeptics labeled the Accord—The Betrayal of Eastern Europe. Basket III, which included fundamental human rights language was either ignored by most of the media or criticized as long on rhetoric, but short on substance. Likewise, two of our most influential and respected Senators, one a Democrat and one a Republican, condemned Basket III of the Accord.

Furthermore, many ethnic groups in the United States, especially those of Baltic heritage, were strongly opposed to portions of the Accord because they believed it legitimized the borders drawn by the Warsaw Pact. The United States and the West German government met this criticism by insisting Basket II language include the following: "They, (the signers) consider that

their frontiers can be changed, in accordance with international law, by peaceful means and by agreement." The wholesale political upheaval behind the Iron Curtain that took place fifteen years later made these differences in 1975—academic, especially Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. The 1975 Helsinki Accord did not freeze the 1945 borders of Europe; it freed them.

The thirty-five leaders of nations on both sides of the Iron Curtain that signed the Final Act of the Helsinki Accord, according to one historian, "Set in motion a chain of events that helped change history." Each of us, including Mr. Brezhnev, who signed the Final Act agreed to a commitment of principle to recognize the existence of certain basic human rights to which all individuals are entitled.

It is ironic that these accords are often described as the "Final Act" when, in fact, they were really just the beginning of an historic process. Today, this process has a past, as well as a present and a future—an unfinished agenda.

Twenty years ago when I spoke here, my country was beginning the bicentennial observance of our Declaration of Independence. I drew on the inspiration of that great moment in our history for the remarks I made to the Conference in this Finnish Capital. I likened the Helsinki Accords to the Declaration of Independence because I realized that, as with our revolution, it is sacrifice and the indomitable human spirit that truly separate ordinary moments in history from those that are extraordinary. And today, as we reflect on the past twenty years of achievement, we see that it has been the sacrifice and the indomitable human spirit of great people throughout the world that have made the signing of the Helsinki Accords a truly extraordinary moment in modern history.

I well remember the impressive ceremony in Finlandia House where signatures were affixed to a 100 page, 30,000 word joint declaration. In the limelight, representing the thirty-five nations, were French President Valérie Giscard d'Estaing, West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, British Prime Minister Harold Wilson, Yugoslav President Josip Broz Tito, Rumanian President Nicolae Ceausescu, Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, East Germany's Erich Honechor, our host, President Kekkonen and others.

On the day we signed the Accords, appropriate speeches were made by each nation's representative. On behalf of the United States I chose to emphasize the Final Act's commitment to human rights.

Let me quote from my speech: "The documents produced here affirm the most fundamental human rights—liberty of thought, conscience, and faith; the exercise of civil and political right; the rights of minorities."

"Almost 200 years ago, the United States of America was born as a free and independent nation. The descendants of Europeans who proclaimed their independence in America expressed in that declaration a decent respect for the opinions of mankind and asserted not only that all men are created equal, but they are endowed with inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

"The founders of my country did not merely say that all Americans should have these rights, but all men everywhere should have these rights. And these principles have guided the United States of America throughout its two centuries of nationhood. They have given hope to millions in Europe and on every continent."

"But it is important that you recognize the deep devotion of the American people and their Government to human rights and fundamental freedoms and thus to the pledges that this conference has made re-

garding the freer movement of people, ideas, information."

I continued in my 1975 speech—"To those nations not participating and to all the people of the world: The solemn obligation undertaken in these documents to promote fundamental rights, economic and social progress, and well-being applies ultimately to all peoples."

"And can there be stability and progress in the absence of justice and fundamental freedoms?"

My final comments were: "History will judge this Conference not by what we say here today, but by what we do tomorrow—not by the promises we make, but by the promises we keep."

In retrospect, it is fair to say that Leonid Brezhnev and other Eastern European leaders did not realize at the time that in endorsing the human rights basket of the Helsinki Accord they were planting, on their own soil, the seeds of freedom and democracy. In agreeing to the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Accord, the Soviets and the eastern bloc nations unwittingly dragged a Trojan horse for liberty behind the Iron Curtain.

Often, current events we believe will be important in history later become obscure and irrelevant. And sometimes, events we consider irrelevant in history, become a defining moment. As former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher noted in Paris in 1990, "It was clear that we underestimated the long-term affects of the Helsinki Agreement." This great British Leader went on to say that the Helsinki Agreements "were a process which some envisioned as perpetuating the division of Europe [but which have] actually helped overcome that division." Likewise, scholars point out that at the time the Magna Carta was adopted in England, its extension of freedom was quite limited and applied only to a privileged few; however, today we recognize the Magna Carta as a dramatic first step on man's march to individual freedom.

Following the meeting in Helsinki, watch groups sprang up throughout Europe. The Fourth Basket provision for a follow-up meeting in Belgrade in 1977 and a subsequent meeting in Madrid in 1980 would give these to those who were aggrieved a global forum for their determined anti-Marxist and pro-human rights views. To those suffering behind the Iron Curtain, the Helsinki Accords was a powerful proclamation that contained seminal ideas it was issued at a most opportune time.

I applaud President Carter's dedicated and effective support of Arthur Goldberg in Belgrade in 1977 and Max Kampelman in Madrid in 1980; however, it would be obviously unfair to attribute all of the cataclysmic events of 1989 and 1990 to the Final Act, in as much as long suppressed nationalist sentiments, economic hardship, and suppressed religious conditions played equally crucial roles.

Today, as we face the harsh realities of August 1995, I am reminded of the words of President Lincoln as he confronted the awesome challenges of the American Civil War. With the Republic hanging in the balance, he observed that "the occasion is piled high with difficulties and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew."

Yet, even as today's violence and suffering enrage and pull at the heartstrings of all people—and the former Yugoslavia is just one example—I know the central issue in the world remains the preservation of liberty and human rights. When the Berlin Wall fell, those who were protesting repression were reading from documents like the American Declaration of Independence. Today, they are reading to us the words of the Helsinki

Accords. These are the great ideas of freedom—the constant drumbeat of ideas that have been repeated time and time again in the Helsinki process.

The harsh realities of the present are challenges which signatories of the Helsinki Accords must address. Its member states must wrestle with these challenges and continue to achieve in the future the aims and goals of what was begun here 20 years ago. To realize these hopes and dreams requires planning, commitment, perseverance and hard work. The Helsinki process provides a vision for a future based on liberty and on the freedom to pursue a better life. As the Bible admonishes, where there is no vision, the people perish.

So, I compliment all the signers and I'm very proud to have been one of the thirty-five. In August 1975 we made serious promises to our countrymen and to people worldwide. Where human rights did not exist in the thirty-five nations twenty years ago, there is now significant progress and hope for even better times. I congratulate the people in each nation who used the tools of the Final Act to achieve the blessings of human rights.

I am confident that if we continue to be vigilant, what we began here two decades ago shall be viewed by future historians as a watershed in the cause of individual freedom and human rights. Twenty years from today, history will again judge whether or not the world is a better place to live because of what we promised here two decades ago, and because of what we promise here today and the promises we keep in the future.

The Helsinki Accords are not, then, a Final Act—rather they are an unfinished agenda for the continued growth of human freedom. On this anniversary date, let us resolve to continue anew the work of that agenda.

THE MENSCH WHO SAVED
CHRISTMAS

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week there was a terrible tragedy in Massachusetts, when a fire did enormous damage to the Malden Mills factory in Methuen, MA. While no one can undo the terrible effects of this fire, thanks to the enormous courage, compassion, and integrity of one individual, Aaron Feuerstein, the working men and women who were the victims of this terrible event have more hope than they otherwise might have. Aaron Feuerstein is the third generation in his family to run this company, and his actions since the tragedy have been an unparalleled example of how a human being can act in a moral manner in a very tough situation. In the Boston Globe for Sunday, December 17, columnist David Nyhan accurately conveys the heroic role that Aaron Feuerstein has played at a time when most people have done far less. Despite himself being a major victim of this tragedy, Aaron Feuerstein has acted with an extraordinary degree of humanity and decisiveness to administer to the other victims, and I believe it is important at a time when more and more working people are giving reason to doubt the essential fairness of the American economic system that the shining example that Aaron Feuerstein presents be fully understood and appreciated by the nation. I therefore ask that David Nyhan's excel-

lent presentation of what Aaron Feuerstein has done be printed here.

[From the Boston Globe, Dec. 17, 1995]

THE MENSCH WHO SAVED CHRISTMAS

Were it not for the 45-mile-an-hour winds ripping out of the Northwest, the sparks that they carried and the destruction they wrought, Aaron Feuerstein today would be just another rich guy who owned a one-time factory, in a country full of the same.

But the fire that destroyed New England's largest textile operation Monday has turned this 70-year-old businessman into a folk hero. If a slim, determined, devoutly-Jewish textile manufacturer can be Santa Claus, then Feuerstein is, to 2,400 workers whose jobs were jeopardized by the fire.

The flames, so intense and widespread that the smoke plume appeared in garish color on TV weathermen's radar maps, presented Feuerstein with a stark choice: Should he rebuild, or take the insurance money and bag it?

Aaron Feuerstein is keeping the paychecks coming, as best he can, for as long as possible, while he rushes to rebuild, and restore the jobs a whole valley-full of families depend upon.

Everybody got paid this week. Everybody got their Christmas bonus. Everybody will get paid at least another month. And Feuerstein will see what he can do after that. But the greatest news of all is that he will rebuild the factory.

The man has a biblical approach to the complexities of late-20th-century economics, capsulated by a Jewish precept:

"When all is moral chaos, this is the time for you to be a mensch."

In Yiddish, a mensch is someone who does the right thing. The Aaron Feuerstein thing. The chaos was not moral but physical in the conflagration that began with an explosion and soon engulfed the four-building Malden Mills complex in Methuen, injuring two dozen workers, a half-dozen firemen and threatening nearby houses along the Merrimack River site.

The destruction was near-absolute. It is still inexplicable how no one perished in a fast-moving firestorm that lit up the sky. This was one of New England's handful of manufacturing success stories, a plant that emerged from bankruptcy 14 years ago. The company manufactures a trademark fabric, Polartec fleece, used extensively in outdoor clothing and sportswear by outfits such as L. L. Bean and Patagonia.

The company was founded by Feuerstein's grandfather in 1907, and its history over the century has traced the rise, fall and rise again of textile manufacturing in New England mill towns.

Most of the textile makers fled south, leaving hundreds of red brick mausoleums lining the rocky riverbeds that provided the water-power to turn lathes and looms before electricity came in. The unions that wrested higher wages from flinty Yankee employers were left behind by the companies that went to the Carolinas and elsewhere, to be closer to cotton and farther from unions.

The Feuerstein family stuck it out while many others left, taking their jobs and their profits with them. The current boss is one textile magnate who wins high praise from the union officials who deal with him.

"He's a man of his word," says Paul Coorey, president of Local 311 of the Union of Needleworkers, Industrial and Textile Employees. "He's extremely compassionate for people." The union's New England chief, Ronald Alman, said: "He believes in the process of collective bargaining and he believes that if you pay people a fair amount of money, and give them good benefits to take care of their families, they will produce for you."

If there is an award somewhere for a Compassionate Capitalist, this man should qualify hands-down. Because he is standing up for decent jobs for working people at a time when the vast bulk of America's employer class is chopping, slimming, hollowing-out the payroll.

Job loss is the story of America at the end of the century. Wall Street is going like gangbusters, but out on the prairie, and in the old mill towns, and in small-town America, the story is not of how big your broker's bonus is this Christmas but of how hard it is to keep working.

The day after the fire, Bank of Boston announced it will buy BayBanks, a mega-merger of financial titans that will result in the elimination of 2,000 jobs. Polaroid, another big New England employer, announced it would pare its payroll by up to 2,000 jobs. Across the country, millions of jobs have been eliminated in the rush to lighten the corporate sled by tossing overboard anyone who could be considered excess baggage by a Harvard MBA with a calculator for a heart.

Aaron Feuerstein, who went from Boston Latin High School and New York's Yeshiva University right into the mill his father owned, sees things differently; The help is part of the enterprise, not just a cost center to be cut.

"They've been with me for a long time. We've been good to each other, and there's a deep realization of that, that is not always expressed, except at times of sorrow."

And it is noble sentiments like those, coming at a time when they are most needed, that turns times of sorrow into occasions of triumph.

IN RECOGNITION OF SPECIAL
AGENT IN CHARGE DAVID F. RAY

HON. MIKE WARD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to acknowledge publicly an outstanding Kentuckian, Mr. David F. Ray. Next month, David will retire from the U.S. Secret Service after 31 years of distinguished service.

David ends his sterling career as the special agent in charge for the Louisville, Kentucky field office of the Secret Service. Previous assignments took David and his family to Charlotte, NC and the District of Columbia.

Conducting advance security arrangements for President Reagan's visit to the Peoples Republic of China and for his meeting with Soviet Union President Gorbachev was a hallmark of David's stint in Washington. During his tenure in Louisville, the Secret Service was responsible for numerous arrests involving fraud, forgery, and embezzlement. And, in 1992, David served as the principal security coordinator for visits to Kentucky by President Bush, Vice President Quayle, Presidential candidate Clinton, and Vice Presidential candidate Gore.

Mr. Speaker, Special Agent In Charge David F. Ray has devoted himself for 31 years to the service of his country as a member of the law enforcement community. It is with much pride that I extend my congratulations and best wishes to him and his family for a well-deserved retirement.

LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE
COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRON-
MENTAL RESPONSE, COMPENSA-
TION, AND LIABILITY ACT OF
1980

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 [CERCLA]. My bill would remove the authority for contracting oversight from the purview of the Environmental Protection Agency and place it solely under the jurisdiction of the Army Corp of Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, this change makes sense given the expertise of each agency. The Army Corp of Engineers is far better suited to handle contracting work and oversight of construction of the design and remedy at a Superfund site than the more technical, environmental orientation of the EPA.

The reason why I am introducing this legislation today is in direct response to an incident that recently happened in my district during an already lengthy and tumultuous cleanup. Hopefully, passage of this legislation will prevent future situations, such as the one I am about to describe, from happening again in the future.

The asbestos dump site in Millington, NJ, is comprised of two residential farms and part of the Great Swamp National Wildlife Reserve. It contains large amounts of asbestos that was dumped on the property. On one of these two residential sites, the homeowners—a family of five—were involved in a lengthy cleanup with the EPA and had been relocated several times, for months at the time. The EPA had contracted out for the construction of the design and the contractor then hired a subcontractor, with a less than perfect track history, to complete construction of the design.

The EPA subcontractors, instead of bringing in clean fill to top the asbestos on the family's property, brought in contaminated soil from another site. This horrendous mistake has added additional years to cleanup and the family's nightmare.

Mr. Speaker, again, I believe that the Army Corp of Engineers is far better equipped to handle the details of the physical cleanup of these Superfund sites, and to oversee more effectively contracting work. At many sites, such a mistake would add only years and costs to taxpayers for cleanup. In this case, it added not only time and money, but additional grief for a family wanting only to have their home and property cleaned up to a livable standard. I believe that my bill would prevent more situations like these and improve the efficiency of site cleanups.

TRIBUTE TO JIM MILLS'S 40
YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE MID-
DLETOWN COMMUNITY

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, for 40 years, Jim Mills has served the Middletown area

through his local reporting and editorial writing at the Middletown Journal. Jim began his career at the Journal in 1955 starting off as a reporter covering local government. In 1957, he was appointed Sunday editor and moved to city editor in 1960. From 1972 until 1981 Jim was the managing editor of the paper. Ultimately, in 1981, he headed the newsroom and retained the title managing editor.

Jim and Middletown, OH, have seen many important news stories over the last four decades. Some of the local highlights include the growth and restructuring of Armcoc to its present organization as AK Steel, creation of the City Centre Mall and redevelopment of the downtown area, state championships for area high schools, and the change Middletown and its business community have undergone.

Jim and the Middletown Journal staff were always conscientious to bring the local angle to national news items ranging from the John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, and Robert Kennedy assassinations, the Vietnam War, the Iranian hostage crisis, Desert Storm, and the explosion of the Space Shuttle Challenger.

Jim has received several awards for his dedication and continuous service. Among them are an award from the Associated Press Society of Ohio for exemplary service to news-gathering business and his assistance to the Xenia Daily Gazette publish and report the news when its offices were destroyed in a 1974 tornado. For coverage of the devastation the Gazette won a Pulitzer Prize.

During the past four decades, Jim has worked with hundreds of reporters and local officials. The join me in saluting Jim for his work and wishing him the best in his retirement.

DRUG LEGALIZATION

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address an issue about a subject which continues to get favorable treatment from our friends in the media. That issue is drug legalization.

Those who support legalization would have us believe that we ought to decriminalize drugs because we have lost the war on drugs. We are not losing this war. The truth is that during the Reagan/Bush years drug use dropped, from 24 million in 1979 to 11 million in 1992. Unfortunately, those hard fought gains have been wasted.

Under President Clinton's watch, this trend has been reversed and drug use is again increasing. The only lasting legacy of the Clinton Presidency will be a dramatic increase in the use of illegal drugs and the consequences of escalating violence and misery associated with it.

As a country, we have never really waged an all out war on drugs. It is now time we declared such a war and I am pleased the Speaker is talking about altering the rules of engagement. We should start this campaign by passing some of the anti-drug legislation which I have introduced.

And although I have been criticized by libertarian organizations for my position, I still do not believe the organizations whose primary

purpose is to promote the use of illegal drugs should operate under a tax free status.

The fathers and mothers in this country who struggle to make ends meet and to raise their children drug free, are paying extra taxes to subsidize the Drug Policy Foundation and their unshaven friends at NORML. These groups are spending millions of dollars in an effort to make dangerous drugs more available to kids. This is wrong.

Drug use is already on the rise. In fact one third of all high school kids are now smoking marijuana. Listen to what the Partnership for a Drug Free America says about teenagers' views on drugs: "Most recent trends among teens indicate a reversal in the attitudes that distinguish non-users from users—perception of risk and social disapproval—and the consequences are an increase in the use of marijuana, LSD, and cocaine."

Fortunately, even this Administration is now opposed to legalizing drugs. In a recent speech entitled "Why the U.S. Will Never Legalize Drugs", former drug czar, Lee Brown, called drug legalization the moral equivalent of genocide.

Listen carefully to his words:

When we look at the plight of many of our youth today, especially African American males, I do not think it is an exaggeration to say that legalizing drugs would be the moral equivalent of genocide. Legalizing addictive, mind altering drugs is an invitation to disaster for communities that are already under seige. Making drugs more readily available would only propel more individuals into a life of crime and violence. Contrary to what the legalization proponents say, profit is not the only reason for the high rates of violence associated with the drug trade . . . drugs are illegal because they are harmful—to both body and mind. Those who can least afford further hardship in their lives would be much worse off if drugs were legalized.

According to Lee Brown, legalization would create three times as many drug users and addicts in this country. And what does this translate into for future generations? It means hundreds of thousands of additional newborns addicted to drugs.

According to the Partnership for a Drug Free America, one out of every ten babies in the U.S. is born addicted to drugs. I guess the advocates of legalization must not think this percentage is high enough!

I challenge anyone in this chamber to go down the street and tell the nurses at D.C. General, who care for these children, that we need to legalize drugs. You will end up with a black eye! And here is another shocking fact * * * today in America over 11 percent of pregnant women use an illegal drug during pregnancy, including heroin, PCP, marijuana, and most commonly, crack cocaine. A sure-fire way to worsen this problem would be to legalize drugs. According to a recent University of Michigan study of 50,000 high school students, drug use is up in all grades. Drug use is up among all students for crack, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, LSD, and marijuana.

Increased drug use also contributes to domestic violence. In fact, drug use is a factor in

half of all family violence, most of it directed against women. And over 30% of all child abuse cases involve a parent using illegal drugs. Legalizing drugs will mean more violence against women and children.

Today, one third of the young people attending high school in our country smoke marijuana. It's no wonder our education system is a mess.

The high school dropout rate in the United States is over 25 percent, and 50 percent in major cities. A recent study of 11th graders showed that over half of the drug users dropped out—twice the rate of those drug-free.

Drugs rob kids of their motivation and self-esteem, leaving them unable to concentrate and indifferent to learning. Millions of these kids end up on welfare or in prison. Drug abuse in the workplace, violence against women and children, welfare dependency, high dropout rates, escalating health care costs, crack babies * * * could it get any worse?

If we legalized drugs it would get much worse! These problems are all interrelated and all have one thing in common. That common denominator is drug abuse. Legalizing drugs would be to say that all of this is acceptable * * * it is not acceptable.

Legislation I have introduced will send a strong and long overdue message to the young people in this country—Under no circumstances is the United States Congress ever * * * ever going to legalize drugs.

I have also introduced legislation aimed at reducing the demand for illegal drugs. Decreasing the desire for these substances is essential in safeguarding the most important things to all Americans: our children and families, our safety and our health and the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would also point out that police chiefs across the United States believe that the number one way to reduce crime is to reduce drug use. The fact is that mandatory minimum drug penalties put in place in 1988 was followed by the Nation's largest decrease in drug use.

It is a myth that many non-violent first time drug offenders are overcrowding our prisons. A comprehensive study by the Department of Justice found that 93 percent of state prisoners were either violent or repeat offenders, two thirds are currently in prison for a violent crime.

It is also a myth that drug arrests are overwhelming our prison systems. The fact is that drug arrests have been decreasing since 1989 and only make up 8 percent of all arrests nationwide. Despite lengthy sentences, the average Federal convicted drug possessor serves only 8 months.

The fact is that drug sentencing is still inadequate and that the last thing this Congress should consider is the repeal of mandatory minimum sentencing. Drug use and drug addiction cause most of the violence in this country and contribute to virtually every social, health and economic problem we face. And according to the most recent reports, hospital emergency room visits caused by illegal drugs are up again.

The fact is that the trend toward increased drug use in this country corresponds directly to President Clinton's term of office. For whatever reason, this President is either unable or unwilling to address this crisis. As a result,

millions of young people and their families are suffering.

This President has failed to come to grips with the fact that only one person in this country has the authority—the Office of the President—to reverse the worsening downward spiral of drug abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I am honestly willing to work with President Clinton to address this problem. And I commend Congressman Zelfiff for establishing this working group. He has presented the President a golden opportunity to work effectively with Congress in a bipartisan manner. All we are missing now is a serious commitment from the President.

COLUMNIST GEORGE F. WILL, A
NATIONAL TREASURE

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the work of Pulitzer Prize winning columnist and author, George F. Will. In him, Mr. Speaker I believe we have a national treasure. Time and again by his labors at the keypad Mr. Will has shown himself to be a man of great insight and depth. I believe him to be among that rarest of rare breeds—an original thinker. The concision and clarity with which he transforms those thoughts to the written word evidences a deep commitment on his part to understand and illuminate the human condition. His will to toil year after year so that others might not be lead astray by intellectual fads or fallacious reasoning is a model to all who would seek to shape the course of public life. Anyone willing to give his work a fair reading will find each week some troubling societal question logically explored, element by element and ultimately reduced to its essence without rancor or sentimentality.

I became a fan of George F. Will many years ago when the writer and father in him came together in a gloriously uncompartimentalized way to render an unambiguous rebuke to anyone who might doubt the quality of a life lived at less than physical perfection. With a few deft paragraphs Mr. Will wrote of his own son's enormous capacity to love and be loved. He explained that his "Oriole fan", despite whatever limitations Downs Syndrome had placed on him, could experience the joys and tragedies of life in the same way we all do—mostly through things as common as baseball. The boy was fully alive, fully human and perfectly formed in the image of God. It is my belief, Mr. Speaker that no writer in our land of literary greatness could deliver this urgent message with more force and grace than Mr. Will. It is clear that we are truly blessed as a nation to have him.

It is also obvious that despite the passing decades Mr. Will has not lost any of the, above-described commitment to his craft. His most recent Newsweek column is another fine example of all that is good and true about his work. And so Mr. Speaker, I enter that essay into the RECORD so that Mr. Will's own words can testify to the greatness of this decent, courageous and talented American.

FANATICS FOR "CHOICE"

(By George F. Will)

Americans are beginning to recoil against the fanaticism that has helped to produce

this fact: more than a quarter of all American pregnancies are ended by abortions. Abundant media attention has been given to the extremism that has tainted the right-to-life movement. Now events are exposing the extraordinary moral evasions and callousness characteristic of fanaticism, prevalent in the abortion-rights lobby.

Begin with "partial-birth abortions." Pro-abortion extremists object to that name, preferring "intact dilation and evacuation," for the same reason the pro-abortion movement prefers to be called "pro-choice." What is "intact" is a baby. During the debate that led to House passage of a ban on partial-birth abortions, the right-to-life movement was criticized for the sensationalism of its print advertisements featuring a Dayton nurse's description of such an abortion:

"The mother was six months pregnant. The baby's heartbeat was clearly visible on the ultrasound screen. The doctor went in with forceps and grabbed the baby's legs and pulled them down into the birth canal. Then he delivered the baby's body and the arms—everything but the head. The doctor kept the baby's head just inside the uterus. The baby's little fingers were clapping and unclapping and his feet were kicking. Then the doctor stuck the scissors through the back of his head, and the baby's arms jerked out in a flinch, a startle reaction, like a baby does when he thinks that he might fall. The doctor opened up the scissors, stuck a high-powered suction tube into the opening and sucked the baby's brains out."

To object to this as sensationalism is to say that discomforting truths should be suppressed. But increasingly the language of pro-abortion people betrays a flinching from facts. In a woman's story about her chemical abortion, published last year in *Mother Jones* magazine, she quotes her doctor as saying, "By Sunday you won't see on the monitor what we call the heartbeat." "What we call"? In partial-birth abortions the birth is kept (just barely) partial to preserve the legal fiction that a baby (what some pro-abortion people call "fetal material") is not being killed. An abortionist has told *The New York Times* that some mothers find such abortions comforting because after the killing, the small body can be "dressed and held" so the (if pro-abortionists will pardon the expression) mother can "say goodbye." *The New York Times* reports, "Most of the doctors interviewed said they saw no moral difference between dismembering the fetus within the uterus and partially delivering it, intact, before killing it." Yes.

Opponents of a ban on partial-birth abortions say almost all such abortions are medically necessary. However, an abortionist at the Dayton clinic is quoted as saying 80 percent are elective. Opponents of a ban on such abortions assert that the baby is killed before the procedure, by the anesthesia given to the mother. (The baby "undergoes demise," in the mincing words of Kate Michelman of the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League. Does Michelman say herbicides cause the crab grass in her lawn to "undergo demise"? Such Orwellian language is a sure sign of squeamishness.) However, the president of the American Society of Anesthesiologists says this "misinformation" has "absolutely no basis in scientific fact" and might endanger pregnant women's health by deterring them from receiving treatment that is safe.

Opponents of a ban say there are only about 600 such procedures a year. Let us suppose, as not everyone does, the number 600 is accurate concerning the more than 13,000 abortions performed after 21 weeks of gestation. Still, 600 is a lot. Think of two crashes of jumbo airliners. Opponents of the ban darkly warn that it would be the first step

toward repeal of all abortion rights. Columnist John Leo of U.S. News & World Report says that is akin to the gun lobby's argument that a ban on assault weapons must lead to repeal of the Second Amendment.

In a prophecy born of hope, many pundits have been predicting that the right-to-life "extremists" would drastically divide the Republican Party. But 73 House Democrats voted to bar partial-birth abortions; only 15 Republicans opposed the ban. If the ban survives the Senate, President Clinton will probably veto it. The convention that nominated him refused to allow the Democratic governor of Pennsylvania, Bob Casey, who is pro-life, to speak. Pro-choice speakers addressed the 1992 Republican Convention. The two presidential candidates who hoped that a pro-choice stance would resonate among Republicans—Gov. Pete Wilson, Sen. Arlen Specter—have become the first two candidates to fold their tents.

In October in *The New Republic*, Naomi Wolf, a feminist and pro-choice writer, argued that by resorting to abortion rhetoric that recognizes neither life nor death, pro-choice people "risk becoming precisely what our critics charge us with being: callous, selfish and casually destructive men and women who share a cheapened view of human life." Other consequences of a "lexicon of dehumanization" about the unborn are "hardness of heart, lying and political failure." Wolf said that the "fetus means nothing" stance of the pro-choice movement is refuted by common current practices of parents-to-be who have framed sonogram photos and fetal heartbeat stethoscopes in their homes. Young upscale adults of child-bearing age are a solidly pro-choice demographic group. But they enjoy watching their unborn babies on sonograms, responding to outside stimuli, and they read "The Well Baby Book," which says: "Increasing knowledge is increasing the awe and respect we have for the unborn baby and is causing us to regard the unborn baby as a real person long before birth . . ."

Wolf argued for keeping abortion legal but treating it as a matter of moral gravity because "grief and respect are the proper tones for all discussions about choosing to endanger or destroy a manifestation of life." This temperate judgment drew from Jane Johnson, interim president of Planned Parenthood, a denunciation of the "view that there are good and bad reasons for abortion." So, who now are the fanatics?

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2099,
DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS
AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK RIGGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank my colleague from California [Mr. LEWIS] the Chairman of the VA/HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, for his work on this bill under difficult circumstances. His diligence and hard work are to be commended.

As a veteran myself, I am particularly sensitive to the importance of keeping our promises to our veterans.

Shortly before the House of Representatives was to consider the conference report on the

VA/HUD and related agencies bill, I learned the Clinton administration, in a "statement of administration policy," had failed to mention the lack of a VA replacement hospital at Travis Air Force Base as a reason for a potential Presidential veto. Earlier in the month, the administration had pledged its support to the hospital in a letter from Office of Management and Budget Director Alice Rivlin to the chairman of the House of Appropriations Committee, ROBERT LIVINGSTON.

In light of this apparent reversal of administration policy, I feel that I have no choice but to support the fiscal year 96 VA/HUD Appropriations Bill. It contains \$25 million for a new state-of-the-art VA outpatient clinic at Travis Air Force Base, in addition to a \$400 million increase in the VA medical accounts. This is especially important since every other account in the bill, except those pertaining to veterans, was significantly reduced.

The Travis outpatient facility will meet the immediate health care needs of most Solano County and northern California veterans. I feel a moral obligation to do what is right for my fellow vets and to support any measure that will have a positive impact upon the region.

I was dismayed that the conference committee provided only \$25 million for the outpatient clinic at Travis. I had worked to secure additional funding in light of the Veterans Administration's recommendation of \$39.5 million in funding for the outpatient clinic.

With a projected 85,000 annual outpatient visits, the new facility will meet the needs of most veterans who require ambulatory care. However, I still believe there is the urgent need to attend to the acute medical needs of northern California's veterans.

The very survival of the outpatient facility was placed in jeopardy due to a November 29 stalling tactic that sent the conference report back to committee. I was told by VA Chairman Lewis that the motion could have jeopardized the clinic if the committee had been forced to reallocate funds among competing accounts.

Further delay in enacting the VA/HUD appropriations bill could force the legislation to be integrated into a full-year continuing resolution. Under that scenario, virtually all programs, including veterans' medical care and construction projects, will receive less than under the conference agreement. This would leave the veterans of northern California at a severe disadvantage. Those individuals who could delay or defeat this appropriations bill would be putting their political whims before the needs of our veterans.

By no means should my support for this bill signal that I am abandoning the long-term goal of building a replacement hospital at Travis Air Force Base.

It has become clear to me that full funding for the proposed replacement hospital is not possible this year. I cannot ignore present fiscal realities. Rather than contribute to budget gridlock, I must do what is best for northern California veterans and support this bill.

TRIBUTE TO RAYMOND JOHNSON
OF FORT WALTON BEACH

HON. JOE SCARBOROUGH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell this Chamber a story of remark-

able heroism, a story I recently heard about a World War II veteran who resided in my district and who, in a time of crisis in our Nation's history rose to the defense of his country. I relay this story, because it lets us know that, at a time when cynicism and pessimism seem pervasive, we need to be reminded that we are a nation of heroes and that we can rise to meet the challenges before us. Mr. Raymond Johnson was just a hero, and in the best tradition of the American spirit he rose to the challenges before him for no other reason than that he loved his country.

Raymond Johnson was like any other young American boy growing up before World War II. He enjoyed the innocence of playing baseball, climbing trees, fishing, and the other simplicities of a young life. But when Japan attacked Pearl Harbor, bringing the United States into World War II, Raymond Johnson did his duty and went off to serve his country as an infantryman in the U.S. Army. In April 1942, Raymond and hundreds of other young men traveled to Inniskillan, Northern Ireland, for specialized training as an Army scout. After further training in Inverary, Scotland, Raymond and his comrades found themselves in North Africa with the 168th Regiment of the 34th Infantry Division. Their enemy—Field Marshall Rommel's vaunted Afrika Korps.

Soon enough, the 34th Infantry Division received their baptism of fire during the Allied invasion of North Africa on November 17, 1942. Raymond served gallantly in battle during two major campaigns in Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia. After being bombarded both day and night by German artillery fire for over 1 month, the 34th Infantry found themselves divided and in disarray. One morning, just before dawn, Raymond and his comrades found themselves encircled by German tanks and infantry. Those American soldiers who were not machine gunned immediately found their positions overrun and themselves taken prisoner. That morning marked what would become 2½ years of hell for Raymond Johnson in Nazi prisoner of war camps in Tunisia, Sicily, Italy, and ultimately the heart of the German interior.

Meanwhile, Raymond's family had no word of their son's fate. Reported missing, probably killed in action, the family feared for the worst. Then, a Canadian ham radio operator monitoring Vatican City Radio recorded the names of American prisoners of war that a Vatican City envoy had visited in a Nazi-controlled camp near Mount Vesuvius. Hearing the name Raymond Johnson and his home town broadcast over the radio, the ham radio operator contacted the Johnson family, giving them the first word that their son was alive. Despite his capture, the Johnson family, steadfast in their Roman Catholic faith, thanked God that their son was alive and that a priest had visited the men, giving them the sacrament of communion. Faith in God and confidence in their country were all that the Johnson family had to sustain them for some time to come.

Department of State Cables 446, 464, 579, and 649 mentioned Raymond Johnson as being sighted in Nazi POW Camps 7A and 3B near Furstenberg along with other prisoners, but the family was told nothing more than that their Raymond was a prisoner of war and that his fate was uncertain. Forced to labor on German public works projects and later on German farms, Raymond, like his fellow

POW's, became emaciated from extreme hunger and his health declined. Dysentery, infections, work injuries, and TB ravaged the men held by the Nazis in the dreaded stalags and Raymond Johnson was not immune. By the spring of 1945, near death, weighing only 98 pounds, suffering from dysentery and having lost all of his teeth because of malnutrition, Raymond and most of his comrades had survived almost 2½ years as prisoners of war, subjected to constant hardship and Gestapo interrogation. Prisoners were dying at the rate of three or four dead a day. Still, secure in his faith in both God and country, Raymond did not give up hope that he would be liberated and see his home and family again. Raymond's prayers would not go unanswered. As the Irish proverb goes, "God is just but He takes His time."

Almost as suddenly as he became a prisoner of war, events transpired that would change Raymond's life for the better. On Friday, April 13, 1945, Raymond's prayers were answered. The men of Nazi Stalag 3B heard thunder in the distance. In a state of panic, German guards began shooting some prisoners and locked the rest in their barracks as the thunder loomed nearer. That thunder soon was recognized as artillery fire. The artillery fire became the sounds of tanks in battle. The sounds of tank fire transformed into the sound of tank treads. The tank treads became so loud that the POW's huddled on the floor together fearing that the Germans would make good on their threat to kill them before they could be liberated. The commotion outside the barracks was so loud that many of the men later reported being almost deafened until the next sound that they heard was the barracks doors being thrown open and an American GI yelling, "You're safe now, boys. We've come to take you home!" A day that is feared by the superstitious of the world, Friday the 13th, thereafter became Raymond's special day for the rest of his life.

Although liberated, Raymond's life still weighed in the balance. At the fittingly named Camp Lucky, Raymond almost died from his state of malnutrition several times. After 3 harrowing weeks, medics finally approved Raymond to be placed aboard a hospital ship heading for America. Enroute, men continued to die and were buried at sea. Contemplating the hardships he had endured, Raymond feared that it would be both senseless and ironic if he should die at sea before seeing his family again. Raymond continued to pray that God would spare his life. Once again Raymond's prayers were answered.

This story would end here and would not be of note had it not been for one simple thing. A nation anxious to return to normal, eager to discharge veterans as quickly as they could be brought back home from the war in Europe and the Pacific, became a nation too busy to honor its heroes. Raymond Johnson never received the recognition that he deserved for serving his country with distinction and honor in both its saddest and finest moments.

Raymond Johnson eventually regained much of his health. However, doctors told him that he would never be the same after having suffered the fate of Nazi prison camps. Humbly, Raymond went on with his life, devout in his faith, and proud of his service to his country. Like most veterans, Raymond did not complain much. They were just thankful to be home with their families. In fact, Raymond

Johnson lead a modest but happy life, barely speaking of his experiences in the Nazi stalags. Few people could have guessed what the war had been like for Raymond.

Unfortunately, Raymond left this life on October 20, 1981, after suffering from cancer. Today, Raymond Johnson is survived by his widow, Mildred Johnson of Fort Walton Beach, FL, who attends St. Mary's Catholic Church regularly and is active in the Legion of Mary. Raymond was fortunate to have seven children, four sons, Robert, a teacher in Fort Walton Beach, Dennis a postal worker, a Roman Catholic Priest, Kevin, and Thomas who works for the State of Florida, and three daughters, Sandra, Katherine, and Mary, as well as 10 grandchildren, including a namesake, Raymond. While it may be too late to honor Raymond Johnson personally, this Christmas season I am pleased to be able to present to his family the medals and awards that this hero has been owed for over 50 years—the Bronze Star Medal, the Prisoner of War Medal, the World War II Victory Medal, and the coveted Combat Infantryman's Badge. These decorations pale in comparison to the gift that Raymond gave his country but they are all that a humble nation can give to pay tribute to one of its heroes. I am pleased to know that the First Congressional District of Florida can boast of the merits of an American the likes of Raymond Johnson and his fine family. Mr. Speaker, we owe this man, and all of our Nation's veterans our most sincere thanks and gratitude.

TRIBUTE TO LINCOLN TECHNICAL
INSTITUTE ON ITS 50TH ANNI-
VERSARY

HON. BOB FRANKS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lincoln Technical Institute, the largest training company in the Nation, on its 50th anniversary.

Lincoln Technical Institute [LTI] was founded in Newark, NJ, in 1946 to provide returning war veterans with practical job skills. Since that time, the institute has grown to develop and offer one of the Nation's most innovative and effective job training programs at 14 schools in 6 States.

The first programs offered in 1946 trained veterans in the fields of heating and air-conditioning. Training in automatic transmissions was added soon after. That began LTI's expertise in the automotive field. Over the years, courses in electronic and computer technologies and mechanical and architectural drafting have been added. In 1993, LTI acquired the Cittone Institute which added office focused programs such as court reporting and computerized accounting skills training. Today, LTI offers specialized training in 12 fields.

Students at LTI come from many different stages of life. Some are recent high school graduates that enroll in LTI to start their career. Others decide to make a career change and attend LTI to learn the skills necessary for their new profession. There are also a number of students who go to LTI through their employers in an effort to improve their skills.

Most impressive is that over 90 percent of LTI's graduates are working in the fields for

which they trained. This reflects not only the quality of the students, but the faculty, curriculum and state-of-the-art equipment LTI uses in its schools and classrooms.

I commend Lincoln Technical Institute for its dedication to the education and training of its students. In the competitive job market of the 1990s, Lincoln Technical Institute is essential to help many Americans reach their career objectives. I urge my colleagues to join me in wishing this fine institution a happy anniversary and another 50 years of continued success.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION'S FATAL
FLAWS

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to the excellent article on bilingual education that appeared in the September 25, 1995 U.S. News & World Report, "Tongue-tied in the schools." The author, Susan Headden, makes a compelling argument that bilingual education is a public policy failure that has been kept alive by bureaucratic inertia.

Ms. Headden's assessment of the program's effectiveness is unambiguous; she writes that "along with crumbling classrooms and violence in the hallways, bilingual education has emerged as one of the dark spots on the grim tableau of American public education."

The article goes on to show that current bilingual education programs are inadequate and actually counter-productive in helping new Americans and their children integrate into American society by learning English. Surveys have shown that today's immigrants want a chance for their children to learn English because it is the key to success in America.

Transitional bilingual education has failed to meet the test Congress established for it in 1978—namely, that it improves students' performance in English. The research evidence on transitional bilingual education indicates that it may, in fact, have a negative impact on students in these programs.

The first step we must take is to eliminate the bilingual education bureaucracy which has a vested interest in continuing along the same failed path. The money the Federal Government spends on bilingual education could be better spent on English classes for immigrants and intensive English instruction for their children. An afterschool program could do these children far more good than 6 years of a bilingual education program.

In the past, America has always been a shining example of how people from all corners of the world can live and work together in cultural harmony. This was the case because our country has enjoyed a common and unifying bond, the English language. We must preserve this bond to protect our future as a nation.

Bilingual education is a threat to that unity, because it doesn't help teach children English. That's why I introduced the Declaration of Official Language Act. In addition to declaring English our official language, H.R. 739 also seeks to repeal Federal mandates—like bilingual

education—which discourage the use of English. If my bill passes, the bilingual education boondoggle would cease to exist.

I hope you will heed this article's warning and join me today in the effort to refocus our country's educational efforts towards the goal of teaching children English quickly and effectively. We want all of our children to be fluent in the language of opportunity in our society, so that they too can take hold of their share of the American Dream. Cosponsor H.R. 739, the Declaration of Official Language Act. I ask that the full text of Susan Headden's article appear in the RECORD at this point.

[From the U.S. News and World Report, Sept. 25, 1995]

TONGUE-TIED IN THE SCHOOLS

(By Susan Headden)

Javier Sanchez speaks English like the proud American he is. Born in Brooklyn, N.Y., the wiry 12-year-old speaks English at home, and he speaks it on the playground. He spoke it in the classroom, too—until one day in the third grade, when he was abruptly moved to a program that taught him in Spanish all but 45 minutes a day. "It was a disaster," says his Puerto Rican-born mother, Dominga Sanchez. "He didn't understand Spanish." Sanchez begged the teacher to return her son to his regular class. Her request was met with amazement. "Why?" the teacher asked. "Don't you feel proud to be Hispanic?"

Along with crumbling classrooms and violence in the hallways, bilingual education has emerged as one of the dark spots on the grim tableau of American public education. Started 27 years ago to help impoverished Mexican-Americans, the program was born of good intentions, but today it has mushroomed into a \$10 billion-a-year bureaucracy that not only cannot promise that students will learn English but may actually do some children more harm than good. Just as troubling, while children like Javier are placed in programs they don't want and may not need, thousands more children are foundering because they get no help with English at all.

Bilingual education was intended to give new immigrants a leg up. During earlier waves of immigration, children who entered American schools without speaking English were left to fend for themselves. Many thrived, but others, feeling lost and confused, did not. Their failures led to Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which ensured supplementary services for all non-English-speaking newcomers to America.

ARMENIAN TO URDU

Significantly, the law did not prescribe a method for delivering those services. But today, of the funds used to help children learn English, 75 percent of federal money—and the bulk of state and local money—goes toward classes taught in students' native tongues; only 25 percent supports programs rooted in English. That makes bilingual education the de facto law of the land.

Historically, Hispanics have been the largest beneficiaries of bilingual education. Today, however, they compete for funding with new immigrant groups whose urge to assimilate some educators say, may be stronger. Further, not many school districts can offer classes in such languages as Armenian and Urdu. So for practical reasons, too, children of other nationalities are placed in English-based classes more often than children of Hispanics. The problem, as many see it, is that students are staying in native-language programs far too long. In a typical complaint, the mother of one New York

ninth grader says her daughter has been in "transitional" bilingual education for nine years. "We support bilingual education," says Ray Domanico of the New York Public Education Association. "But it is becoming an institutionalized ghetto."

LEARNING CHINESE

In theory, bilingual education is hard to fault. Students learn math, science and other "content" subjects in their native tongues, and they take special English classes for a small part of the day. When they are ready, ideally within three or four years, they switch to classes taught exclusively in English. The crucial advantage is that students don't fall behind in their other lessons while gaining competence in English. Further, supporters claim, bilingual education produces students fluent in two languages.

That would be great, if it were true. Too often it is not. What is sometimes mistaken for dual-language instruction is actually native-language instruction, in which students hear English for as little as 30 minutes a day. "Art, physical education and music are supposed to be taught in English," says Lucy Fortney, a third-grade teacher from Sun Valley, Calif. "But that is absolutely not happening at all."

Assignments to bilingual programs are increasingly a source of complaint. Many students, parents say, are placed in bilingual classes not because they can't understand English but because they don't read well. They need remedial, not bilingual, help. Others wind up in bilingual programs simply because there is no room in regular classes. Luz Pena says her third-grade son, born in America, spoke excellent English until he was moved to a bilingual track. Determined to avoid such problems with her daughter, she registered her for English kindergarten—only to be told the sole vacancies were in the Spanish class.

In some cases, the placements seem to defy common sense. In San Francisco, because of a desegregation order, some English-speaking African-Americans end up in classes taught partly in Chinese. Chinese-speakers, meanwhile, have been placed in classes taught partly in Spanish. Presented with evidence that blacks in bilingual programs scored well below other blacks on basic skills tests, school officials recently announced an end to the practice.

Whether a child is placed in a bilingual program can turn on criteria as arbitrary as whether his name is Miller or Martinez. In Utah, federal records show that the same test scores that identified some students as "limited English proficient" (LEP) were used to identify others as learning disabled. The distinction depended on the student's ethnic group: Hispanics were designated LEP, while Native Americans who spoke Navajo or Ute were labeled learning disabled. In New York City, where public schools teach children in 10 different languages, enrollment in bilingual education has jumped by half since 1989, when officials raised the cut-off on a reading test. Critics say that 40 percent of all children are likely to fail the test—whether they speak English or not.

Misplacement, however, is only part of the problem. At least 25 percent of LEP students, according to the U.S. Department of Education, get no special help at all. Other children are victims of a haphazard approach. In Medford, Ore., LEP students received English training anywhere from three hours a day, five days a week to 30 minutes a day, three days a week. The results? Of 12 former LEP students reviewed by education department officials, seven had two or more F's and achievement scores below the 20th percentile. Four more had D's and test scores below the 30th percentile. In Twin Falls,

Idaho, three high-school teachers had no idea that their students needed any help with English, despite their obvious LEP background and consistently failing grades.

Poorly trained teachers further complicate the picture. Nationwide, the shortage of teachers trained for bilingual-education programs is estimated at 170,000. The paucity of qualified candidates has forced desperate superintendents to waive some credentialing requirements and recruit instructors from abroad. The result is teachers who themselves struggle with English. "You can hardly understand them," said San Francisco teacher Gwen Carmen, in Duchesne, Utah, two teachers' aides admitted to education department inspectors that they had no college credits, no instructional materials and no idea what was expected of them.

What all these problems add up to is impossible to say precisely, but one statistic is hard to ignore. The high-school dropout rate for Hispanic students is nearly 30 percent. It remains by far the highest of any ethnic group—four times that of whites, three times that of blacks—and it has not budged since bilingual education began.

Although poverty and other problems contribute to the disappointing numbers, studies suggest that confining Hispanic students to Spanish-only classrooms also may be a significant factor. A New York study, published earlier this year, determined that 80 percent of LEP students who enrolled in English-immersion classes graduated to mainstream English within three years, while only half the students in bilingual classes tested out that quickly. A similar study released last fall by the state of California concluded that students stayed in native-language instruction far too long. It followed an independent investigation in 1993 that called native-language instruction "divisive, wasteful and unproductive."

Not everyone agrees. More than half of American voters, according to a new U.S. News poll, approve of bilingual education. Jim Lyons, executive director of the Bilingual Education Association, says the recent studies are flawed because they fail to measure mastery of academic content: "They don't even pretend to address the issue of the full education," he says. Learning English takes time, insists Eugene Garcia of the education department. "And it's well worth the wait."

PRACTICAL APPROACH

The alternative to native-language instruction is to teach children exclusively in English, pulling them out of class periodically for lessons in English as a second language. Lucy Fortney taught exclusively white American-born children when she started her career 30 years ago; now her classroom is almost entirely Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Armenian. "I can't translate one single word for them," she says, "but they learn English."

Today, bilingual education is creeping beyond impoverished urban neighborhoods to rural and suburban communities likely to expose its failings to harsher light. Until now, no constituency has been vested or powerful enough to force the kind of reforms that may yet come with civil-rights lawsuits. "Everybody's appalled when they find out about the problems," says Linda Chavez, one-time director of the Commission on Civil Rights and a dogged opponent of bilingual education, "but the fact is, it doesn't affect their kids." That may have been true in the past. But as a rainbow-hued contingent of schoolchildren starts filling up the desks in mostly white suburbia, it is not likely to be the case for long.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. PEARL ALMA
RIVERO

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mrs. Pearl Alma Rivero, an outstanding individual who has devoted her life to her family and to serving her community. Mrs. Rivero will be celebrating her 70th birthday on Sunday in the company of her loving family and friends in Miami, FL.

Mrs. Rivero is a native of New York City. She is the youngest of eight children born to Alexander and Ursula Shepard. She is the sister of Joseph Anthony Moniz, Vincent DePaul Moniz, Sylvia Patronella Moniz Nicholas, Ivy Eleanor Cristabel Moniz, Virella Santiago, Hyacinth Moniz, and Florin Moniz, Jr.

On October 18, 1942, she married Louis Bouchet and was blessed with two daughters, Margo Maria Bouchet and Sandra Cecelia Bouchet.

On August 1, 1959, Mrs. Rivero married Emil Joseph Rivero, with whom she celebrated 33 years of happiness until Emil's death on May 13, 1993. Their marriage was blessed with the birth of three children, Maria Theresa Rivero, Angela Justine Rivero, and Emil John Rivero.

Mrs. Rivero has four wonderful grandchildren, Betti-Rahkel Bouchet-Williams, Derrick Boddie, Mychal Williams, and Cassandra Bankhead-Williams.

A devoted mother, Mrs. Rivero raised her family to be religious, sharing, and caring individuals.

Mrs. Rivero has worked tirelessly to benefit her community and her church. She has served as a Eucharistic minister, lecturer, and a teacher of religious classes at Blessed Sacrament Catholic Church in the Bronx, and St. John Neumann Catholic Church in Miami, where she presently resides. Mrs. Rivero has also taught Bible classes at St. Ann's Nursing Home in Florida and currently serves as CORE member of the Divorced and Separated Ministry at St. John Neumann Catholic Church in Miami. She is a founding member of WINGS, a ministry serving the needs of widows, and has served as mediator for the Better Business Bureau in New York City.

Mrs. Rivero has received accolades, acknowledgments, and awards from her community, including awards from the Better Business Bureau of New York and the committee on the handicapped from the New York Board of Education. She was also certified as a lay minister for the Archdiocese of Miami.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me and the family of Mrs. Pearl Alma Rivero in wishing her a happy 70th birthday and best wishes during this holiday season.

THE IMPORTANCE OF ECONOMIC
REFORM IN UKRAINE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the American-Ukrainian Advisory Committee

and its distinguished chairman, Zbigniew Brzezinski, for their constructive contributions to building a strong and effective relationship between the United States and Ukraine. The committee, formed in 1993 by the Washington-based Center for Strategic and International Studies, recently held its third meeting in New York and issued a report.

The recommendations of the report were designed to advance the process of economic reform in Ukraine, foster a climate to attract foreign investment, and integrate Ukraine into the global economy. In order to meet these goals, Ukraine's political leadership must adhere to the fundamental elements of the economic reform program proposed a year ago by President Leonid Kuchma.

The American-Ukrainian Advisory Committee calls upon the Ukrainian Government to "speed up and broaden privatization with aim of achieving the long-term objective of establishing a market economy" and to "follow through with real macroeconomic stabilization." The committee all urges the United States, the European Union, Japan, and the international financial institutions to provide adequate financial assistance to reinforce Ukraine's commitment to economic reform.

The American-Ukrainian Advisory Committee's report follows:

AMERICAN-UKRAINIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
COMMUNIQUE

The American-Ukrainian Advisory Committee met in New York on November 17-18 and reiterated its strong conviction that a resilient Ukraine is in the interest of European stability and thus also American security. It welcomed the evident improvement in the American-Ukrainian relationship, especially the recognition by the U.S. government of Ukraine's geopolitical significance. It also endorsed strongly the reform efforts being pursued by the Ukrainian government in order to transform Ukraine into a stable democracy based on a free market economy.

The American participants included: Hon Zbigniew Brzezinski (CSIS Counselor), Hon. Richard Burt (Chairman International Equity Partners), Hon. Frank Carlucci (Chairman, Carlyle Group), Gen. John Galvin (Dean, Fletcher School of International Law and Diplomacy), Mr. Michael Jordan (Chairman & CEO, Westinghouse Electric Corporation), Hon Henry Kissinger (Chairman, Kissinger Associates), and Mr. George Soros (Chairman, Soros Foundations).

The Ukrainian participants included: Dr. Bohdan Hawrylyshyn (Chairman, Council of Advisors to Ukrainian Parliament), Ms. Svitlana Oharkova (General Director, "Tekno Ukrayina"), Mr. Serhiy Oksanych (President, KINTO Investment Association), Hon. Borys Sobolev (Deputy Minister of Finance), Hon. Dmytro Tabachnyk (Chief of Staff, Presidential Administration), Hon. Oleh Taranov (Chairman, Parliamentary Commission on Economic Policy), Hon. Boris Tarasiuk (Ambassador to Belgium), and Hon. Volodymyr Vasylenko (Ambassador-at-Large). In addition, present at the meeting was Hon. Yuri Sheberbak, Ambassador of Ukraine to the United States.

More specifically, the AUAC endorses or recommends the following:

SECURITY ISSUES

1. Encourage the U.S. to clearly articulate its vision of European security architecture, and in that context urge it to develop a consistent, long-term policy toward Ukraine which views that country as a Central European state. That policy needs to strongly and actively demonstrate American support for an independent, democratic, and economi-

cally successful Ukraine as a key factor of security and stability in Europe as a whole.

2. Recommend the establishment of a ministerial-level U.S.-Ukrainian Joint Commission. While applauding the existence of joint, bilateral working groups, we urge the creation of additional groups—by the Department of State and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as well as the Department of Defense and the Ministry of Defense—to deal with a range of issues, including energy supplies and security; environmental issues; and combating organized crime.

3. In order to develop a special relationship between NATO and Ukraine, extend eligibility to Ukraine under the NATO Participation Act of 1994. At the same time, encourage and support Ukraine's active participation in the Partnership for Peace program.

4. Encourage strong support for the closest possible Ukrainian participation and integration in European multilateral institutions, such as the Central European Initiative and CEFTA, cooperation partner status in the WEU, and the inclusion of Ukraine with Moldova, Bulgaria, and Romania in the Clinton Administration's Regional Airspace Initiative.

5. Support collective efforts to achieve reductions in and confidence-building measures for military forces in the Black Sea basin. When appropriate, a U.S. role as mediator in Black Sea issues could prove useful.

6. Encourage the U.S. Administration to continue rendering support for Ukraine's territorial integrity and inviolability of its state borders, and to urge Ukraine's neighbors to refrain from raising territorial claims.

7. Initiate the holding of U.S.-Ukrainian seminars and roundtables on security-related matters.

8. Encourage Western investment and technical and economic assistance for the exploration and development of Ukraine's natural gas and oil deposits, as well as diversification of external energy supplies to Ukraine. Encourage also the U.S. to play a leading role in helping Ukraine work out a comprehensive plan for reforming the energy sector.

ECONOMIC ISSUES

1. Urge the Ukrainian government to speed up and broaden privatization with the aim of achieving the long-term objective of establishing a market economy. One important step is to open opportunities to sell blocks of equity to strategic investors, while urging U.S. AID to enhance the efficacy of its support of Ukrainian privatization.

2. Given the critical stage of Ukraine's economic reforms, encourage the Ukrainian government to follow through with real macroeconomic stabilization, while urging the IMF, the World Bank, the European Union, Japan, and the U.S. government to provide timely and adequate financial assistance.

3. Support the introduction of the Ukrainian national currency, which should be a stable currency inspiring confidence, and urge the IMF to provide the appropriate stabilization fund.

4. Encourage the U.S. government and the EU to identify and overcome trade barriers so as to facilitate Ukraine's integration into the global trading system.

5. Assist with Ukraine's efforts to join the World Trade Organization, and encourage the U.S. Administration to extend Ukraine's participation in the U.S. General System of Preferences.

6. Express appreciation of the public education in market economics financed by the U.S. government, and advocate financing of education in business management and public administration. Such efforts should lead to the Ukrainian government's enhanced capacity to attract and retain competent persons at all levels of administration.

7. Support Ukraine's participation in the global space program.

8. Urge the U.S. Congress to follow Ukraine's lead and ratify both agreements dealing with double taxation and investment promotion and protection.

BUSINESS INVESTMENT ISSUES

1. Encourage Ukraine to establish clear property and contract rights, in harmony with international norms, so that both foreign and domestic investors' rights can be protected and enforced.

2. Under the joint sponsorship of the Ukrainian Union of Entrepreneurs and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, establish a Business Forum composed of CEOs and senior management to meet once a year to discuss business opportunities and obstacles in Ukraine and the United States.

3. Encourage Ukraine to establish an equitable and rational tax code which abjures retroactivity, double indemnity, discrimination, and punitive taxation levels.

4. Express clearly to the U.S. Congress and executive branch the AUAC's strong support for rule of law programs which could improve significantly Ukraine's business investment climate (e.g. development of commercial code, enforcement of decisions of Arbitration Courts), and identifies this area as a priority.

5. Encourage the Kyiv Political-Economic Working Group to provide the Western NIS Enterprise Fund (Ukraine) with specific investment/joint venture guidance and suggestions on small business projects.

6. Work through the Center for International Private Enterprise, an affiliate of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, to conduct seminars on investment opportunities in different sectors of the Ukrainian economy.

CELEBRATING 20 YEARS OF THE CONNECTICUT LEGISLATIVE BLACK AND PUERTO RICAN CAUCUS

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give recognition to an organization that has helped countless residents in my State for 20 years: the Connecticut Legislative Black and Puerto Rican Caucus.

The Caucus was formed in January 1976, under the leadership of its first chairman, Representative Clyde Billington, Jr., of Hartford. In subsequent years, this leadership was provided by distinguished legislators Maurice Mosley of Waterbury, Walter Brooks of New Haven, William Dyson of New Haven, Abraham Giles of Hartford, Eric Coleman of Bloomfield, Ernest Newton of Bridgeport and Wade Hyslop of New London.

The Caucus membership includes 13 African-American and Puerto Rican members—currently 10 Representatives and 3 Senators. These hard-working, dedicated members strive not only to find solutions to problems, but to promote the cultural diversity we are so fortunate to have in Connecticut.

Throughout its 20-year history, the Caucus has worked to improve the lives of African-Americans and Latino Americans. The Caucus promotes the growth of minority-owned business, and works to expand economic and educational opportunities in our communities.

It seeks to advance the cooperation and effectiveness of legislatures in U.S. States, territories, possessions, and commonwealths, and to make them more accountable and accessible to all residents. It places as one of its highest priorities the fulfillment of goals of the African-American and Latino American communities.

Among other accomplishments, the Caucus was instrumental in persuading the State of Connecticut to divest from South Africa; in calling attention to the plight of Haitians; and in calling for the appointment of African-American Curtissa Coffield to the State Supreme Court.

My home State has reaped enormous benefits from the work of the Connecticut Legislative Black and Puerto Rican Caucus. Its current chairwoman, Annette Carter, heads a team of dedicated leaders who work hard to help all of us. As the Caucus continues its work and accomplishments into the next century, my State and the Nation will benefit. I thank the Caucus for its endeavors and applaud its mission.

TAX RELIEF AND THE RIGHT TO WORK FOR OLDER AMERICANS

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend the House of Representatives for passing H.R. 2684, the Senior Citizens' Right To Work Act of 1995, which ends the practice of punishing older Americans who want to work.

Earlier this year, I promised the 1 million working, older Americans financial relief from the punitive Social Security earnings limit which is wrongly imposed on them. H.R. 2684, fulfills my promise by increasing the earnings limit to \$30,000 by the year 2002. Today, many people across the Nation want or need to work beyond the age of 64 because a fixed Social Security income alone cannot provide adequate financial resources.

This Nation has a tremendous amount of talent available in its older Americans. Younger people in the workplace gain a lot through the experience of these individuals who continue to work. Simply put, lifting the earnings limit is the right thing to do because it is good for all of us.

When fully phased in, the Senior Citizens' Right To Work Act will exempt about 50 percent of the people who currently have to comply with the earnings limit. These individuals have worked hard to pay into the Social Security trust fund. This legislation keeps our promise to lift the earnings limit for older people so they can continue to contribute to our Nation.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO UNITED STATES TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

SPEECH OF

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are facing an important and difficult moment: Should we send United States troops into Bosnia? Deploying U.S. troops to foreign territory and possibly into harm's way is always a difficult decision.

There is, however, one compelling rationale for United States participation in the international peacekeeping force; Bosnia has been the victim of international aggression and of crime against humanity that the Bosnian Serbs, supported by the Milosevic regime in Belgrade, have committed against hundreds of thousands of predominately Moslem Bosnians.

The American people are rightly outraged by the atrocities suffered by the Bosnian people: mass executions, ethnic cleansing, concentration camps, rape and terror, disease and starvation. Numerous accounts report on the slaughter of innocent civilians in Srebrenica. Peace is the only way to end the terrible human toll of this year. Now, with the official signing of the peace agreement in Paris this week, the warring factions have agreed to peace and the principles of the settlement. We finally have a chance to end the violence that has been so perniciously directed at specific groups because of their faith.

President Bill Clinton, and U.S. diplomatic effort brought the parties to the peace table. The progress we have made toward peace has been the result of American leadership. NATO's bombing campaign, led by American pilots, stopped Serb attacks against the safe areas. In Dayton, our single-minded pursuit of peace helped the parties reach an overall settlement. The Presidents of Croatia, Serbia, and Bosnia have made a serious commitment to peace. We must help them to make it work.

After 4 years of war, a credible international military presence is needed to give the parties confidence to live up to their agreement and breathing room to begin reconciliation and rebuilding. NATO, proven strong and effective, is that military presence. And the U.S. is the heart of NATO. If we fail to do our part in implementation, we would undermine our leadership of NATO. We would weaken the alliance itself. We would also undercut the chance for peace in Bosnia to the detriment of our own interests. At this pivotal point in time, our U.S. troops and our Commander in Chief deserve our complete support and confidence.

President Clinton has clearly defined the objectives of the implementation force [I-For] and stated our exact role in the international peacekeeping mission. I-For's mission is limited to assisting the parties in executing the military aspects of the peace agreement. These efforts, in turn, will help create a secure environment that will enable the people of Bosnia to get on with the job of rebuilding. To

ensure a stable Bosnia, we must be committed, publicly and resolutely, to the I-For mission, and most importantly to our United States troops.

SUPPORTING THE INDEPENDENCE
AND SOVEREIGNTY OF UKRAINE
AND ITS POLITICAL AND ECO-
NOMIC REFORMS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing House Concurrent Resolution 120, expressing the support of the United States Congress for the independence and sovereignty of Ukraine and for political and economic reforms in that important country. In laying out a number of areas that both Ukraine and the United States should focus upon, House Concurrent Resolution 120 should serve as a contribution to the evolving relationship between our two countries. I am pleased that I am joined in sponsoring this resolution by my colleagues, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. HOKE.

The challenges Ukraine faces in ensuring its independence and in successfully implementing political and economic reforms should not be minimized. In the area of economic reforms, in particular, the Ukrainian people face many difficult struggles. The United States is providing vitally needed assistance intended to focus on those economic reforms that are key to Ukraine's economic transformation and, ultimately, to its continued independence. The international community has also begun to provide substantial assistance and loans to Ukraine in support of economic reforms there. As this resolution clearly points out, however, the ultimate responsibility for the success of those reforms lies with the President and Parliament of that country. It is, quite simply, a question of Ukraine's future independence. If Ukraine's leadership cannot overcome the political and economic legacy of the failed Soviet Union, that legacy will drag Ukraine's people backward. The burdens of that Soviet legacy are the greatest challenge to Ukraine's assumption of its proper place in Europe and in the trans-Atlantic community, and those burdens must be overcome.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 120 has a number of very positive things to say about Ukraine. Ukraine must be commended for the success of its political reforms to date. Ukraine has yet to adopt a new constitution that, by clearly defining the separation of powers among the branches of government, would lay a strong foundation upon which to consolidate Ukrainian democracy. Despite that, Ukraine has managed to carry out—in a free and fair manner—its first Presidential and Parliamentary elections as an independent State. Ukraine was also the first of those States that arose from the collapse of the Soviet Union to carry out a peaceful, democratic transfer of executive power. It is the first of those States to place its Ministry of Defense under civilian control. Finally, in June of this year, Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma and the Ukrainian Parliament agreed to an interim political arrangement, pending the adoption of a new constitution. That arrangement should allow the President to move forward with pri-

vatization of State-owned enterprises and other important reforms.

In closing, let me say that the future peace and prosperity of Ukraine also depends greatly on the behavior of its neighbors. The Russian Federation, in particular, should redouble its efforts to achieve a bilateral treaty with Ukraine that clearly accepts and respects Ukraine's independence. Russia should also move quickly to achieve a final and fair agreement with Ukraine on the disposition and basing of the Black Sea fleet. Ukraine has sought to work with Russia on various issues. Most important, Ukraine has agreed to become a nonnuclear State, relinquishing its Soviet-era nuclear weapons to Russia. It is appropriate for Russia to respond in a cooperative spirit by fairly dividing the fleet with Ukraine, paying appropriate compensation for the use of Ukrainian ports or facilities, and recognizing Ukrainian sovereignty. This would be no less than Russia itself would expect with regard to its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Mr. Speaker, Ukraine is the second largest State in all of Europe, with the sixth largest population. House Concurrent Resolution 120 makes clear just how important Ukraine is to the peace, stability, and prosperity of Europe and therefore to the trans-Atlantic community of nations. American can and should play a vital role in helping Ukraine through these difficult times.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the resolution be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

H. CON. RES. 120

Supporting the independence and sovereignty of Ukraine and the progress of its political and economic reforms.

Whereas August 24, 1995, marked the fourth anniversary of the independence of Ukraine;

Whereas the independent State of Ukraine is a member State of the United Nations and the United Nations has established in Ukraine an office to assist Ukraine in building relations with the international community and in coordinating international assistance for Ukraine;

Whereas the independent State of Ukraine is a member State of the Council of Europe, the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the North Atlantic Cooperation Council of the North Atlantic Alliance, is a participant in the Partnership for Peace program of the North Atlantic Alliance, and has entered into a Partnership and Cooperation Agreement with the European Union and has been accepted for membership in the Central European Initiative in 1996;

Whereas the United States recognized Ukraine as an independent State on December 25, 1991, and established diplomatic relations with Ukraine on January 2, 1992;

Whereas Ukraine is a major European nation, having the second largest territory and sixth largest population of all the States of Europe;

Whereas Ukraine has an important geopolitical and economic role to play within Central and Eastern Europe and a strong, stable, and secure Ukraine serves the interests of peace and stability in all of Europe, which is also an important national security interest of the United States;

Whereas Ukraine conducted its first presidential and parliamentary elections as an independent State in 1994, carrying such elections out in a free and fair manner and moving further away from the former communist model of one-party, centralized, totalitarian rule;

Whereas Ukraine's presidential elections of July 1994 resulted in the first peaceful trans-

fer of executive power in any of the independent States of the former Soviet Union;

Whereas in June 1995, through peaceful cooperation and compromise, the President and Parliament of Ukraine reached a political accord meant to better define the balance of powers between the executive and legislative branches of government, pending the adoption of a new constitution for Ukraine;

Whereas Ukraine is the first of the independent states of the former Soviet Union to appoint a civilian to the office of Minister of Defense;

Whereas Ukraine is pursuing political and economic reforms intended to ensure its future strength, stability, and security and to ensure that it will assume its rightful place among the international community of democratic States and in European and trans-Atlantic institutions;

Whereas through the agreement by the Government of Ukraine to the establishment of a mission from the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe in the region of Crimea, Ukraine has shown its interest in avoiding the use of force in resolving ethnic and regional disputes within Ukraine;

Whereas Ukraine has taken very positive steps in supporting efforts to stem proliferation of nuclear weapons by ratifying the START I Treaty on nuclear disarmament and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, thereby relinquishing nuclear weapons it possessed after the dissolution of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

Whereas in December 1994, the Presidents of the United States and the Russian Federation and the Prime Minister of Great Britain signed a Memorandum on National Security Assurances for Ukraine as depository States under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons;

Whereas the Secretary of Defense of the United States and the Minister of Defense of Ukraine signed a Memorandum of Understanding on cooperation in the field of defense and military relations on July 27, 1993;

Whereas Ukraine has sought to promote constructive cooperation with its neighbors through humanitarian assistance and through mediation of disputes;

Whereas Ukraine has provided Ukrainian troops as part of the international peacekeeping force meant to prevent the spread of conflict in the states of the former Yugoslavia; and

Whereas Ukraine has played a vital role in preventing the emergence of a coercive military bloc on the territory of the former Soviet Union by representing the interests of the smaller states that are members of the organization known as the Commonwealth of Independent States; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) Ukraine has made significant progress in political reform in its first 4 years of independence and that it is to be congratulated for the successful conduct of free and fair elections for the presidency and parliament;

(2) the territorial integrity of Ukraine in its existing borders is an important element of European peace and stability;

(3) the President and Parliament of Ukraine should continue their strong efforts to agree upon and submit to the Ukrainian people for their approval a new democratic constitution providing for a proper balance of power between the branches of government;

(4) the Government of Ukraine should continue its efforts to ensure the rights of all citizens of Ukraine regardless of their ethnic or religious background;

(5) the Government of Ukraine should continue and accelerate its efforts to transform

its economy, abandoning the failed economic policies of the former communist regime and ensuring that programs meant to ensure the success of economic reform receive strong support at all levels of government;

(6) the Government of Ukraine should, in particular, proceed with the privatization of state-owned enterprises in a very expeditious manner;

(7) the Government of Ukraine should, in particular, place a high priority on the adoption of those laws necessary to ensure the continued growth of an economy based on market mechanisms, private enterprise, and the right to private property;

(8) the Government of Ukraine should continue its effort to arrive at an agreement with the "G-7" group of States whereby the nuclear reactors at Chernobyl, Ukraine, might be shut down in a safe and expeditious manner;

(9) the President of the United States should support continued United States assistance to Ukraine for its political and economic reforms, for the safe and secure dismantlement of its weapons of mass destruction, and for the increased safety of operation of its civilian nuclear reactors, and assistance for the establishment of rule of law, for criminal justice and law enforcement training, and for the promotion of trade and investment;

(10) the President of the United States should insist that the Government of the Russian Federation, in line with the assurances for the security of Ukraine made by the President of the Russian Federation in the January 1994 Trilateral Statement on Nuclear Disarmament in Ukraine, fully and finally recognize Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity and refrain from any economic coercion of Ukraine;

(11) the Government of Ukraine should continue to act in defense of its sovereignty and that of the other independent states of the former Soviet Union by opposing the emergence of any collective military bloc on the territory of the former Soviet Union whose primary purpose would be the re-creation of that failed state or the reintegration into one political entity of those nations once held captive by it;

(12) the President of the United States should express the support of the United States for Ukraine's insistence that it be provided with appropriate rent or compensation for the use of its bases, ports or other facilities on its territory under appropriately negotiated and ratified agreements and treaties;

(13) the President of the United States should ensure that Ukraine's national security interests are fully considered in any revision of the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe that may be agreed to by the signatories to that agreement;

(14) the President of the United States should work to ensure that Ukraine's interests as an integral part of Central and Eastern Europe are fully considered in any review of European security arrangements and understandings;

(15) the President of the United States should support continued United States security assistance for Ukraine, including assistance for training of military officers, military exercises as part of the North Atlantic Alliance's Partnership for Peace program, and appropriate military equipment to assist Ukraine in maintaining its defensive capabilities as it reduces its military force levels;

(16) the President of the United States should ensure the United States Government's continued efforts to assist Ukraine in its accession to the World Trade Organization; and should ensure, in particular, that the potential for aerospace and space co-op-

eration and commerce between the United States and Ukraine is fully and appropriately exploited; and

(17) as a leader of the democratic nations of the world, the United States should continue to support the people of Ukraine in their struggle to bring peace, prosperity, and democracy to Ukraine and to the other independent states of the former Soviet Union.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes 863 and 864. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on both rollcall votes.

I would ask unanimous consent that these votes be placed in the appropriate place in the permanent RECORD.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO MARIE
ELIZABETH ZEMAN ENGBERG

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Marie Elizabeth Zeman Engberg, who will celebrate her 100th birthday this Saturday, December 16, 1995. Ms. Engberg is a long-time resident of San Leandro in California's 13th Congressional District. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Ms. Engberg on reaching this milestone, but also to recognize her for achieving something that may be even more distinguished. At this time, she has accumulated over 23,360 hours of volunteer work in the disabled American veteran medical system in California's bay area.

Ms. Engberg was born on December 16, 1895, in Pittsburgh, PA, to immigrant parents. She spent her early years in Kensington, Canada, and later moved to Crosby, ND, where she married a World War I soldier. She moved on to Lawrence, KS, and then to Tarkio, MO. Ms. Engberg made her living by working in the corn fields. While living in a tent, she volunteered to cook for the other field hands. She believes that this was the beginning of her volunteer spirit. She also worked the carnivals before she traveled to Alameda, CA, where she finally settled. She took a job at Bethlehem Shipyards in a machine shop and made her home in the projects, which, at that time, were at the west end of the island of Alameda. After the war ended, she worked in the insurance industry until she retired at age 65.

After her retirement, Ms. Engberg continued to volunteer at VA hospitals in Oakland and later at the Martinez facility. As late as 1990, at the age of 95, she attended a VAVS meeting in Martinez. She joined the DAV Auxiliary, chapter 7, in Oakland, in 1949, and has been an active member ever since. In 1954, she served as the chapter's commander. She has represented the chapter at national conventions all over the United States.

Ms. Engberg is also a member of Rebekah Lodge No. 19 and has two children. Her

daughter is also an active volunteer and her son has served as California State Commander of the DAV and the AMVETS.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in saluting Ms. Engberg for her great spirit and to wish her a very happy 100th birthday.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO UNITED STATES TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

SPEECH OF

HON. PAT DANNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1995

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to have grave reservations about the United States' mission to Bosnia and this concern is reflected in my votes on this issue. I do not believe we should agree to the placement of American men and women in harm's way without the support of the American people, which I do not believe exists. I fear that the mission could result in a significant loss of American lives without accomplishing the goal of peace in the Balkans.

I have listened closely to the arguments made in support of sending troops. I have not yet been convinced that the parties to the agreement are completely willing to accept the terms of the agreement, nor am I convinced that they have complete control over the people they represent.

One of my chief concerns with the peace agreement continues to be the individual interpretations of the terms by the leaders. For example, Croat authorities released a jailed military commander who was under indictment by the international war crimes tribunal for atrocities. This action knowingly violated one of the major provisions of the Balkan peace agreement. This type of blatant and self-serving disregard for the terms of the agreement certainly does not bode well for the peace agreement and the United States mission. Because of this, I am concerned that a mission intended to keep the peace could quickly become a military engagement similar to what transpired in Somalia.

In closing, however, it is important to note that like the many other Americans opposed to the mission, I will be supportive of our troops as they are committed to Bosnia.

ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST AFRICAN-AMERICAN TO SERVE IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SPEECH OF

HON. BARBARA-ROSE COLLINS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1995

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commemorate the 125th anniversary of the election to Congress of the first African-American Member. Clearly, the highest honor we could bestow on the Honorable Joseph Hayne Rainey is to assure him that the

struggle he began in this Congress 125 years ago, is being carried on today by some of us who still recognize that racial inequality and discrimination—two of the issues Congressman Rainey struggle valiantly against—continue to impact important policy decisions of this body. We saw it in our consideration of the sentencing guidelines relating to crack cocaine. We see it in the ongoing emphasis of the majority to put more of our citizens in prison, as opposed to investing in education and jobs. It is visible in the efforts by some to reduce the liability for white collar crime and securities fraud. We see it this week in the foreign operations appropriations measure which provides billions of foreign aid to some individual countries, while completely annihilating aid to the entire region of the sub-Saharan African countries. Another example is the announced effort in the coming session to eliminate affirmative action programs, without taking other effective steps to correct racial discrimination in that all important area of meaningful employment.

I believe that all of these important issues and others like them would be of great concern to Congressman Joseph Hayne Rainey, if he were here today. And I want him to know that partly due to the inspiration of his efforts and memory—many of us are still here working in support of his cause. Thank you Congressman Rainey. We will continue the fight.

LEGISLATION TO ALLOW HEALTH PROVIDERS TO PAY FEES FOR INITIAL CERTIFICATIONS

HON. BLANCHE LAMBERT LINCOLN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, budget policies imposed by Congress have placed the American health care system in a catch-22. Hundreds of new specialized health treatment facilities stand idle today because of conflict-rules coming out of Washington.

I rise today to introduce commonsense legislation that will restore order to the havoc wreaked upon health care providers by Washington. Here is the problem:

No. 1, Republican budget policy encourages health care providers to reduce costs by establishing specialized facilities that segregate certain health treatments, such as rural health clinics and hospices, from the mainstream hospital population.

No. 2, Medicare regulations require initial certification of new health treatment facilities in order to receive Government reimbursement for eligible treatment.

No. 3, initial certifications of new health facilities are currently on hold in several States due to severe budget cuts imposed by the Republican-led Congress.

No. 4, Federal rules do not provide any other means to pay for initial certifications.

My legislation simply gives the States the authority to charge fees to health providers to cover the cost of inspections. If passed, an orderly system of initial inspections can resume and good, sensible health policy can go into effect.

I have heard from representatives of many of the 41 health facilities in Arkansas which are standing idle and empty while awaiting initial certifications. All have stated they are more than willing to pay the cost of certification if it will help expedite the opening of these much-needed facilities.

Robert Pear reported in the New York Times on November 25 that this particular problem was "a case study of what might be in store for GOP plans after spending reductions." In the past 5 years, the number of hospices has more than doubled and the number of rural health clinics has more than quadrupled. Health facilities such as these are trying to meet the growing health care needs of our citizens at less cost to the American public. If these facilities are forced to stay closed because of bogus regulations and budget cuts by Congress, then it is the people who need health care who ultimately lose out.

Mr. Speaker, let's not tie the hands of our health care providers who are trying to meet our requests. I urge my colleagues to support my commonsense solution to this problem and allow our health providers to care for America's patients.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT P. ZERBOLIO

HON. JERRY WELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, today, I'd like to honor the retirement of Robert P. Zerbolio, commander's representative of the Joliet Army Ammunition Plant.

Born in Coal City, IL, Mr. Zerbolio began a career in civil service on April 1, 1962, with the ammunition procurement on supply agency in Joliet, IL. As an engineering technician in the technical data division, Mr. Zerbolio was a dedicated and hard-working civil servant.

Because of his expertise and work ethic, Mr. Zerbolio became the supervisor of the foreign military sales branch and held that position until 1973 when he left civil service for the private sector.

In November 1983, Mr. Zerbolio rejoined civil service as an industrial specialist on the contracting officer representative staff at the Joliet Army Ammunition Plant. He served in that position until 1993 when he was promoted to his current job.

Mr. Zerbolio is the type of civil servant who is loyal, diligent, and has a proven record of achievement. He will be missed at the Joliet Army Ammunition Plant.

We wish him and his wife, Gloria, and their three daughters much happiness in retirement. And, we thank Mr. Zerbolio for his service to our country as a civil servant.

PEACEBUILDERS CAN SAVE OUR CHILDREN

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an education and crime

prevention program in my district, PeaceBuilders. This innovative program may help save our children and greatly reduce the number of young lives that enter the criminal justice system.

Crime and violence in our schools is a problem high on my list of concerns, for its negative effects touch us all. Having looked for solutions over the years, I feel encouraged by the model used in the PeaceBuilders Program.

In 1992, Dr. Dennis Embry, a licensed child psychologist, started the nationally known violence prevention program called PeaceBuilders. PeaceBuilders has been selected as one of three projects by the Center for Disease Control as a promising national model for elementary school students. The program teaches children to praise people, give up put downs, seek wise adults, notice hurts and right wrongs.

Over 150 schools in 17 states make up the network of PeaceBuilders. Schools participating in the program notice immediate changes in student behavior. The number of student suspensions, playground problems and injuries decrease. What is the magic of this program? The formula includes partnerships between all elements of a child's environment that means active participation by parents, school personnel and the community. The program targets children during the formative years, before habits of aggression are firmly fixed. It is based on the African concept that it takes an entire village to raise a child. Everyone must reinforce the concepts of the program and, therefore, everyone is affected by the program.

I recently visited Emmerton Elementary, a school in my district that has had a PeaceBuilders Program in operation there since March 1994. The program is making a difference. The Emmerton model is providing a means for everyone from custodian to school administrator, businessperson, parent and student to have a role in creating a better world. I was inspired by what I saw at Emmerton.

Inland Agency, a non-profit organization serving the Inland area of Southern California, is the first organization to introduce PeaceBuilders in California and has been successful in launching it since March of 1994 in 87 educational sites throughout San Bernardino and Riverside counties. Inland agency serves as the link between the schools, business, civic and community organizations to help secure sponsorships and to provide local trainers and technical assistance. Numerous business and civic organizations including State Farm Insurance, TARGET, Rotary, and Kiwanis have undertaken volunteer projects and have provided financial sponsorship of the PeaceBuilders Program for elementary schools throughout the Inland area.

In the Inland Empire over 31,020 students are enrolled in PeaceBuilder programs and are learning to be builders of peace. In 1996, Inland Agency projects an enrollment of 40,000 to 60,000 students. It is possible to create a better environment in our respective cities if we work together (families, schools, businesses and law enforcement) to nurture the seeds of peace that PeaceBuilders has given us.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO U.S. TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

SPEECH OF

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1995

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, today, we asked to vote on three measures regarding the deployment of United States troops to Bosnia. Ten days ago, I joined 14 of my colleagues from the House and Senate on a factfinding trip to Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, and Croatia. I did so because I wanted to fully understand the implications of the United States being involved in the Balkans. We meet with the Presidents of the Yugoslav Republic, Croatia, and Bosnia, the United States Army, and NATO Commanders, as well as U.N. military authorities. And we all saw images in Sarejevo I'm sure we'll never forget.

The devastation is staggering beyond comprehension around Sarajevo—the host of the 1984 Winter Olympics. Once a city of 500,000, its population, it has been reduced in half. Virtually every building is damaged. Electricity, water, sewer, and other basic services are sporadic. Most troubling, however, is the human toll—many thousands of civilians have been killed in the conflict and there are perhaps as many as 3 million Balkan refugees scattered across Europe. They are the innocent victims of this conflict. It was obvious to all on our trip that life will never be the same for those who live in this troubled region of the world.

Now, the President has made a decision to send 20,000 Americans to Bosnia to join with other NATO Forces in implementing the peace agreement. I think the policy that led to this decision was wrong. But the question of whether we should have gone there is largely moot. It now matters only that we succeed. This raises the question of how we should define success.

I believe that success should be defined as minimizing casualties to U.S. troops and ensuring the peace we enforce for 12 months can endure beyond that period. Regarding the safety of our troops, I am convinced our military is capable of protecting themselves and enforcing peace while they are there. Make no mistake, this is a tough assignment and it carries with it the dangers inherent to any military operation in a potentially hostile environment. However, our troops are well-trained, their mission is well-defined, and they have the requisite firepower and clear rules of engagement to protect themselves. Morale is high and I am confident they are well-prepared for the mission ahead.

I remain, however, doubtful about the prospects for long-term peace in the region. The NATO Forces have established a self-imposed 1-year deadline for the departure of troops. It hardly seems plausible that a 1-year respite in the fighting will be sufficient to secure the lasting peace contemplated by the Dayton Agreement and coveted by the people of that war-torn region.

It has been my consistent view that a stable military balance is essential to achieve lasting peace in the Balkans. That means, in my

view, during the next year, the Bosnian military must be armed and trained in the use of weapons. If the deployment of American peacekeepers is inconsistent with an active effort to arm the Bosnians—by whomever—as some of our allies and some in Congress assert, then American peacekeepers should not be deployed because lasting peace cannot be achieved because of the extreme military imbalance that exists today. We must have a commitment from our allies on this issue in advance or this mission will almost certainly be doomed to failure. It is impossible to imagine the Bosnian Republic living in harmony without a sufficiently armed and trained Bosnian military force. I am disappointed that, in the House of Representatives, we have not had the opportunity to consider initiatives to compel the administration to extract such a commitment from our allies.

Furthermore, I see little in the peace accord to address the monumental problem of the nearly 3 million refugees who have been displaced from their homes. While the agreement calls for these people to return to their homes and villages in territories controlled by former enemies, it provides no guarantees of security for them. If the Bosnians, Serbs, and Croats cannot return to their homes with assurances of safety, it is a virtual certainty that they will remain refugees, with all the attendant problems such a massive population displacement will cause. It could easily lead to a situation similar to that which has plagued Israel and Palestine for over 40 years.

Despite my reservations about the wisdom of the President's decision to deploy United States forces to Bosnia, now that the decision to deploy them has been made, I am committed to providing full support to our troops. I will vote now, and in the future, to provide them with whatever resources are deemed necessary to allow them to accomplish their mission. Certainly, the brave men and women serving in our Armed Forces deserve no less.

TRIBUTE TO COL. VLADIMIR SOBICHEVSKY

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a great military leader, U.S. Army Col. Vladimir Sobichevsky. The colonel retires from the U.S. Army this month after serving for the last 3 years as the commandant of the Defense Language Institute located in my district.

A native of Russia, Sobichevsky fled the former Soviet Union with his mother in 1943. Settling in Germany, the two emigrated to the United States from a displaced persons camp in 1949. He enlisted in the U.S. Army just 7 years later, joining the first Special Forces group.

At the time, Sobichevsky said he was motivated to become a soldier because you could earn U.S. citizenship by serving in the Armed Forces for 5 years. He recently told a reporter:

I was going to join the Marines. I kind of fell into the Special Forces. I was the dumbest kid you could've met, with virtually no education, due probably to a poor start in life.

I was standing in a drugstore in Geary Street in San Francisco, reading a magazine,

and I saw an article titled "The Apes of Rath," about Colonel Rath, who was putting together the first Special Forces group. I thought they had nice headgear, the green beret.

I joined the Army without any idea of what I was getting into. I began to realize it at the Airborne School at Fort Benning (Georgia).

And after nearly 40 years in uniform, there is little doubt that Sobichevsky made the right choice. Indeed, his career in the Army has been very distinguished. Completing three tours of duty in Germany, two tours in Korea, and one in Panama, Sobichevsky saw combat first in Laos as part of the White Star initiative and then in the Military Assistance Command Vietnam's Studies and Observation Group.

After earning both bachelor's and master's degrees in government from the University of San Francisco, Sobichevsky also graduated from the Army Command and General Staff College and the National War College.

After serving as operations director for the Special Operations Command, Pacific, Colonel Sobichevsky was transferred to the Defense Language Institute, which will mark its 50th anniversary next year as the premier military institution for foreign language instruction in support of national security requirements for all four military services.

During his 3-year tenure at DLI, the largest language training institution in the world, Sobichevsky is credited with incorporating the school into the network of Monterey Bay educational and language facilities. DLI now works cooperatively with other Monterey Bay institutions of higher learning dedicated to foreign language training, including the Monterey Institute of International Studies and the Naval Postgraduate School. The consortium of institutions that provide graduate-level training in foreign language in the Monterey Bay area have a strong leader in Colonel Sobichevsky and DLI.

More importantly, the commandant has improved the training at DLI. "Our goal is to have students achieve a Level II proficiency in listening comprehension, reading and speaking," Sobichevsky said. "That's not a native speaker, but that's pretty darned good."

According to Sobichevsky, while just 12 percent of DLI graduates had level II proficiency in 1985, 64 percent have it this year.

"I don't want to take credit," Sobichevsky modestly added. "We built on the building blocks of previous commandants. The credit goes to the 650 faculty, seven school deans, 80 military language instructors. They deserve the credit."

As each student who has received language training at DLI will attest, Sobichevsky is to be commended for enhancing the language preparedness of its students. Colonel Sobichevsky is a soldier's soldier and deserves the Nation's heartfelt appreciation for his military service.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1995

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, there were a number of environmental matters in this year's

DOD authorization bill that fell within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce, and for which Chairman BLILEY and I served as conferees. The first issue related to reforms of so-called restoration advisory boards, which are community involvement organizations developed by the Department of Defense to ensure citizen participation in decisionmaking on environmental cleanups of DOD facilities. The Commerce Committee is very concerned that the bill's provisions may ultimately have the effect of putting an inappropriate burden on the Superfund trust fund, and I understand that an exchange of letters between Chairmen BLILEY and SPENCE will be included in the record of this debate. I simply rise to emphasize the point, and to assure my colleagues that, as the Commerce Committee considers its Superfund reform legislation in 1996, we will be keeping a close eye on this issue.

The second matter of importance to the Committee was a direct amendment to Superfund relating to DOD's ability to lease parcels of its property. We worked closely with the Senator from New Hampshire in the other body to make commonsense reforms in this area. Nevertheless, the Commerce Committee clearly retains jurisdiction over these provisions, and I intend to review them as our Superfund reform bill progresses.

COMMENDING SAMUETTA H. DREW, PRINCIPAL OF ANNA STUART DUPUY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN BIRMINGHAM, AL

HON. EARL F. HILLIARD

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following for the RECORD:

Whereas, Dupuy Elementary School under the guidance and leadership of Principal Samuetta H. Drew implemented the ABC's of Etiquette Training Program which has been recognized by CBS Good Morning America Show and CNN's Parenting Today; and

Whereas, Dupuy Elementary School has been instrumental in the development of programs such as the Builders Club, Beta Club, Safety Patrol, Student Council, Scouting and the DARE Program, such programs have help enhanced the organizational skills of our future leaders as well as strenghted their self esteem; and

Whereas, Dupuy Elementary School is involved in positive activities and desiring those things pleasing to God and that the Dupuy Elementary represents the type of educational environment deserving of praise and recognition by all in the Seventh Congressional District: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That I hereby most highly commend Mrs. Samuetta H. Drew all the staff of Anna Stuart Dupuy Elementary School for the Implementation of the ABC's of Etiquette Program, for taking the extra initiative to develop the social and organizational skills of our youngsters and just for a job well done.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO UNITED STATES TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

SPEECH OF

HON. TIM ROEMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1995

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 302 as introduced by Representatives SKELTON and BUYER that would reiterate our serious concerns about the planned deployment of 20,000 United States ground troops to Bosnia to help implement the Dayton peace accord. This resolution also expresses the deep pride and confidence of our Nation in the brave and courageous U.S. troops supporting this complicated and dangerous mission. This is certainly the message that we want to send to our proud men and women in uniform.

Without question, the decision to send United States troops to Bosnia is one of the most difficult foreign policy choices our Nation must confront. The risk our troops will face is real, and the long-term success of the Dayton agreement is far from certain. From the outset, I have been opposed to sending United States troops because the situation in Bosnia does not involve a vital and compelling national interest. This mission is not clearly defined, other than the exit date, and there is a great deal of potential danger and confusion entailed in nation-building. The Dayton accord involves assuring fair and free elections and resettling the refugees. As horrible as this strategy has been, the current situation in Bosnia could be solved with NATO and United Nations assistance.

However, in the event that the remaining 20,000-member contingent of U.S. troops is deployed, we must ensure that our military commanders have everything they need to do their job effectively. Furthermore, we must be certain that the requests of the military commanders in Bosnia will be addressed immediately and completely. Moreover, in the interest of maintaining the moral and confidence in our young men and women in uniform, we must make them understand that their Government and their Nation completely supports their cause and stands behind them in this mission, once the President has sent them into Bosnia.

I certainly welcome all efforts to reach a peace in Bosnia, but I oppose any increased United States military role in this volatile area. American soldiers should be deployed when and if American national interests are at stake. We should deploy our forces when treaties are broken and when our troops are threatened. There may be other circumstances for U.S. involvement. We should reflect these principles in a thoughtful doctrine or policy, not a pick and choose method.

U.S. foreign policy has always come to the defense of sovereign democratic allies that came under external military attack. This is not consistent with the current situation in Bosnia. As heart-wrenching as this tragedy has been, this does not seem to justify the loss of American lives. It is certainly not something I can justify to my constituents, who have sons and daughters who may not come home.

One can only wonder how meaningful a peace agreement is when it requires 60,000

foreign troops, including 20,000 Americans to enforce it. As horrible as this tragedy has been, the current situation in Bosnia might be solved without American troops. In fact, General Shalikhshvili testified that from a strictly military perspective, the task of implementing a peace accord in Bosnia could be accomplished solely by European forces. The United States can and probably should bring some unique support capabilities to any peacekeeping operation, but these would not require a ground presence of up to 20,000 U.S. troops.

We were also told that the United States must play a leading role on the ground because the United States is the leader of NATO and that Alliance solidarity would crumble if we did not. However, to argue that the credibility and effectiveness of NATO rest upon committing American forces to an ill-defined peacekeeping mission is suspect. In fact, the strains of a prolonged military deployment, in support of ambiguous objectives could do more to pull the alliance apart in the long run than to solidify it.

Our message should be, "Do not send our young men and women to Bosnia," and I agree strongly with that message. This body should say "No" right now to a mission that lacks concrete strategic objectives. I have voted twice to do this.

As we have learned from Somalia and Haiti, we cannot put troops in harm's way in a foreign country without a clear, achievable objective and a clearly defined exit strategy. It is a recipe for disaster and we certainly cannot put those lives on the line without an American chain of command.

I do not rise in support of this resolution to undermine our President. I am an ardent supporter of our Armed Forces, and I am a strong supporter of humanitarian aid to the people of Bosnia. I support the resolution for the same reason that I voted against lifting the arms embargo against the Governments of Bosnia and Herzegovina: to prevent the Americanization of the Balkan conflict and save American lives. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO UNITED STATES TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

SPEECH OF

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I support House Resolution 302, but with one important objection. I support it because I have severe reservations about the President's policy and implementation plan. Specifically, it is not at all clear to me that the situation in Bosnia will be any better after our troops depart 1 year from now. This is because, in my view, the plan fails to articulate the kind of explicit objectives and success criteria necessary for the success of such a deployment. What exactly do we expect to achieve over the next 12 months in order to preserve peace, and how will we know whether we've succeeded when the appointed exit time arrives? Unless these questions are answered more satisfactorily, our

troops could very well be placed in harm's way on a mission based more on good intentions than on reasoned expectations.

The resolution also declares that the House "is confident that the members of the United States Armed Forces, in whom it has the greatest pride and admiration, will perform their responsibilities with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary courage," a confidence I fully share and wish deeply to express.

However, I object to paragraph (5) of section 2 of the resolution, which states that "the United States Government in all respects should be impartial and evenhanded with all parties to the conflict." I disagree with this provision because of my longstanding support of lifting the arms embargo to permit the Bosnian Government to defend itself against Bosnian Serb aggression, a cause for which I also have supported United States financial assistance. In fact, I believe that if anything of lasting value can be achieved by the President's plan, it is to achieve this necessary military balance. This paragraph contradicts that essential objective and I must object to its inclusion in a resolution otherwise deserving of support.

TRIBUTE TO DR. LEWIS J. MINOR

HON. DICK CHRYSLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues the unique contributions of a 20th century icon in the American food service field—Dr. Lewis J. Minor.

As an inventor, entrepreneur, educator, and generous benefactor, Dr. Minor's career has been one of honor and pride to an industry that is fundamental to all Americans, yet this story is largely unknown.

Like Thomas Edison and Alexander Graham Bell, Lewis J. Minor was a visionary who brought his solution to a basic human need to market with startling success.

A food scientist by training, Dr. Minor worked with his wife Ruth in their family kitchen to develop a variety of food bases that condensed the savory essence of poultry, vegetables, beef, pork, and seafood for use by professional chefs. Using their own children as blind-folded tasters, the Minors discovered the secret techniques that would save chefs hours of tedious labor in their kitchens, and allow all of America to enjoy an excellent cuisine that previously had been available only to the wealth elite.

Now a staple in virtually every professional kitchen, L. J. Minor food bases were launched in 1951 when Dr. Minor left his secure job as a respected corporate technical director at age 37 and set up shop in a single room with \$7,500, mostly borrowed, a loaned Hobart mixer, and his dreams. After nearly a decade of struggle—moving first into a former horse barn and later to a converted car wash—the Minor food bases caught on, largely through word-of-mouth among experienced chefs.

From the outset Dr. Minor stressed quality and customer satisfaction above all else. Upon launching the L. J. Minor Corporation he stated, "The tenets upon which I shall build my business will be honesty, integrity, accuracy,

kindness, punctuality, courtesy, friendliness, and cleanliness. I will endeavor always to be fair and helpful, not only to employees, my management team and stockholders, but also to customers, Government agencies, and competitors."

Today, the L. J. Minor Corporation is housed in an expansive plant in Cleveland and its products are sold and highly respected around the world. As an Horatio Alger story about a dedicated inventor and industrialist who made good, the tale of Lewis J. Minor would be worth telling. But that's only part of this extraordinary man's saga.

In 1961, with wealth and accolades to last a lifetime, Dr. Minor made a pivotal decision—he went back to school and in a sense started over. In 1964, he received his Ph.D. from Michigan State University's food service program with the sole intent of sharing with the upcoming generation of hospitality professionals his vast knowledge of food science and his personal vision of the importance of an unwavering commitment to excellence.

Balancing his duties as president of a major food manufacturer with the growing legion of devoted students he taught at Michigan State, Dr. Minor has left an indelible imprint on his industry that would be difficult to overstate.

Although he sold off his interest in the L.J. Minor Corporation some years back, Dr. Minor remains a dominant force in American food service education, and one of its most generous benefactors. He has written or coauthored 12 books and numerous articles in the field, and has donated millions of dollars to help students in the programs at Michigan State, Cornell, the Culinary Institute of America, Purdue, Johnson and Wales, the University of Nevada-Las Vegas, and through the continuing education programs of the American Culinary Federation.

Much is made these days of importance of family values, and Dr. Minor embodies this term at its finest. Beyond his devotion to his wife Ruth over the 57 years of their marriage and to their 8 grown children and their grandchildren, Dr. Minor has extended his family through the years to embrace countless students who came to consider the Minor's house their second home. It is interesting to note that many of Dr. Minor's pupils have gone on to become distinguished food service industry and educational leaders in their own right.

A new book entitled *Always in Good Taste: The L.J. Minor Story*, has been written with the assistance of John Knight, captures the philosophies and accomplishments of this distinguished American for those who would like to learn about a successful man who is not above extending a helpful hand to anyone who will take it. His example should be remembered always.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, due to the death of my mother-in-law, Mrs. Norah Lehtinen, I was unable to vote "yes" on House Joint Resolution 132 expressing the sense of Congress in favor of a 7-year balanced budget.

HONORING DAN W. ECKSTROM

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a leader of the Tucson community and a dear friend of many years. In this holiday season, I am especially grateful for the services that Dan W. Eckstrom provides to the Second Congressional District of Arizona as an outstanding elected official and a dedicated public servant. Dan has long been an activist for children's programs and for senior citizen programs in Pima County, AZ, but it is during this time of year that his caring for these two groups is especially evident. On December 22, 1995, Dan will host his 28th annual Christmas party for the needy children of South Tucson and the Pasqua Yaqui tribe. At this event, more than 2,000 children will receive gifts and toys; for many of them, these will be the only gifts they will receive this holiday season. In working all year for this event, Dan organizes the gifts, food, and volunteers and is solely responsible for the events' tremendous success. In addition, Dan organizes, packs, and personally distributes 400 fruit baskets to senior citizens.

Dan's work for the community began at the age of 9 when he walked various precincts for candidates who pledged to help the disadvantaged residents of south Tucson. At age 24, Dan was elected to the South Tucson city Council and 2 years later, he was elected mayor of South Tucson. He held the distinction for many years of being the youngest mayor ever elected in the State of Arizona. He served his constituents well and continued as mayor for 20 years.

In 1988, he expanded his services to all of Pima County, becoming a member of the Pima County Board of supervisors. He continues to serve in that capacity today.

In his capacity as an elected official and as a private citizen, Dan has always been the voice of those in need, and he has tirelessly worked to extend to all members of our society the opportunities to succeed. To this end, Dan has been a strong advocate of small business and the free enterprise system. He has also supported and endorsed worker protection and unions.

Dan has served on many boards and commissions with distinction. His awards and community recognitions span 41 years and are from almost every group that works or serves the south side of Tucson.

Dan W. Eckstrom is a citizen of merit for his community, his State, and his country. I applaud his energy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing one of our most devoted and admirable citizens, Mr. Dan W. Eckstrom.

TIMELY INTELLIGENCE: IMPORTANT AS EVER IN THE POST-COLD-WAR ERA

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to reduce the size of our military forces and their

presence overseas, it is imperative that intelligence—this Nation's early warning system—is better than ever in this post-cold-war era. As a combat veteran of World War II, I vividly remember how an intelligence failure contributed to the tragedy at Pearl Harbor in December 1941. Within the Roosevelt administration there were scattered bits of information as to what the Japanese might be contemplating. But, there was no one pulling together and analyzing them as part of a coordinated effort to furnish the President with an intelligence estimate of Japan's intentions.

Indeed, it was the painful lesson of Pearl Harbor that prompted then President Truman to establish after World War II a centralized intelligence organization. We must, therefore, resist efforts to dismantle or cripple U.S. intelligence. U.S. intelligence capabilities are critical instruments of our national power and an integral part of our national security. With that historical background, I would like to offer some observations and recommendations.

THE DOWNSIDE OF DOWNSIZING

I have been told that the downsizing of the intelligence community's work force has been especially injurious in key areas. In some agencies, these reductions have allegedly exceeded 80 percent. For example, most of the seasoned Russian military analysts, including those performing highly complex analyses on strategic missile systems, are reportedly moving on or taking early retirement while the remaining talented young analysts are looking for other job opportunities that promise more advancement. Meanwhile, the intelligence community is being tasked to address a wider range of threats and policy needs, especially in the areas of proliferation, economic competitiveness, environment, drugs, terrorism, and humanitarian relief. Currently, warning of potential regional crises and providing support to NATO and U.N. forces in the Balkans are absorbing major resources. These rapidly increasing demands do not include the day-to-day crises that consume additional collection and research resources.

The upshot is a growing concern that intelligence is being stretched to the breaking point. This could have serious implications downstream. For example, if another Russian crisis were to occur—such as Yeltsin's attack on Parliament in 1993—the intelligence community today would be less able to warn of military mobilization. Informed sources claim, until recently, analysis and collection on the deception and denial activities of potential adversaries had dropped to dangerously low levels. Purportedly, remedial action is underway. This should be a high priority, as interpreting warnings of attack will become more difficult as adversaries improve their denial and deception techniques. We must remember that U.S. intelligence's highest mission is to support U.S. policymakers in identifying and forestalling threats to U.S. interests worldwide. How to do this in an era of shrinking resources poses real risks and challenges.

The idea that intelligence can stay abreast of new technology, add new missions and still downsize its personnel at a rate of 3 to 5 percent per year is fantasy. Experienced intelligence hands say downsizing must be slowed overall and halted for high priority needs. At a minimum intelligence programs should be reinvigorated in three broad areas to minimize risks to U.S. forces and insure our ability to maintain the capability to act effectively in a

major crisis. First, new investment should be dedicated to increasing access to high priority targets including Russia, China, North Korea and the rogue states of the Middle East. We must not forget that Russia and China possess strategic nuclear forces and that their long-term political orientation could turn against the United States if hostile leaders were to gain power again in these megastates. Second, a robust investment program to counter denial and deception should be built to embrace satellite, air, and ground base collection. Such a program must include dedicated analysis of, and attention to denial and deception, especially in areas of highest concern. Third, programmatic and personnel policies must be formed to ensure the brightest talent, with linguistic and cultural expertise, is devoted to the most vital issues that affect U.S. security in the long run, not just to issues of the moment.

COMPETITIVE ANALYSIS—A CARDINAL PRINCIPLE THAT MUST BE PRESERVED

In this era of restructuring, the temptation may be irresistible to eliminate perceived redundancies within the intelligence community. That may be necessary in the hardware and collection areas. But, some competitive analysis must be preserved in the analytical realm, especially in areas like strategic nuclear force analysis where threats to the United States are potentially the gravest. I know I always want a second, and in some instances even a third opinion, when it comes to questions of my health. The Nation's well being often pivots around national security issues. Thus, the President and his key advisors must have a variety of assessments presented to them before they make critical, life and death decisions. Moreover, there should be an established procedure and available resources for pursuing comprehensive challenges to mainstream opinion in any analytical area significant to national security.

COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY

The explosive pace of communication technology is posing new challenges for the intelligence community. Data is moving around the world in greater volumes and at faster speeds than ever before. Maintaining our advantage in understanding secret foreign communications will hinge upon preserving a strong and robust cryptological capability in the face of rapid technological advances. I am concerned, however, about assertions from reliable sources that adequate resources are not being committed to sustaining this capability.

DIRECTORATE OF OPERATIONS (DO)/COUNTER-INTELLIGENCE

The incessant battering the CIA, and the DO in particular, is receiving in the wake of the Ames case has caused morale in the DO to plummet to an all-time low. Much of the criticism is deserved. Nevertheless, there is a real need to be sensitive to this debilitating morale problem as Congress helps the DO remedy the problems cited in the IG's report on the Ames case. I was struck by the serious lack of managerial accountability with respect to the Ames case. Thus, it is very important for the congressional intelligence committees to engage in intensive oversight of what is being done in the counterintelligence area. As far back as 1988, I can recall Dick Cheney joining me in questioning the then DCI, Judge Webster, and others on why the Soviet, Chinese, and Cuba sections of the Operations Directorate were exempted from the Counter-

intelligence Center scrutiny applied to other areas of the world. In retrospect, it appears that this exemption may have contributed to Ames' going undetected so long. Reportedly, this inexplicable anomaly has now been remedied.

Until recently, there did not appear to be a coordinated counterintelligence mission for the Government as a whole. Consequently, no one determined what priorities and resources should be given to each agency. I understand a national counterintelligence strategy has now been developed. If so, it should include the following: First, a system for identifying which secrets are truly critical to the national security, second, assessing those secrets' vulnerability to intelligence threats, third, mandatory counterintelligence training for all intelligence officers, and fourth, establishing professional counterintelligence services within all appropriate agencies and departments.

It is my understanding that the DO is withdrawing to a large extent from certain parts of the world. Budgetary constraints may make this necessary, but it should be very carefully watched. We do not want to repeat the mistake of the late 1970's when the CIA withdrew its presence from key areas of the world only to find shortly thereafter that it had to be reinstated. Therefore, the DO must maintain a surge capability to ensure it can rapidly respond to unexpected emergencies. And for this to be possible, a core network of agents must be sustained in those places deemed momentarily quiescent and unimportant to U.S. security interests.

Recently, there have been disturbing press accounts indicating the CIA is considering new screening criteria for recruiting foreign agents. The general impression conveyed is that henceforth future foreign assets must have the pedigree of Mother Teresa or St. Francis of Assisi. Hopefully, these are exaggerated stories. To expect someone with the moral purity of a saint to penetrate the Cali Cartel is wholly unrealistic. Unfortunately, the harsh reality is that the only way to infiltrate the tightly controlled Colombian drug networks is to recruit someone who has ties to them. The same holds true for terrorist cells. We live in an imperfect world, and we sometimes must join forces with individuals with less than pristine personal histories. After all, during World War II, we allied ourselves with Joe Stalin, one of history's all-time mass murderers, to defeat Hitler.

In an experiment that bears watching, the DI, Directorate of Intelligence, and the DO have begun to colocate their personnel. In other words, the operators and the analysts are working side by side. Given the historical antipathy between these two sharply contrasting cultures, everyone is watching to see if they can work together congenially. If they can, the overall intelligence effort should benefit immeasurably, especially in the area of counterintelligence where—as spy scandals in recent years have demonstrated—there has been a crying need for better analysis. In this partnership, it is crucial that the DI maintain rigorous objectivity to preclude charges that intelligence analysis is being politicized. This problem can only be avoided through strong agency management.

COVERT ACTION

Since the mid-1970's covert action has been seen as an atypical procedure for the conduct of foreign policy. It is imperative to rebuild the

consensus within the United States that once saw covert action as a regular, legitimate means of bolstering the realization of foreign policy objectives. It must not be seen, nor used, as a last resort, panacea, or substitute for policy. Rather, covert action should be employed as a normal tool of U.S. statecraft, designed to work in support of and in conjunction with government's other diplomatic, military, and economic efforts both against traditional and nontraditional targets.

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF INTELLIGENCE
ACTIVITIES

Congress obviously must play a very substantial role in any proposal to restructure and oversee the U.S. intelligence community. In this regard, I first introduced a joint intelligence committee bill in 1984 and a congressional oath of secrecy proposal in 1987 that was inspired by a similar oath taken by Ben Franklin and four other members on the Committee of Secret Correspondence of the Second Continental Congress. The latter has now been adopted in the House, thanks to the efforts of one of my congressional colleagues, PORTER GOSS of Florida.

What prompted these confidence building measures was a desire to make congressional oversight more secure and effective. That can only be accomplished if the membership of the congressional panels trust the intelligence agencies and vice versa. If they trust each other, then both sides can be candid with each other. As former advisor to President Eisenhower, Bryce Harlow, reportedly once said, "Trust is the coin of the realm." Leaks destroy that trust and do great damage to the whole oversight process. Moreover, they can jeopardize lives, as well as vital relationships with foreign agents and friendly intelligence services.

A joint intelligence committee, composed of a small number of key Members from both Chambers of Congress, would substantially reduce the risks of leaks. The fewer people in the loop, the less likelihood of damaging disclosures. Our forefathers clearly recognized this fact of life as they limited knowledge of Revolutionary War secrets to only five Members. Moreover, each of those individuals took his oath of secrecy very seriously. None other than Thomas Paine, the author of "Common Sense," was fired as a staffer of the Secret Correspondence Committee for leaking information concerning France's covert help to our Revolutionary War effort. We should not hesitate to emulate our forefathers and punish those who violate their secrecy pledges and betray the trust bestowed upon them.

INTELLIGENCE PURITY

Periodically during my tenure on the House Intelligence Committee, there were assertions that intelligence assessments were cooked to buttress certain foreign policy objectives. Immunizing the integrity of intelligence is of paramount importance. Thus, I am opposed to any measures that would even smack of tainting objective intelligence. In this connection, two things come to mind. First, is the proposal to abolish the CIA and fold its functions into the Department of State. That is a recipe for cooking intelligence if I ever saw one. Inevitably, there will come a time when the diplomats will pressure their intelligence colleagues down the hall to color an intelligence assessment to justify a foreign policy initiative. Moreover, the more controversial the policy, the greater the risk of politicized intelligence. Second, and re-

lated to the question of cooked intelligence, the Director of Central Intelligence [DCI] must not be viewed as essentially a political operative. Clearly, it is beneficial to the intelligence community if the DCI has the President's confidence, but he or she should not be a policy maker, as are Cabinet members. Rather, he or she should be the President's ultimate intelligence advisor. In short, there must be a firewall erected between intelligence and policy which often is driven by political considerations.

INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO LAW ENFORCEMENT

As chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, I am cognizant of the significant role intelligence plays in supporting law enforcement efforts. I am also very much aware of the tension that often develops between intelligence and law enforcement officials as to how and when intelligence can be used.

Protecting sources and methods is the transcendent concern of every intelligence officer. Prosecutors, however, are looking for information that can be used at trial. If security reasons preclude the use of relevant intelligence, then the prosecutor is left with something that is, at best, of marginal utility. Moreover, constitutional standards of due process and the right to confront one's accusers further complicate the relationship between the intelligence community and law enforcement.

Prosecutors are constitutionally bound, in a criminal trial, to provide all exculpatory evidence and any other evidence that might tend to diminish the government witnesses' credibility. Any information given to law enforcement by the intelligence community is subject to disclosure, for these very reasons. The Classified Information Procedures Act [CIPA] model works quite well for criminal cases countenancing the government's Hobson's choice between prosecution for criminal misdeeds and the protection of sources and methods of confidential national security information. In that context, the difficult choice is rightfully upon the government. But, in nonpunitive circumstances, such as with deportation of individuals shown through classified information to be a threat to the national security if they remain in the country, the same tension exists under current law.

How to reconcile the competing needs and concerns in a deportation matter is a real challenge and one I have attempted to address in the "Comprehensive Antiterrorism Act of 1995" (H.R. 1710). In that bill, we address the frustrating situation where the intelligence community has identified an alien as engaging in terrorist activities while in the United States, but because of the current deportation laws, we cannot expel the alien from the United States without disclosing sensitive information—which could jeopardize lives and the security of this Nation.

In response to this dilemma, a procedure has been developed whereby the alien would get only a declassified summary of the classified evidence against him. All other non-classified evidence is, of course, discoverable.

Unlike CIPA cases, when a situation exists where the provision of a summary to the alien would risk irreparable and significant harm to others, or to the United States, no summary is required and the deportation procedure of the terrorist alien can proceed. The classified evidence, without disclosure to the alien, can be utilized. Because this is not a criminal case, we allow the Government action to proceed

without disclosure of the classified evidence. The liberty interests of the alien are significantly less than those of a criminal defendant, and the national security interests of the United States must be superior to the interests of any noncitizen.

In criminal cases, the defendant stands to be punished—to lose either his life or his freedom for a period of time. The result of a deportation is simply expulsion from the United States—to continue one's life freely and unencumbered, elsewhere. To Americans, life outside the United States may seem oppressive, or certainly less than optimal; but, it is not punishment.

A greater tension exists, however, when the United States is faced with a classified allegation that a legal permanent resident alien is engaging in terrorist activities, and a declassified summary cannot be provided without creating larger risks of harm to others or to the United States. These aliens, as recognized by the Supreme Court, have a greater liberty interest in remaining in the United States than do other nonpermanent aliens. Thus, additional procedures to safeguard the accuracy of the outcome, and the fairness of the procedure, must be established. To that end, in our antiterrorism bill, we established a special panel of cleared attorneys who will be given access to the classified information supporting the terrorism allegation so that they can challenge the reliability of that evidence. This is done to help the court in its determination of whether it should ultimately order the alien's deportation based on the classified information. The cleared attorney would be subject to a 10-year prison term for disclosure of the classified information. Hopefully, this new procedure, when enacted, will facilitate greater sharing of classified information between our intelligence and law enforcement officials, without unduly risking disclosure of sensitive information.

In summary, the world remains a treacherous place in this post-cold-war era. The increasing threat of terrorism, especially against U.S. targets both home and abroad, is just one very important reason for maintaining a robust intelligence capability around the world. To do less ignores the lessons of Pearl Harbor, and all that implies for the security of this great nation.

THANKS TO MAYOR WILLIAM
LYON

HON. JAY DICKEY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, when the Government shut down the first time this year, all of us heard from our constituents about the effects upon them. Let me take this opportunity to recognize a local hero in my district who responded to the shutdown with swift professionalism.

Knowing the shutdown would affect hunters in the region by keeping them from hunting in the Felsenthal Wildlife Refuge, Mayor William Lyon of Fordyce, AK, responded with swift professionalism.

A November 18, 1995, article from the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette highlights well the work of Mayor Lyons:

TAKE A STAND NEAR FORDYCE, HUNTERS TOLD

Need a place to hunt after being tossed out of your stand on a federal wildlife refuge?

Mayor William Lyon of Fordyce has just the place for you.

Call Fordyce City Hall at 352-2198 and a friendly employee will arrange for you to hunt at one of the many deer camps operating in Dallas County. There's no charge for the service.

Lyon said Friday there are an estimated 1,000 deer camps within 50 miles of Fordyce.

"I read in the Democrat-Gazette about what they had done to those people," Lyon said of an article in Wednesday's newspaper about hunters being told to leave the federal refuges. "I thought how I would feel if I was a teen-ager going hunting with my father. I thought about how my grandsons would feel."

The partial shutdown of the federal government has resulted in the closings of seven national wildlife refuge in the state and the displacement of many hunters.

Lions said he knows most of the people running deer camps in the county and can easily put hunters in touch with them.

"It's probably going to create some problems with a lot of moving around, but we are willing to help," Lyon said. "It's possible we might find some good people that would like to come back and pull some industries down here."

Joe Pennington, 55 of Fordyce leases land for his deer camp and said he mainly hunts within a five-mile radius of town.

"There's not room for a whole abundance of people," he said. "But I have some spots where I can put a few people. There are a few others that will take a few for a day or two. "It's a goodwill gesture," Pennington said. "Most sportsmen try to get along."

"We think it's very generous what the mayor has done," said Joe Mosby, spokesman for the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission. "We're tickled to death by it."

Mosby said the closing of federal refuges will not affect the majority of hunters in the state. "But the refuges are very popular," he said. "Those hunters have a real good chance of getting a deer in the refuges."

Lyon said his offer is a result of local officials trying to build on the momentum of their successful Fall Hunting Festival, held Oct. 27. Fordyce Chamber of Commerce President Jim Philips, County Judge Troy Bradley and Lyon have been meeting to discuss ways to promote Fordyce as "the Hunting Capital of Arkansas," Lyon said.

For this effort, we congratulate and honor Mayor Lyons. Perhaps many of us in Congress can learn from his dedication and ability to ensure—despite bureaucratic obstacles—that our constituents are well-served.

MEDICARE REFORM

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, the following op-ed by Pamela G. Bailey ran in the Wall

Street Journal on December 19, 1995. As the debate over Medicare intensifies, I commend Ms. Bailey's op-ed to my colleagues:

SEVEN DOLLARS OF SEPARATION

(By Pamela G. Bailey)

The Medicare debate reached a new low last week, if such a thing is any longer possible, as the AFL-CIO uncorked a giant media and grassroots campaign to attack 55 House members who support the Republican on Draconian GOP "cuts" in Medicare and suggest that there is a huge difference between the Republican plan and the one supported by President Clinton.

What you would never guess from the AFL-CIO campaign is that the division between the two sides comes down to roughly \$7 a month in Medicare premiums. Combined with other reforms, the higher premium for seniors proposed by Republicans will save today's average seven-year-old more than \$140,000 in income taxes over the course of this working life. Congress wants to protect our children from this additional tax hit—after all, they'll already be paying \$300,000 in Medicare payroll taxes over their lifetime. But the president is willing to trade these taxes on our children for a \$7-per-month break for seniors.

Despite this superficial difference, the president's new budget has moved to a near embrace of the Republican position on Medicare. Like the Republicans, Mr. Clinton wants to open a failed government program to the choices of the marketplace. And with notable exceptions, his overall budget numbers are within talking distance of the GOP's. It couldn't have come a moment too soon.

As most people have heard, Medicare Part A—the mandatory, payroll-tax-funded program that pays insurance costs for retirees' hospital, home health, nursing and hospice services—is hurtling toward insolvency and effective shutdown by 2002. And costs for Medicare Part B—the voluntary insurance program that pays doctor, lab, and equipment fees out of general federal revenues and beneficiary premiums—have been rising far faster than the rate of inflation for many years. In its present form, Medicare is quite simply unsustainable, either for the taxpayers who finance it or for the elderly Americans who depend on it. Not much controversy there. And neither, despite all the political noise, is there much controversy over what to do about it.

Congress's plan to preserve Medicare and restrain its costs involves \$1.65 trillion in spending over the next seven years. The president's current plan forecasts \$1.68 trillion in spending during the same period—a \$30 billion, or less than 2%, difference. Both proposals involve better-than-inflation increase in Medicare spending on every enrolled retiree; the Republican budget allows a 62% jump in total spending (to \$7,101 per beneficiary per year), for example. And where the basic structure of the program is concerned, the White House and congressional budgets mirror one another in nearly every essential respect. Except one.

Congress spreads its necessary Medicare savings across every category of program ex-

penditure. The Republican plan brakes projected spending growth on hospitals, doctors, home health providers, nursing homes, lab tests, and medical equipment. And it asks retirees—America's wealthiest age group—to make their own, modest contribution, in the national interest, to the program that benefits them alone. How modest? In the year 2002, at the point where the two competing Medicare proposals most sharply diverge, Congress would have beneficiaries pay a monthly Part B premium \$7 higher than the administration plan envisions.

This is a very small amount of money with very large potential consequences. If the president's current veto holds, and Medicare's structure is left unreformed, its Board of Trustees reports that a steep payroll tax increase will be required to pay for future medical services. The current rate, 2.9%, shared evenly between employees and their companies, will necessarily more than double.

Today's first or second-grader, who enters the labor force in 2010 at age 22, and earns average wages until retiring in 2053, will pay \$450,314 over his working lifetime in Medicare payroll taxes. And by the same accounting assuming revenues needed to keep Medicare in long-term balance, this hypothetical worker will pay over \$200,000 more in lifetime payroll and income taxes under the president's plan—taxes that are unnecessary under the Medicare reform endorsed by Congress. More than two-thirds of this tax difference, or \$140,691, is directly attributable to that \$7 monthly Part B premium increase.

Undeterred by these undeniable facts, the AFL-CIO is sending a million pieces of mail into the districts of its 55 targeted congressmen, placing 500,000 phone calls, handing out leaflets and staging rallies—all designed to punish these elected officials for approving fictitious "massive cuts in Medicare" when they voted for the Republican budget. The labor federation has spent more than \$1 million to put individualized television ads on the air against 22 of these House members. Each spot, over video of a worried elderly woman, ominously (and dishonestly) reports that "he voted to cut Medicare." But no one has voted to cut Medicare this year.

With a provision entirely unrelated to the push for a balanced budget—this treasured program must be fixed and saved whether the budget is balanced or not—Congress has voted to spare the grandchildren of current and future Medicare beneficiaries enough money in taxes to pay for four expensive years of college, or purchase a first home. Is there a grandparent in America who would not pay \$7 a month for that?

Find me one, and I'll eat my hat.