

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CORPORATE LEADERS SHOULD CONTRIBUTE TO BUDGET SACRIFICE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the budget discussions are about fundamentally important issues. For instance, nearly 50 Democratic Members of the House who are prepared to make tough budget choices are asking corporate leaders, who have called for fiscal discipline, to declare the sacrifices they are prepared to make for deficit reduction.

After all, we are talking about some of the richest people in the country, paid millions of dollars a year. And the Republican budget bill will make them richer still, thanks to reduction of the alternative minimum tax, lower capital gains taxes and extended tax loopholes. Some, like ASARCO and Chevron, stand to gain billions from royalty-free giveaways of public resources.

Are they prepared to pay a fair share of corporate taxes, which are just one-third the level in 1954 despite a 14 fold increase in profits?

Will they pay their employees wages and benefits that support a family, so that the taxpayers can stop subsidizing their corporations through welfare, food stamps, Medicaid and tax credits—all targeted for big cuts in the Republican budget?

There is something unseemly about some of the richest people in America demanding a budget that preserves their perks and penalize the poor—many of whom they employ.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 22, 1995.

DEAR SIR: We have seen the recent advertisement which you signed with 90 other CEOs. I am glad to know that we share a common goal of cutting federal budget deficits. You and the other cosigners of the letter make it clear that as corporate leaders you would like entitlements such as Medicare, Medicaid and Food Stamps which affect the nation's poor and elderly be put on the table. Believe us, those items are on the table and are almost certain to take a major hit in any likely resolution of the current impasse.

While it appears you are willing to offer up substantial sacrifice on the part of the nation's poor and elderly, it is not clear what you are willing to put on the table. We would like to know if Corporate America in general and your corporation in particular are willing to play a role beyond offering sacrifice on the part of others. These are some questions which illustrate the possible contributions which corporate America might consider.

CORPORATE TAX BURDEN

During the 1950s Corporate America paid a much bigger share of the cost of government. In 1954, corporate taxes accounted for 30% of all federal revenues. Corporations will pay only 11% of the taxes collected by the federal government this year despite the fact that

corporate profits have increased 14 fold in the intervening years. If the same share of profits were paid in taxes this year as in 1954, the federal deficit would be eliminated in one year with no cuts required in Medicare or any other program. Are you willing to accept a larger share of the federal tax burden, a share more in line with that which corporations bore in the 1950s (a period remembered as a time of growth and prosperity for rich and poor alike)?

ACCEPTING A MINIMUM TAX (REGARDLESS OF LOOPHOLES)

A central proposal in the House Republican budget is to eliminate the Alternative Minimum Tax for corporations such as yours. This would allow numerous large and profitable corporations to exploit tax loopholes and pay no federal taxes whatsoever. Would you commit your corporation to continue to pay the current minimum tax level regardless of the loopholes, deductions and exemptions that the Republicans promise to enact?

WORKER HEALTH BENEFITS

A major cost to the Medicare and Medicaid programs is the additional payments that they and other payers in the health care system must make in order to cover the cost that hospitals, clinics and physicians incur treating the more than 30 million Americans who have no health benefits. Most of these uninsured patients are either employed or are dependents of Americans who have jobs but not health care coverage. How many of your employees do not have full health care coverage? Are you willing to extend coverage to those employees so that the federal government, private individuals and corporations don't have to continue picking up the tab?

PAYMENT OF LIVING WAGES

Millions of Americans who have full time jobs, earn too little money to support their families. As a result, many workers qualify for Food Stamps, the Earned Income Tax Credit and numerous other federal programs. How much do your lowest paid workers make? How many of your workers are a drain on the federal treasury because they are being paid less than the amount required to feed, clothe and provide minimal shelter to their family? What is the current multiple of the salary and benefits received by your lowest paid workers and that paid to you and your senior executives? How has that multiple changed over time? If your company would return to the multiple that it maintained during the 1950s, how much would it allow lower rung wages to rise and how much would that reduce the drain that your employees place on federal programs?

PAYING YOUR FAIR SHARE TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

The federal government has attempted to improve the quality of local schools by making direct federal payments to local school districts so that they can hire more qualified teachers, reduce classroom size and toughen academic requirements. Those efforts are now facing substantial cutbacks as the result of various budget balancing proposals. At the same time American corporations are forcing local communities to bid against each other, offering up huge tax concessions to persuade you to locate facilities in their area. Many of those tax concessions come directly out of the budgets of local school dis-

tricts. Is your company willing to cease such practices and is it further willing to pay the appropriate level of taxes in communities where it is now located without respect to earlier tax concessions made by those communities? That would do a great deal to help build a better trained and educated workforce that in the end would be a real boon to corporate America. Further, it would help offset the decline in federal funds that the schools are likely to experience if this budget package is adopted.

HELPING EMPLOYEES BE BETTER PARENTS

The federal government provides grants to local communities to provide child care simply because many employers refuse to do so despite indications that on site day care improves productivity, employee retention and loyalty. In addition, it helps workers be better parents and that results in a better, stronger society in which corporations can expect to be more profitable. Would you be willing to reduce the need for federal grants for daycare assistance by extending daycare services to a larger share of your employees.

CEASE BUDGET BUSTING LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Many corporations hire lobbyists that actually encourage the federal government to spend *more*—not less—money, provided that the money will flow into corporate coffers. This year for example corporate lobbyists succeeded in persuading the Congress to spend \$7 billion more at the Department of Defense than the Department had requested. Much of this went for new procurement of fancy new weapon systems which the military had not asked for but which will produce fat contracts and subcontracts for many of the Fortune 500. It might help to balance the budget if Corporate executives such as yourself made a commitment not to send lobbyists to Washington to ask Congress to spend money that the Pentagon and other portions of the Executive Branch are not asking for. Would you make that commitment?

A FAIRER DISTRIBUTION OF THE INDIVIDUAL TAX BURDEN

Most senior executives in America's largest corporations benefit from not only the highest salaries of corporate leaders anywhere in the world, but stock option and benefit packages which are worth in many instances millions of dollars a year and have become increasingly generous in recent years. The value of these packages has increased even further as a result of the tremendous run up in stock valuations in recent years. The stock of many companies can attribute their spectacular growth to the wage concessions of their employees. As Business Week pointed out this spring "the combination of high productivity and tepid wages increases is pushing corporate profits through the roof" and as every investor or stock option beneficiary knows stock prices move in direct multiples to profits. The Republican budget includes a big cut in capital gains taxation which makes the windfall for corporate leaders such as yourself even greater. But there is another policy option. Since events of the last decade have allowed you and your cosigners to grow far richer than earlier generations of corporate managers at the same time that the lot of most of your countrymen has declined, you could offer to pay more tax rather than less.

You probably won't want to help out in all of the respects listed above. But perhaps

• 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.

some of these items could be put on the table. Whether or not they are adopted, it would at least make the elderly couple who has to pay more of their Social Security check for Medicare coverage or the working family that has had to assume the nursing home costs of an elderly aunt feel that the decision that they should sacrifice was not made before other possible options were explored.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MILLER.
DAVID R. OBEY.
RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

P.S.—Another option that you might consider in examining what you might do to help with the budget deficit would be to refrain from deducting from your corporate federal tax payment the advertising cost associated with these ads. Some taxpayers might feel that the advice you are providing on the sacrifices that they might make should be paid entirely by you rather than billing 35% of those costs to Uncle Sam.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS WHO SIGNED LETTER
TO CORPORATE CEO'S, DECEMBER 22, 1995

1. Hon. George Miller.
2. Hon. David R. Obey.
3. Hon. Richard A. Gephardt.
4. Hon. Dick Durbin.
5. Hon. Alcee Hastings.
6. Hon. Rosa DeLauro.
7. Hon. Joseph P. Kennedy.
8. Hon. John Lewis.
9. Hon. Cleo Fields.
10. Hon. Melvin Watts.
11. Hon. Bill Hefner.
12. Hon. Nancy Pelosi.
13. Hon. Patrick J. Kennedy.
14. Hon. Albert Wynn.
15. Hon. Major Owens.
16. Hon. Sam Gejdenson.
17. Hon. Maxine Waters.
18. Hon. Ronald V. Dellums.
19. Hon. Jesse Jackson, Jr.
20. Hon. Tom Foglietta.
21. Hon. Louise Slaughter.
22. Hon. Ron Coleman.
23. Hon. Chaka Fattah.
24. Hon. John W. Olver.
25. Hon. Karen L. Thurman.
26. Hon. Cynthia McKinney.
27. Hon. Eva M. Clayton.
28. Hon. Pat Williams.
29. Hon. Bobby Rush.
30. Hon. Bill Richardson.
31. Hon. Marcy Kaptur.
32. Hon. Lynne C. Woolsey.
33. Hon. Barney Frank.
34. Hon. John Joseph Moakley.
35. Hon. Patsy T. Mink.
36. Hon. William L. Clay.
37. Hon. Jim McDermott.
38. Hon. Lane Evans.
39. Hon. Pete Stark.
40. Hon. Bernie Sanders.
41. Hon. Donald M. Payne.
42. Hon. Maurice Hinchey.
43. Hon. Peter A. DeFazio.
44. Hon. Patricia Schroeder.
45. Hon. David Bonior.
46. Hon. Neil Abercrombie.

BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, December 20, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE STATUS OF THE BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

The negotiations between Congress and the President over a balanced budget are now entering a critical phase. Hoosiers tells me they want to get these budget issues resolved. They want Congress and the President to work together to get the government's business done. They do not want government furloughs and they see the threat of default on the national debt as very much to be avoided.

The President and the Republican leaders in Congress agree on the need for a balanced budget in seven years. There are very good economic arguments for a balanced budget, which will reduce interest rates and free up capital to enhance America's global competitiveness, but the real political passion for fiscal responsibility flows from people's opposition to saddening their children with a huge public debt.

Medicare continues to be a major sticking point in negotiations. Congressional leaders have proposed cutting back Medicare by \$270 billion, raising premiums and reducing consumer protections for beneficiaries. The President has proposed \$124 billion in cutbacks and more modest changes in the program, consistent with the recommendations of the Medicare trustees. While we should go after cutbacks in Medicare in a serious way, we should preserve Medicare to protect older persons.

MEDICAID

Medicaid is another crucial battleground. Medicaid is the insurer of last resort in the health care system today, providing services to poor families and children, and nursing home care for the elderly. The Republican leadership wants to replace the Medicaid guarantee with a block grant; cut projected federal spending sharply on the program; and let the states decide how and on whom the money would be spent. The President wants to preserve the guarantee, but would cut projected costs by capping the annual increase per beneficiary.

Medicaid must be preserved to protect the vulnerable, while made more efficient and effective. The alternative would be more poor people uninsured, and the poor, the states and hospitals that serve the poor would all be stranded.

WELFARE

The current welfare program embodies a federal guarantee of aid to needy single parents and their children. The congressional leadership has proposed eliminating the 60-year-old federal guarantee and turning the program over to the states as block grants. The President apparently supports this basic reform, but has said that the Republican plan bites too deeply into cash assistance, child nutrition, child care and food stamps. He accepts the principle of allowing states to set eligibility requirements and benefit levels, but he would maintain the federal entitlement for the poor.

I support welfare reform that rewards work over welfare and encourages responsibility. Welfare reform should limit the time families could remain on welfare, require parents to support their children, and provide the states with flexibility to set eligibility and benefit levels.

Welfare reform has stalled in Congress because of differences between GOP leaders in the House and Senate over the school lunch program. I agree with those in the Senate who want to keep the entitlement status of the school lunch program. The House leadership, in contrast, wants to turn the program over to the states.

TAX CUTS

Congressional leaders propose to cut taxes by \$245 billion over seven years, \$140 billion

more than the President proposes, but they are now hinting they might be willing to trim the level of cuts and target them more to low and moderate income families, rather than the well-to-do. My preference is to cut the spending first. I would defer a tax cut until the budget is balanced or the deficit is neutralized, and would not increase taxes on the working poor, as proposed in the congressional leadership budget. One other problem with GOP tax cuts is that the revenue losses explode after the seventh year. No sooner would the budget be balanced than the tax cuts would threaten to unbalance it all over again.

SPENDING PRIORITIES

Both the President's and the Republican proposals call for significant savings by cutting domestic spending. I agree with this approach, but also believe that the spending cuts favored by congressional leaders are much larger than needed in order to finance large tax breaks to the well-to-do. I oppose laying the burden of deficit reduction largely on poorer Americans. Other problems with the current proposals are that too much of the savings come from unspecified domestic programs and come late in the seven-year process.

We must exercise care in where we cut. The idea behind eliminating the budget deficit is that savings and investment count—that a balanced budget raises savings which in turn fuel investment. But just as business invests in machinery and equipment, the government must invest in education, research and development, and infrastructure to boost growth in a world of fierce international competition. That means that investments in human and physical capital are necessary and vital ingredients for faster growth in the American economy.

This Congress is not being tough enough in reducing "corporate welfare." The mining industry still gets a huge discount on mining federal lands. California's agribusiness has access to very low-cost federal water. The timber industry enjoys subsidies for cutting in federal forests. And livestock owners, particularly in the West, benefit from minimal grazing fees on federal lands. We need to reduce or eliminate these subsidies, particularly when budget proposals today are clearly skewed against poorer Americans.

CONCLUSION

The key now is that the two parties work together to fashion a compromise that balances the budget in seven years, but in a way that does not devastate key federal programs, particularly Medicare, Medicaid and education. I believe a decent deal is within reach. I have staked out a position with other moderate and conservative House Democrats to achieve these goals, and my sense is that the President and congressional leaders have been moving toward this position. All differences may not be settled before the end of the year, and those which can't be resolved ought to be taken to the voters in 1996. But, in the interim, we should work to compromise in areas where we can.

A POEM DEDICATED BY LYNN
MURPHY OF PRINCETON, WV, IN
TRIBUTE TO HER FATHER

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I have received thousands of letters and other manner of communication from my constituents in southern

West Virginia in recent months and recent days, expressing concern over the budget impasse. More recently, their communications have dealt with the Government shutdown and their fears not only for themselves who are Federal employees, but the fears of those who are not, but whose family members rely upon earned Social Security and veterans benefit checks arriving on time.

One such person—Lynn Murphy of Princeton, WV, wrote to voice her concern over the worry she could see in her father's eyes when report after report told him that his Social Security disability and veterans benefit checks might be delayed or fall short of the total benefits due as a result of the budget battles and the longest Government shutdown in our history—a battle still raging in Congress.

While we were able to vote on a measure that assured Social Security and veterans benefit checks would arrive on time and not fall short of their total amount due, when Lynn Murphy wrote her letter and accompanying tribute to her veteran father in the form of a poem, neither she nor her father knew for sure and they were worried.

In Ms. Murphy's poem, she not only pays homage to her father, but speaks to each of us as Members of the House concerning our need to get it together and put a stop to scarring the elderly, our veterans, and others who depend upon benefits of one kind or another for their daily necessities. She calls upon Congress not to forget her father and others like him as they continue to debate a balanced budget.

On behalf of Ms. Murphy's deep and abiding love for her father, I am privileged to commend the poem she wrote in tribute to him and his life, to the reading of my colleagues and all who have access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as we try to make some progress on coming to an agreement to fund the U.S. Government.

Mr. Speaker, the untitled poem by Lynn Murphy follows:

My father fought in two separate wars and still come out with life.
He then worked for the mines, and took my Mom to be his wife.

With my Mom came a family, and my Dad wanted it that way.

No matter how bad my Daddy felt, He was still at work every day.

Finally, my Dad retired at the age of Fifty-five

And with all my Dad has endured in his life, his is lucky to be alive.

So Congress, when you make your decisions, the way you need to do, remember my Dad risked his life, for others, and for you.

Why shouldn't he get his disability checks from Social Security and the VA?

Those checks pay the bills for he and Mom; he doesn't throw his money away.

I've watched my parents do without to see that us kids had.

And they both were on their feet each day, Although often they felt so bad.

My Dad deserves an honorary award for he is the greatest Dad in the land.

I hope he will always get his checks, and I hope you will understand.

Look to God for answers to questions, that may arise on Capitol Hill.

And think about my Dad who still strives to do God's will.

Let God ease the problems. Have faith and you will see that everything seems to work out, if it is God's will for it to be.

NEBRASKA CORNHUSKERS:
COLLEGE FOOTBALL CHAMPIONS

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, last night the University of Nebraska Cornhuskers firmly convinced all of America that they are still the No. 1 college football team in the country.

The Huskers' complete domination of the University of Florida Gators in the Fiesta Bowl for a 62 to 24 win was truly one of the most impressive displays of offensive and defensive talent in college football history.

It is also important to note that this awe-inspiring victory was Nebraska's 36th win in a 3-year period, establishing a new record.

The Cornhuskers, under the extraordinary coaching and steady leadership of Coach Tom Osborne, demonstrated remarkable persistence and consistency in their drive toward a second consecutive national championship. Their committed efforts show that the reward of success is won by dedication, teamwork, exceptional conditioning, high motivation, and the superior efforts of Coach Osborne and his coaching and support staff.

As an alumnus of the university and the Representative in Congress from Lincoln, the home of the Huskers, this Member enthusiastically congratulates the University of Nebraska Cornhuskers and Coach Osborne on another well-deserved national championship.

CONGRESSMAN BARNEY FRANK
ON "DEMOCRACY REAFFIRMED
IN ISRAEL"

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an article written by our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, BARNEY FRANK. It appeared in the Boston Globe on December 25 of last year.

Barney has given an outstanding analysis of how Israel has dealt with the emotional and political aftermath of the tragic assassination of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. His analysis is particularly significant—not only for democratic Israel, but also for industrial societies such as our own and for developing democratic societies in the former Soviet Union and in the Third World—who must deal with the relationship between terrorism and democracy, between violence and freedom. As he said: "For nearly 50 years, Israel has been the most persistent and successful in demonstrating that democracy is not a luxury to be enjoyed only by societies that are wealthy, secure and well insulated from outside attack, but is a recognition of the fundamental right of men and women to govern themselves freely."

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the entire article by Mr. Frank be placed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues read it and give it thoughtful and careful attention.

DEMOCRACY REAFFIRMED IN ISRAEL

In the emotional aftermath of the searing, tragic murder of Yitzhak Rabin, Israeli society has understandably been deeply engaged in a debate over the role of dissent in a democracy. But the most important aspect of this debate—both for Israel and the rest of the world—is what is not being discussed. No significant elements within Israel are arguing that there should be any serious curtailment of the vigorous, open democracy that has characterized Israel since its beginning. It is significant that Israelis are not questioning their commitment to democracy at this terrible time.

In many societies, the murder of a popular leader in the midst of a delegate set of negotiations involving the security of the Nation would have led to widespread repression of elements in the opposition party, whether or not they were connected to the murder. The sad fact is that in most societies facing the kind of overwhelming physical threats to their existence that Israel has lived with since 1948, democracy would never have flourished in the first place. The mature, pained, thoughtful response of Israeli society to this murder is a reminder of something that would be a grave error to overlook: every condition that has been put forward by repressive rulers in the post-war world to justify the suppression of democracy has been present in Israel since its inception, and the experience of Israel is an eloquent repudiation of the notion that democracy is a luxury to be indulged only by those nations that are prosperous and secure.

From its birth, Israel's existence was threatened by attack from the overwhelmingly larger hostile forces which surround it. While fighting to defend its right to exist, Israel has also coped with the difficult economic problems of a new nation, compounded by the military drain on its resources and its unshakable commitment to absorb large numbers of Jewish refugees from oppression elsewhere in the world. Through all of this, Israel has maintained a commitment to a flourishing, vigorous democracy, governed by leaders chosen in elections as free as those held anywhere in the world, amidst untrammelled—often raucous—free speech.

Among those who have enjoyed the rights of free speech and the ability to participate fully in free elections are members of the Arab minority, some of whom reject the very legitimacy of the state of Israel. But that rejection has never been used to prevent them from participating fully in the electoral process on a one-person/one-vote basis, and those they vote for are seated in parliament with full rights to vote, debate, etc.

There should be nothing remarkable about these facts, and in the United States or much of Western Europe they would not be. But among those nations which have come into being since the end of the war, this pattern is an exception. And it is especially exceptional in nations that have faced severe external threats from heavily armed enemies, have been struggling simultaneously with the difficult task of economic development, have been severely divided internally over some fundamental issues involving the security of the nation and have undergone the difficult social process of absorption of large numbers of migrants, many of whom come ill-prepared at first to deal with the complexities of modern society.

In fact, Israel has now become through the peace process an exporter of democracy in the Middle East. The elections that will soon

be held in the West Bank will be freer and more democratically legitimated than any other elections in the nations surrounding Israel. It is highly unlikely that Yasser Arafat would have decided that elections were the appropriate path to power in the emerging Palestinian entity had that not been a condition laid down by the Israeli government in the ongoing negotiations.

As with our own country, Israeli democracy has not been perfect. There have been lapses, although these have been few compared with the territories. And much of what we know about these occasional lapses comes from the vigorous denunciation of them from people and organizations within Israel, because its democracy is among other things appropriately self-critical.

Israel is not the only new nation that is working hard to demonstrate that democracy is the best way to cope with the multiple dangers in the post-war world. Through the efforts of Nelson Mandela and others, South Africa is also on the list of societies that seek to make this point. But for nearly 50 years, Israel has been the most persistent and successful in demonstrating that democracy is not a luxury to be enjoyed only by societies that are wealthy, secure and well insulated from outside attack, but is a recognition of the fundamental right of men and women to govern themselves freely. When properly understood, it strengthens society and better enables it to cope with the gravest problems.

RECOGNIZING PHYLLIS L.
PETERSON

HON. BILL BAKER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, education is a crucial building block of our society. An informed electorate is critical to effective self-government. An educated work force is vital to a successful economy. And the capacity for knowledgeable decisionmaking enriches our individual lives.

Dr. Phyllis L. Peterson has played an important role in turning these principles into realities for thousands of men and women in the East Bay of San Francisco. For 12 years she has served ably as president of Diablo Valley College in Pleasant Hill, CA, located in the heart of the Golden State's 10th Congressional District, which I represent here in Washington. Overseeing Diablo's growth as a premier community college, she has been nationally recognized for her leadership in preparing young adults both for careers in the job market and for further academic pursuits.

When Dr. Peterson retires later this year, she will leave a legacy of hope and opportunity for the many lives she has touched in her 37 years as an educator. Her development of the Center for Higher Education in San Ramon made education available in an area previously without a higher educational presence. Her leadership enabled Diablo Valley College to grow to its present enrollment of 23,000 students, providing them with a quality, affordable, and accessible education.

In 1993, her peers called on her to serve as head of the Chief Executive Officers of the California Community Colleges. The University of Texas Community College leadership program recognized her as an outstanding community college president and the Association

of California Community College Administrators honored her with the Harry Buttimer Distinguished Administrator Award.

These signal honors were bestowed in recognition of Dr. Peterson's commitment to higher education, her capability as an administrator, and her love for students. Dr. Phyllis L. Peterson is an exemplary educator and community leader, and richly deserves our thanks for all she has done to prepare new leaders for our country and our world. I am pleased to call on my colleagues to join me in honoring her today.

CORNHUSKERS WIN ANOTHER NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP: A CREDIT TO TEAMWORK AND DEDICATED COACHING

HON. BILL BARRETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, last night the 1995 college football season climaxed with an awesome display of athletic ability, teamwork, determination, and brilliant coaching. I refer, of course, to the Fiesta Bowl, in Tempe, AZ, and the Nebraska Cornhuskers' impressive and decisive victory over the Florida Gators.

The No. 1 Huskers rolled over the No. 2 Gators 62 to 24 to win their second consecutive NCAA football championship. The Fiesta Bowl win capped off a second straight undefeated season, and put the Big Red in the record books as the first team in 40 years to win back-to-back, undefeated, undisputed national championships.

While some of the Cornhusker players are receiving the laurels of victory because of their outstanding individual performances in last night's game, the real credit rests with the hard work, dedication, and discipline of the entire Cornhusker squad. The old adage that there is no "I" in "TEAM" was never more apparent.

Those who watched the game last night saw a team that loves to play the game and plays it better than any other team in the country. The team was both the Husker offense and defense, and the team ran over, around, and through the vaunted Florida Gators.

Cornhusker Coach Dr. Tom Osborne heads a football program in which we in Nebraska take great pride. It is renowned for its success on the field, but also for its program of weight training and physical conditioning. Dr. Tom is a true sportsman and insists his players be the same. He is also an educator, and it shows in his program—Nebraska has had more academic all-Americans than any other program and graduates more than 85 percent of its players.

It takes not only exceptional talent, but also patience, a thick skin, great courage, and character to coach a team of Nebraska's caliber and national exposure. I applaud Coach Osborne's victory in the Fiesta Bowl last night, and I applaud his unwavering determination to support his players and do what he believes best to turn out young men who understand the responsibility of being not only champions on the football field, but also good citizens. It is not always easy; it is not always without its

setbacks, but the success and quality of the players he sends into the world each year speaks volumes about the coaching of Dr. Tom and his staff.

I'm confident that in the annals of college football, the University of Nebraska Cornhusker teams of 1994 and 1995 will be heralded as among the best ever to step onto the college gridiron. I'm even more confident that the discipline and hard work needed to achieve that victory will inspire thousands of Nebraskans and Americans in years to come to achieve the best in their families, communities, businesses, and government.

Congratulations, Huskers.

VALUES

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report of Wednesday, December 27, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

VALUES

"Peace on earth, good will toward men"—it is a blessing echoed often at this time of year. While we have many reasons to be grateful that we live in the U.S., it is also true that Americans daily face many disturbing realities—crime, drug abuse, illegitimacy—which strike right at the heart of a decent life. A few years ago "It's the economy, stupid" conveyed the idea that the economy was paramount on voters' minds; now people are more inclined to blame the nation's problems on the moral decline. Today social issues like crime, welfare, education, and racial preference, and cultural issues like abortion, gay rights, school prayer, flag burning, and television violence have become prominent.

Americans are struggling to restore old-fashioned values to a central place in their lives and to revitalize the family. Parents struggle to raise their children in the face of powerful forces that are sending very different messages to their children than they want to send. Again and again I have been asked by distraught parents to watch a particular movie, listen to a particular piece of music, or watch a television show or video game that encourages casual sex or incessant violence. One parent said to me the other day, "What in the world is going on?"

What parents tell me they really want in life is a benign environment for raising their children. They express deep concern about the birth rate for unwed mothers and the divorce rate, both of which have doubled in recent decades. They are distressed that more children are being raised with less supervision and fewer resources, putting them at much greater risk for delinquency. Each day I encounter heroic parents who have kept their family together against all the odds.

Concern for moral values has always been a part of American life—from the battle against slavery to the battle against excessive use of alcohol. Yet the debate over our society's moral fiber has picked up recently as Americans increasingly question why they face a host of social problems and how best to deal with them. People are fearful that families and values are disappearing, and they often feel hopeless and powerless. I think the debate is worthwhile and healthy, and indicates that we are on our way to addressing our social ills. People ask me what they can do about declining values. The answer begins with individual responsibility.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

"The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil," said the political leader and writer Edmund Burke, "is for good men to do nothing." Individual responsibility for our own actions and instilling a sense of shared values play a crucial part in solving our country's problems. We need to look for common ground combining the great themes in American values—personal responsibility, freedom, individualism, respect, trustworthiness, fairness and caring. We must return to the ideas of our Founding Fathers who spoke unashamedly of virtue. They understood that without a virtuous people the country does not function well, and that without virtue individuals cannot realize either their own or the common good.

FAMILIES

Central to our efforts to take back our streets, our neighborhoods and our homes is strengthening the family. As Barbara Bush said, "Your success as a family—our success as a society—depends not on what happens at the White House, but on what happens inside your house." Like many Americans, I believe that the breakdown in families is at the root of many of our social ills. I am struck by how, in discussions of wide-ranging public policy questions, we often come back to strengthening the family as the best way to remedy the ills. Questions dealing with values, morals, and character should be addressed first in the family and then in society.

THE COMMUNITY

We need to develop and encourage community institutions that reinforce and strengthen the traditional values. Many familiar institutions work at this everyday—churches, scout groups, service clubs, to name a few. People can contribute in many ways—volunteering at a local Boys or Girls Club, helping out with a church youth group, setting up afterschool programs for "latch-key" kids, or supporting the character education programs that have sprung up to help young people think and talk about moral behavior and core values. In the words of the African proverb, "It takes a whole village to raise a child."

THE GOVERNMENT

Public officials deal with improving values in a variety of ways—from the White House conference on ways to teach character, the Congress struggling to find ways to keep pornography off the Internet, to public calls for teenage curfews and school prayers. Many politicians push government programs to strengthen values, including family and medical leave, earned income tax credits for the working poor, income tax credits for children, anti-crime efforts, and reforming welfare by emphasizing work and responsibility.

I believe that government can solve few of the core cultural issues that bother most Americans, but it can play an important secondary role. Congress can, for example, support local anti-crime efforts or help states improve anti-drug programs, and we should make sure that in the current budget-cutting climate important programs with proven results are not gutted. Lawmakers must also be careful to look at how broad legislation impacts on families, children, community, and values—for example, making sure we assess whether a certain tax policy would tend to strengthen families or weaken them.

CONCLUSION

In talking with many foreign visitors, I find what grips their imagination about America is not our affluence or military power, or even our clogged freeways and high crime rates. What really impresses them are

the values upon which our system is built. These values include not only liberty and individual freedom but also individual responsibility and a sense of community purpose. One visitor said to me the other day that when we as a nation depart from these values, we do so at our peril.

I am encouraged by the increased discussion in our country over character and values, and the consideration of what kind of people we want to be. This country has a marvelous power of self-correction, and my hope is that the process is now underway. A collective effort on the part of individuals, families, communities, and public officials can result in tremendous change. We often think of steps we should take to make America more prosperous. It is even more important to think of ways to make America safe, moral, and just.

A TRIBUTE TO JIM HARKINS

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, as chance would have it, the end of 1995 brought about not only the elimination of the Interstate Commerce Commission but the retirement from the Regular Common Carrier Conference [RCCC] of a friend to many of us, Jim Harkins.

While Jim has had a long and distinguished career in the freight transportation industry, including stints in the railroad industry and with a major shipper, many of us first came to know him in his capacity from 1967 through 1985 as executive director of the Traffic Department of the American Trucking Association and of the National Motor Freight Traffic Association. It was probably from Jim that many of us who know anything about freight classification learned it.

In 1985, Jim became executive director of the RCCC. In that capacity, he has been an articulate, knowledgeable, and effective spokesman from the less-than-truckload segment of the motor carrier industry.

Although Jim is leaving RCCC, I am sure that we will continue to hear from him on matters related to freight transportation in this country. I also hope that Jim and his wife Lucille will have more opportunity to enjoy a relaxed life in Maryland and Florida with their four children, and of course, their grandchildren.

It has been indeed a great pleasure for this gentleman from West Virginia to have worked closely with Jim Harkins. On behalf of the many members of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, and the full Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, who know Jim, I wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

MEDICARE REFORM

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member highly commends to his colleagues the following two excellent editorials which appeared in the Norfolk Daily News on January 2 and 3, 1996.

[From the Norfolk Daily News, Jan. 2, 1996]

MEDICARE OUTLAYS MUST HAVE LIMIT

Medicare was not conceived as a welfare program. But those who now argue for taxpayers to make up any differences between actual costs of Medicare and the premiums that beneficiaries pay are treating it that way.

If a similar philosophy prevails early in the next century when there are too-few workers to sustain benefits at projected levels without turning to Uncle Sam, then Social Security will also be in that "welfare" category.

It is important not to accept either of those programs as general welfare obligations of the U.S. Treasury, financed by taxpayers either through higher taxation or by more borrowing. Social Security and Medicare were conceived as programs that would depend on contributions by the beneficiaries themselves, who could afford to pay the equivalent of insurance premiums during their working years, and, in the case of Medicare, pay modest premiums during retirement.

In the case of Social Security, that has worked. It has been a struggle, however, to make sure that political promises to beneficiaries were matched by legislative action to adjust "premiums"—in the form of payroll taxes—to keep the system solvent. The struggle continues.

More than a difference in total outlays is involved in the contest between the White House plan for Medicare, which proposes spending of \$97 billion less than would otherwise be projected and the plan proposed by Republicans in Congress, which projects spending about \$200 billion less.

The difference is that the GOP plan puts a ceiling on the outlays, and fixed specific dollar amounts that would not be exceeded. That would bar further tapping of taxpayer resources. The White House plan takes a different approach, though also claiming to slow spending growth. It projects some savings but includes no provisions to enforce them. Greater demands on the system than projected would simply be made up by shifting the extra costs to taxpayers at large.

That has become the traditional way for the prevailing majorities in Washington to handle federal programs: Enact a formula for benefits, then tax or borrow to meet the overall demand. Setting and enforcing a ceiling on expenditures has been something to resist.

If that pattern were to be followed in the future in the government's other major insurance program—Social Security—trillions in debt limits would not be enough. The budgeteers would have to begin thinking in quadrillions. Better to fix limits right now.

[From the Norfolk Daily News, Jan. 3, 1996]

PLENTY OF BLAME TO GO AROUND

At the Social Security Administration office in the Washington suburb of Woodlawn, Md., 100 of the federal workers idled by the budget impasse staged a small demonstration. "Furlough Newt," proclaimed one of the placards displayed. Another said, "Give Newt the boot, not the loot." Still another was less focused on the speaker, but put the blame on Capitol Hill: "Congress we have a contract with America, too."

If the majority ruled among the elected policymakers in the federal establishment, the conflict which found the government partially shut down would have been resolved quickly. But a congressional majority is not enough. One man's veto—the President's—can mean that a super-majority is needed in Congress if legislators are to work their will.

Speaker Gingrich has attempted to use the congressional majority's power to get the

Clinton administration to accept a balanced budget in 2002, Medicare reform and modest reductions in taxation—all of them being goals which Mr. Clinton also proclaimed at various times. There is a sharp and continuing dispute about the details, of course.

An objective view of the situation should lead to the conclusion that the contending parties are equally accountable for the failure to reach an agreement, whatever the arguments.

Why should the federal workers only blame Newt when it is obvious that the president could have avoided the shutdown by accepting a compromise? Of course, it would not be seemly for them to be parading in front of the White House with banners calling for Bill, their boss, to give in to Capitol Hill.

Popular opinion, fed by sad stories of the lives disrupted momentarily by the partial federal shutdown, seems to reflect the idea that all the blame should be heaped on Newt and his cohorts. Who elected them, anyway? Only a majority of the voters in their districts, which is as good a claim to legitimate power as the president himself has.

A more presidential president, one willing to acknowledge that there is wisdom on the east end of Pennsylvania Avenue, would have found a way to end this impasse long before it became so disruptive.

TRIBUTE TO A HALF-CENTURY OF
HERBLOCK—POLITICAL CAR-
TOONIST AND POLITICAL CON-
SCIENCE

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday the Washington Post dedicated the Outlook Section of the newspaper to its outstanding editorial cartoonist, Herb Block—Herblock—in appropriate recognition of his 50 years of cartooning for the Post. In 1946 Herb accepted the offer to join the Washington Post, and for the past half-century, we have been blessed or—at least in the view of some—cursed with his wit, his humor, and his principles.

The selection of his cartoons from the past 50 years, which was included in the Outlook Section, brought back memories of the high points and low points of the political history of our Nation. Looking through these cartoons has brought Herb's wonderful gift into dramatic perspective for me. With a few well drawn lines and a few well chosen words, he has the ability to convey the essence of an entire complex political issue and highlight the absurdities and inconsistencies.

But the laughter is never at the expense of the message. This is not humor for the sake of humor, but wit with a point. I admire Herb's humor, but even more I admire his principles. His cartoons always reflect his strongly held point of view, and I must say that most of the time I am in perfect agreement with him.

Mr. Speaker, a few years ago when I was chairman of the House subcommittee conducting the investigation of fraud and mismanagement at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Herb did a number of delightful and insightful cartoons about the HUD scandal. At that time, I invited Herb to join me for lunch at the Member's dining room. We spent a delightful hour or more talking about his

background and highlights of his career. He mentioned then that he generally avoids spending time with those of us whom he cartoons, but I was delighted that he made an exception for me that day. It was an engaging experience that I still remember fondly.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress seem to find ourselves the frequent focus of Herb's sharp wit and his sharper pen. This past year, and particularly these past 19 days of Government shutdown, have provided him with abundant material, which he has exploited with this typical skill. In the past few days, as well as throughout the last half-century, Herb's humor and his principled point of view are important in keeping political issues in perspective. If this were Japan, I am certain that Herblock would be officially declared a "National Treasure." He is a national treasure, and I invite my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to him for his contribution to our national political debate and to the strength of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, Kate Graham—the chairman of the Executive Committee of the Washington Post Co. who has had extensive experience and frequent exasperation with Herb—paid homage to Herblock in a wonderful column in Sunday's Outlook. I ask that her column be placed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to read it.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 31, 1995]

A TIGER BY THE TAIL—THE TURBULENT
PLEASURES OF LIFE WITH HERB

(By Katharine Graham)

My mother had a saying: "Any man worth marrying is impossible to live with." Why does this make me think of my glorious life and times with Herblock, one of the greatest ornaments to The Post and to all of journalism? Underneath his genius for cartooning and writing lies a modest, sweet, aw-shucks personality. Underneath that lies a layer of iron and steel. For the publishers and editors over him—or under him, as it would be more accurate to say—it's like having a tiger by the tail.

Herb started out in his hometown of Chicago doing editorial cartoons for the Chicago Daily News in 1929. Four years later he became a syndicated editorial cartoonist for the Newspaper Enterprise Association Service in Cleveland, where he won the first of his three Pulitzer Prizes.

When World War II came along, Herb went into the Army and produced and edited a feature service for Army newspapers. After the war, Herb was passing through Washington. A chance encounter led to a meeting with my father, Eugene Meyer, who happened to be desperately looking for a cartoonist for The Post. Herb provided a few samples and in return, my father gave Herb a subscription to the paper. "So you can see how you like us," my father explained.

Evidently the attraction was mutual. Herb arrived at The Post the same week that my husband, Phil Graham, arrived in January of 1946. The extraordinary quality of Herb's eye, his insights and sharp comments immediately stood out. When The Post was struggling for its existence, Herb was one of its major assets, as he has been throughout his 50 years here. The Post and Herblock are forever intertwined. If The Post is his forum, he helped create it. And he has been its shining light.

Herb fought for and earned a unique position at the paper: one of complete independence of anybody and anything. Journalistic enterprises run best when writers and editors have a lot of autonomy. But Herb's case is extreme. And because he's a genius, it works.

Since he arrived at The Post, five editors and five publishers all have learned a car-

dinal rule: Don't mess with Herb. He's just as tough within the confines of The Post as he is in the political world outside.

Herb's independence evolved gradually. In the early years, he made several sketches for the day's cartoon and dutifully submitted them to the editorial page editor to choose. When the editor was away, Herb began showing them to a preferred group of reporters and editorial writers whose opinions he valued. Gradually, the editor's role was dropped altogether.

Of course, this has produced a few tense moments. In 1952, during the Eisenhower-Stevenson campaign, The Post endorsed Ike, but Herb supported Stevenson and continued to jab away at the general. Which point of view do you think made the bigger impression with readers? Finally, Herb's cartoon was dropped by the paper for the last days of the campaign. Since his work continued to be syndicated in other papers, The Post looked silly. The Washington Daily News ran a headline: "Where's Mr. Block? One of D.C.'s Top Drawers Is Missing."

Even earlier, Phil protested Herb's cartoons on Congress. He feared they made The Post look as though it was ridiculing and undermining the strength of that institution. "I think we should put that little 'Congress' character back in the ink bottle," Phil wrote.

Back came three eloquent pages from Herb including, "When a majority of Congress fails to act, or acts badly, I think it's fair to be critical of Congress."

I too sometimes opened the paper and gasped at Herb's cartoons, particularly during Watergate when we were so embattled on all fronts. But I had learned not to interfere. And anyway, most of the time we're on the same wavelength. Even when we aren't, I should confess, I generally find myself laughing uproariously at the cartoon that has caused my apprehension. In this sense, Herb always wins.

Herb studies events and reacts to them in his own way. His point of view is liberal, and his instincts are common-sensical. But his common sense has a special twist. As economist Ken Galbraith once put it: "While Herb appreciates virtue, his real interest is in awfulness." His mind turns to the rascals, the phonies and the frauds. He has pursued them for 50 years without ever flagging except for time taken off for a couple of heart attacks and operations. But these ordeals were probably nothing compared with the distress he has caused a number of other people, such as President Nixon and Sen. Joseph McCarthy. It was Herb who is said to have coined the term McCarthyism, using it on a tar barrel.

Herb's unique ability to crystalize what is right—or, more likely, wrong—about an issue or a person has often influenced the course of events in Washington. Naturally, the strength and impact of his cartoons often provoke strong reactions from readers who disagree. Part of the job of Post publishers is to defend Herb and the paper from these reactions.

"Since Herblock is the most gifted political cartoonist of our times," Phil wrote one reader, "by definition he therefore cannot be an organization man. Being an old reactionary and individualist, I am all for people who simply have to be individualistic. . . . I think—though it will amaze you—that Herblock probably considers himself frustrated and suffocated by our policy."

I too have written my share of explanatory letters. One, in 1989, said that to cartoon is to caricature, and people who are very gifted at cartooning sometimes offend. "Most of the time, however, cartoons illuminate or amuse," the letter went on to say. I doubt the irate reader was completely satisfied, but the statement, I believe, is true.

As Herb begins his second 50 years at The Post, he has lost none of his dynamic energy and original insight. He is going as strong as ever and, as a matter of fact, has just published his 12th book. It's about his cat Bella and, as usual, it's just wonderful. Herb does caricature the cat, but I don't think Don Graham and Meg Greenfield will hear from her in protest.

In fact, Bella has proven she's more than a match for Herb. For example, she is known to complain about Herb's legendary propensity to live in a rat's nest of old newspapers and magazines, discarded clothes and paint brushes and pencils. "We cats are neat," Bella is alleged to have said, while frowning on those who are not.

Now maybe Herb knows what it feels like to have a cat by the tail. It's a privilege, a pleasure and an honor we all have loved and treasured.

TRIBUTE TO NATIONAL
UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO, CA

HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today in celebration of San Diego's outstanding institutions of higher learning. In 1996, National University will celebrate its 25th anniversary. The year-long celebration will officially commence with an academic assembly on Thursday, January 26, 1996.

National University is a nonprofit, accredited institution of higher learning that specializes in meeting the educational needs of adult learners in California. National University is the only university in California offering a unique, one-course-per-month format. The university offers 45 degree programs and a number of teacher credential programs, and its expanding Department of Continuing Education and Educational Services provides nonacademic, customized training and professional development programs to meet the specific objectives of businesses throughout the state. National has a full-time enrollment of approximately 7,800 and 101 full-time faculty members.

The estimated 45,000 alumni of National University have reason to be proud of their affiliation with the university. National has been named one of the best universities in the western United States for two consecutive years by U.S. News and World Report. In 1995 the university received one of six nationwide Creative Restructuring in Higher Education Special Merit Awards from the American Association of University Administrators. Last year, the American Association of University Administrators recognized National's accomplishments through a special award presented at its annual convention. The university also received a Total Excellence in Management Award from the San Diego Business Journal for the excellence of its management.

The university has developed its tone and direction for the next 5 years in "NU 2000." This plan represents a year of discussion and formulation by the people at National. The main objective is to create the premier institution for adult learners by the year 2000. With the continued dedication of its students, faculty, and administrators, the excellent National University will continue maturing into the visionary institution it aspires to be.

NEW YORK CITY VETERANS ARE
ANGRY

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, having just returned from the Christmas recess, I can report that the veterans of New York City are angry. They are angry because the VA budget has been slashed. They are angry because the Government shutdown is affecting services. They are angry because they believe that after all the sacrifices they and their families have made for our country, our Nation is turning its back on them.

I would like to submit for the record a statement put out on December 26, 1995 by Col. Bernard Wray and the United War Veterans Council of New York County. It is indeed sobering reading for those of us who support our Nation's veterans.

NEW YORK VETERANS' COMMUNITY OUTRAGED
BY UNNEEDED REDUCTION IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION SERVICES TO VETERANS IN NEED!

The United War Veterans' Council of New York County which was first incorporated by Union Veterans of the Grand Army of the Republic in New York County, in 1895, to help aging Civil War Veterans, and which now consists of fifty-five separate Veterans and Patriotic organizations, issues this distress call to all concerned members of the Veterans' Community, and to their families and friends:

Never, during the past 100 years have war veterans, men and women, been treated with the disdain and disrespect that we see in this run-away session of Congress. Now is the time for our 16 million War Veterans and their families to demand full restoration of all VA services, and full restoration to their jobs of all VA service providers!

It should be noted by all veterans, that the House of Representatives cut the VA allocation requested by the President by one billion dollars. This is one twentieth of the 20 billion dollars appropriated by this session of Congress for twenty B-2 bombers, which the Air Force does not even want or need in its aircraft stock.

Now is the Time for all Veterans to step forward in all 435 Congressional Districts, and to spell out in the clearest terms, to all Representatives, regardless of party affiliation, that they will be held to strict accountability at the 1996 elections, should they break faith with the Veterans' community. Full restoration of Veterans' Benefits and Veterans' Health Care is non-negotiable. It was a Contract bought and paid for with the blood, sweat and tears of millions of American Veterans.

Meanwhile, we call for all members of Congress, and their staffs to agree to receive no further pay, while the Veterans and their service providers are being asked to make sacrifices. We also call upon Corporate America to share in the sacrifices of the War

Veterans of America on this the 50th Anniversary of Victory in World War II.
Semper Fi'

IN HONOR OF EL MUNDO—CELEBRATING 5 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE HISPANIC COMMUNITY

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor El Mundo Hispanoamericano, celebrating 5 years of distinguished and reliable reporting and community service. El Mundo was founded in 1990 with a commitment to report on all aspects of the Hispanic community throughout New Jersey.

El Mundo Hispanoamericano commemorated its anniversary on Wednesday, December 20, 1995. For 5 years, El Mundo has been providing the Hispanic community with vital information about the world around them and their native lands. El Mundo prides itself as an advocate for the Hispanic community, defending issues and interests that are of importance to the people.

They have covered the good news and the bad news. When municipal or State services were not up to par, they wrote about it. When government and individuals did something positive for the community, they wrote about it too. They have served as an integral link between the Government and the community.

Even though, the founders, Ney Bravo and his family, are Ecuadoran, El Mundo reports on all of Latin America. The newspaper covers issues of concern to all immigrants from the Caribbean, Central, and South America. It does so with sensitivity and care. Ethnic newspapers like El Mundo provide a vital source of information to the Hispanic community about their native lands. Such newspapers help a community establish themselves in this great Nation.

It is an honor to recognize El Mundo, a newspaper that provides accurate news coverage to the people I represent. I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring El Mundo for its faithful service to the Hispanic community.

THE GUATEMALAN ELECTIONS

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, the participation of citizens in free and fair elections, and their faith in the legitimacy of the subsequent electoral results, are fundamental to all democracies. No participatory democracy is able to survive if its citizens do not have faith in the electoral process. To be able to ensure that democracy continues to take root and flourish throughout the Western Hemisphere, we must do all within our power to encourage the development of conditions that inspire faith in electoral processes throughout the Americas.

To that end, as it attempted to do in Haiti, the Clinton administration should do what it can to ensure to the Guatemalan people, that the second round of elections scheduled to

take place on January 7 in that Central American country is free and fair. By doing so, the Clinton administration would help ensure that the Guatemalan people not only develop trust in their own electoral system, but further appreciate the benefits of living in a democracy.

ALEC COURTELIS, AN AMERICAN HERO

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a true American hero, Miami civic leader Alec Courtelis, who died last week after a courageous 2-year struggle against cancer. My sincere condolences go to his wife Louise, son Pan, daughter Kiki, and sister Danae Voyazis.

As former President Bush said after this unfortunate loss to our Nation and south Florida, "Who says there are no heroes any more? Just look at the life and legacy of Alec Courtelis." Although 68 years old and in a fight for his life with pancreatic cancer, Alec continued his tireless work for the many causes in which he believed.

The story of Alec Courtelis' life is an inspiration for all those who know that the American dream is still a reality for anyone, regardless of their background. An immigrant who came to this country from Alexandria, Egypt, Alec always rejoiced in America's unlimited opportunities. He lived his life by the motto that "nothing is impossible in America."

He emigrated to Miami in 1948, a city that has welcomed many immigrants from around the world. After earning his engineering degree at the University of Miami, his company helped build many prominent commercial and residential developments in south Florida, including the Falls shopping center.

A successful self-made businessman, he gave much back to the Nation and our community which had given this opportunity. He raised funds for the cause of education in Florida, including the University of Miami and the University of Florida College of Veterinary Medicine. As State University Chancellor Charles Reed said, "No one in Florida has made a greater contribution to the betterment of this State than Alec Courtelis."

But the greatest example he set for all of us was in the last years of his life when he showed what real courage is all about. He took the time to give great encouragement to many cancer patients in their fight with this dread disease, showing them that through positive mind-therapy, they could win against this disease.

Like the man in Rudyard Kipling's poem "If," which was used in his funeral services, Alec Courtelis truly showed that:

If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With sixty seconds' worth of distance run,
Yours is the Earth and everything that's in it,
And—which is more—you'll be a Man, my son!

STATEMENT BY UNDER SECRETARY JOE R. REEDER

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues, an exceptional statement delivered by Joe R. Reeder, Under Secretary of Defense. Mr. Reeder's analysis is one that merits our attention. I herewith submit his statement to be included in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

WORLDWIDE CONTINUING LEGAL WORKSHOP,
OCT. 3, 1995

It is a pleasure to be back in Charlottesville. The first time I came to this city was in the fall of 1976 for the JAG basic course. I was glad it was only for two months because the cavaliers were suffering through some of the worst football in their history.

I also came back and taught a course as a reservist in 1981. The head of their school was Bill Suter, who later became TJAG—and as you know—is now with the Supreme Court.

I look fondly back upon my time in the JAG Corps and have acquired friends and experiences in the corps which will always be special to me.

That is why I was very pleased when Gen. Mike Nardotti asked me to share some thoughts about our Army—where we are now—where we are going—and your role in the challenges we face.

Let me start with the bottom line on America's Army.

Today's soldiers are the most highly motivated, best led, best trained, and best equipped fighting force in the world. No one disputes that—even those who would like to.

Day in, day out, we have soldiers operating in 60 to 100 countries around the world—an average of over 20,000 American soldiers are on operational deployments. That's in addition to the 120K men and women permanently stationed overseas.

If you think back to the changes made over the last 5 years—you see an active army that has gone from 780 thousand to 515 thousand seen its budget nose-dive from \$90 billion to just under \$60 billion—and at the same time see its missions skyrocket 300 percent.

Those cuts would have severely wounded, if not crippled any other army, or large corporation. But not the U.S. Army.

Thanks to the Army's leadership including many of you in this Room. The Army is as ready as it has ever been—and certainly more ready than we were 5 years in Desert Storm.

In many respects this Army just keeps getting better. One concrete example is "vigilant warrior" in Kuwait last October.

During operation Desert Shield it took almost 30 days for our Armored Forces to arrive in Saudi Arabia. This time, the lead elements of our heavy forces—not 82d Paratroopers or 10th Mountain Division Light Fighters—but tankers from the 24th ID were on the ground in under 72 hrs.

In 2 weeks, 2 brigades of the 24th were in Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, linked up with their prepositioned warfighting equipment. Within 3 weeks, over 30 thousand servicemen were in theater—equipped for war.

Now let me touch on what lies ahead for our army.

I see several major challenges facing their army leadership.

First and foremost, we have to be tougher as our resources shrink. And I do not expect

their resource picture to brighten anytime soon.

I read a poll in the Army Times a few weeks ago which proclaimed that two-thirds of the American people believe the defense budget should be reduced further.

There's just not enough money to cover all our needs. Tough choices have to be made.

Secretary Perry's top 3 are clear and unequivocal.

Our first priority is near term readiness. We cannot afford to let this slip. After the Superbowl, the 49ers get an offseason. They can eat, drink and get fat for a few months. That is a luxury your Army does not have.

Our next priority is quality of life—which surprises some people—but I see it as a steel chain link to readiness.

Quality of life directly relates to our ability to attract and retain quality people.

We face the critical challenge of finding and keeping quality people. The soldiers we have in uniform today are the best ever—hands down.

Easily the most important change in the Army in the past 25 years is the quality of our soldiers.

Last year, I had the opportunity to dine with Gen. and Mrs. George Blanchard. As some of you know, Gen. Blanchard was the Army CINC in Europe in the late 70s. He was also my Div Cdr in the 82d ABN Div.

About half way thru the meal, he turned to me said, "Joe, it hurts me to admit this, but I have got to tell you the soldiers today are better than when I served."

I agreed, but asked why he said that. He said for two reasons:

First, the all-volunteer Army and second, the way we treat soldiers today—among other things, their quality of life.

I told him he should not feel bad—because the quality of today's Army is his legacy.

I also told him I had a different perspective, in one respect maybe a better perspective than his. Rather than having lived through that change, I left the Army in the late 70s and was gone 14 years.

Coming back in 1993, I had the benefit of not having watched that process of change in a slow, gradual way, . . . I can tell you the difference was like night and day.

We must continue recruiting and retaining high quality people.

Our third priority is modernization. Modernization dollars have shrunk dramatically. We have been hit harder here than anywhere else.

Your Army, best in the world, but only eight in size cannot afford to lose any more modernization dollars.

We are accepting some risk in this area for two reasons.

One, our superior technology completely outmatches the entire world. We expect that no country will come close to competing with our existing systems for the next 10 years.

And two, we expect to achieve cost savings from BRAC and acquisition streamlining that will allow us to reinvest these savings into our modernization program.

We must always maintain technological superiority. This is one of my greatest concerns.

Anyone who thinks it was decency or goodness that caused Saddam Hussein or General Cedras to back off when faced by American soldiers, lives in a dream world.

In Haiti and Kuwait, lives were saved from the ravages of war—not out of goodness—but out of a knowledge of what our soldiers could and would do if forced to fight.

Technology overmatch—by deterring—saves lives. It saves not only lives—it saves money—by allowing us to maintain a smaller and more effective Army, and avoiding the prohibitive, gut-wrenching costs of war.

In these days of reduced resources, and tough program cuts we must squeeze more out of dollars. We must become more efficient. The dollars we save in efficiencies can and must be plowed back into modernization.

General Reimer, your new chief, believes—and I quote: “We must find new and innovative ways to help ourselves. We must find smarter ways to do business, streamline our management processes, reduce overhead, leverage outside resources and use what we have more efficiently.”

I can think of no better group to “help us help ourselves” than the leadership of the JAG Corps. Because, in the end, your real clients are your soldiers and ultimately, the American taxpayer.

Let me spend a few minutes talking to you, as a lawyer who has been functioning as a client for the past 2 years. I’d like to tell you what lawyers do for me, and what lawyers do for the Army as a whole.

But before I do that, let me tell you that being a client is a real eye-opener. I have learned a great deal in this capacity about what makes clients happy and, sometimes, what frustrates them.

Maybe the best story I’ve seen on reversal of roles was the movie “The Doctor,” starring William Hurt. Hurt played the role of a great surgeon who was very flippant, played acid rock in the operating room, and was not very sensitive to the needs of his patients.

His perspective radically changes when he learned he has cancer of the eye. The balance of the movie—following this discovery—covers his frustration under the cold-blooded treatment of another “Hot Shot” doctor.

The last scenes of the movie are ones I will never forget. William Hurt, after recovery, is placed in charge of 10 interns. He orders them to live, for 48 hours, as patients as part of their training. The interns are forced to experience the discomforts of patients including enemas, staff rudeness, and a shocking lack of privacy.

I can assure you my client experiences have been a little more pleasant.

As Mike Nardotti and Bill Coleman can vouch, I use lawyers extensively—every day. They have traveled with me; they have provided traditional legal counsel, advice and representation; and they have assisted in crafting argument on matters of policy having very little to do with the law.

Based on my experiences, I think lawyers could be used more extensively.

The art of good advocacy is something that can be applied anywhere.

Just about everything we write—everything I have seen of any import—is expository. Everything is either asking someone to do or approve something.

Everytime I see an Army document that is asking for something important from OSD, from Congress, or from another agency, I instinctively ask to have counsel review and edit it. I do not believe I have ever failed to get back a product that was measurably better than what I had provided.

Recently I worked in a non-legal capacity, and sometimes, extensively on the rocky mountain arsenal settlement negotiations. My role was restricted to interfacing with the policy-makers of the State of Colorado—Gov. Roy Romer, Lt. Gov. Gail Schoettler, and other policy people.

Both Bill Coleman and Mike Nardotti built a great negotiation team. From the General Counsel’s office, Earl Stockdale and Tammy Paragino oversaw the development of the negotiation strategy. While JAG officers Col. Cal Lederer, Maj. Sharon Riley, Maj. Jonathan Potter, and Capt. Tom Cook played key roles on the negotiating team.

In addition to everything else he did, the quarterback of our rock mountain negotiat-

ing team, Col. John Benson, was absolutely superb in knowing when—and he was very sparing—to call me out and dust me off for action.

John’s team tackled several complex and controversial issues and masterfully dealt with a wide range of groups that included the State of Colorado, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the EPA, shell Oil, and several local groups.

The efforts of Benson’s team led to a cost-savings to the Army of between \$1 to 2 billion and brought over 12 years of negotiations to a successful juncture.

A couple of weeks ago we awarded John Benson the legion of merit, and recognized with awards four other attorneys who were instrumental in that landmark litigation and settlement.

In the months to come, Col. Cal Lederer will lead the team in completing final negotiations.

If you forget everything else that I say to you today, the one thought I would hope you would take away—my one request—is that you set your top priority knowing intimately the business of your customers. What are their priorities today?

When I say “the business of your customers,” I am not talking only about the legal implications of your client’s actions. I am talking about what your client does on a day-in/day-out basis—readiness challenges, maintenance challenges, personnel progression, training, finding efficiencies, and whatever else happens to be the priorities at your particular installation.

I say this because I have had very fine lawyers—lawyers who obviously were capable analytically—who turned out to be of marginal use because they simply did not understand—they did not undertake to develop a rudimentary understanding of—the context of the legal problem.

It is not that they did not want to; they simply did not understand it. It is like a doctor—and there are many fine doctors who behave like this—who is technically superb, but who treats each person to be operated on as a specimen.

I am reminded of the time when my daughter was 10 months old when I was serving in the 82d airborne division. One night, we had to rush her to Womack Army Hospital with a 106 degree temperature, for what turned out to be spinal meningitis. Apart from misdiagnosing her, the doctor who treated her that night, kept referring to her as my “son.”

Our legal community faces similar challenges in serving our clients. All of us know lawyers in private practice who might prepare a lease that costs \$10,000 in legal expenses for a condo that is only \$20,000 itself.

What’s the problem?—Complete disregard, or lack of understanding, of the context.

I am reminded of a young aggressive Navy attorney.—The prosecutor in famous murder trial a few years ago.

During the trial, a sailor took the stand. “Would you please tell the court if you recognize either the defendant or the plaintiff?” asked the prosecuting attorney “beg your pardon, sir” said the sailor, “but would you explain to me what those words mean?”

The prosecutor’s eyes narrowed. “Shame on you! How can you take the stand as a witness in a murder trial and not know those basic terms?”

“Sorry sir”

The prosecutor said, “Let me rephrase the question. Tell the court where you were when the accused is said to have struck the victim.”

“Well sir, I was abaft the binnacle”

And would you please explain what those words mean?”

“Shame on you sir!” said the sailor. “How can you work on a case about murder on a ship and not know those basic terms?”

Now, to keep our counsel as lawyers relevant, in addition to keeping track of the context, it also helps to think of our decisions in terms of business consequences. Doctors and lawyers are considered notoriously bad businessmen. And we must change that.

Sid Lanoue, our Surgeon General, is an exception. He has put every hospital on a budget that rewards preventive medicine, and lets hospitals keep savings.

I understand the JAG Corps is moving in the same direction. SJA claims officers are more aggressively recovering money from carriers for damaged household goods—and their office budgets are rewarded with a portion of the recovered money.

One aspect of lawyering that makes good business sense is how a private attorney charges for his time.

One way is the contingency fee—if the client does not win, the lawyer does not get paid.

The other way is billing rates.

I always tried as an attorney, not only to consider the dollar and cent consequences of decisions, and the time value of money—but also the money value of my time.

Ask yourself these questions: “Would I pay for what I am doing?” “Am I giving the taxpayer what they are paying for?”

Everyone has a “billing rate.”

Governmental bureaucracies are a real challenge to change, especially if attorneys are part of the foot dragging.

No one is better than attorneys at putting up roadblocks or taking them down—telling people they can not do things that otherwise make good business sense. We as attorneys must think about the practical business consequences of our advice.

Last year, the AMC legal community has also begun a program that makes good business sense. They now routinely conduct post-award contract negotiations with unsuccessful bidders.

When people think they have been treated unfairly—they litigate. These debriefings help make contractors understand why they have been treated fairly—and save millions in litigation costs.

Let me just make a couple other observations about being an Army lawyer.

Army attorneys in one respect have a tougher job than their civilian counterparts, who are constrained only by the code of professional responsibility.

Army lawyers, on the other hand, under EC 7-14—must also be fair—must not employ the awesome power of Government to effect an unjust end.

Looking back, I am not proud of everything I did as a Government attorney. I am sure there were times that I was over-zealous. I abided by code but did not always focus on what was just or fair.

Some of those who have never served in private practice may not appreciate the power the Government was available to effect unjust ends.

If I had to do it over again, I would be more oriented to pursue my work because it was just and fair—not solely because I had a legal argument.

Why? Because it’s just good lawyering. People who believe they have been wronged usually will not give up easily.

When it comes to fairness, people demand more from their Government than they do from others.

Another aspect of context involves change—especially those changes over which we do not exercise control—shrinking resources, new technology, new missions.

Last May, Judge Frank Posner of the 7th circuit was the keynote speaker at the American Law Institute in Chicago. His speech was critical of the ACI. He chastised the entire body for failing to adapt or to

even acknowledge revolutionary changes taking place in society.

While I did not agree with everything he said, he was right that attorneys cannot function as elite professionals in a vacuum.

Obviously today's world is much more complicated than just a few years ago. It was much easier to give advice. As often as not, SJA advice was more confined to military criminal law and a few community matters.

The end of the Cold War has contributed to changing this.

Commanders now find themselves anywhere in the world—assigned any number of unusual missions.—Reducing street crime on the streets of Port 'A Prince, or guarding refugees in Panama—the different scenarios are endless.

In the past the SJA was always considered part of the special staff. A specialist who could keep to himself. No more the SJA has become a member of the commander's battle staff. He plays a role—like that of the G2—assessing the battlefield—identifying potential legal, and ethical landmines.

In Panama, Haiti, Somalia, and Rwanda our SJAs are one of the most important staff members, helping their commanders avoid these landmines.—Stepping forward and guiding them through these minefields.

It is in this regard I would ask you to do ever more. In this period of resource constraints, we need our attorneys more than ever—to keep stepping forward.

Help us streamline our processes.—Not something lawyers are well-known for doing, but vitally important. Help make the rules and procedures more understandable—more accessible—and more relevant to the needs of your commander.

The law, ethically applied and sensibly interpreted—invariably is fair and makes sense. And your role in interpreting and applying the law, if anything, is more important today than ever before.

Let me close by thanking each of you for what you've done up to now, what you're doing this week, what you must keep doing in order to keep our Army the finest in the world.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LIFE-LONG CIVIC ACHIEVEMENTS OF HAMILTON C. FORMAN

HON. PETER DEUTSCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, for the past 50 years in Broward County, one man has been at the forefront of civic progress in South Florida. Whether it was a fight for the preservation of the Everglades or the integration of our schools, Hamilton C. Forman has taken a leading role in finding solutions to our communities' problems. In recognition of these civic accomplishments, the B'nai B'rith Foundation of the United States is awarding Hamilton Forman the Great American Traditions Award on Saturday, January 6.

The Hamilton Forman story began in the rural section of Broward County during the pre-Depression era. His family worked as dairy farmers in an isolated section of the county. Yet, even though Hamilton Forman grew up in a remote section of Broward County, it did not restrain him from devising a clear vision on how he wanted Broward County, his home, to develop. He wanted to create a booming economy in South Florida built around warm weather and migration. With this

idea in mind, he invested a good portion of his life's savings in real estate located across the region. By the end of World War II he had amassed hundreds of acres of local real estate and established himself as a role model for entrepreneurial success and civic involvement.

But the achievements of Hamilton C. Forman over the last 50 years cannot simply be summarized by saying that he was instrumental in building a hospital or that he donated money and time to a charitable organization. The primary contribution Hamilton C. Forman has given to South Florida is that he has repeatedly offered his services to the community over the last 50 years. It is this rare example of continued leadership and civic involvement that I wish to pay special tribute to today. Since World War II, Hamilton Forman has chosen to involve himself in a wide array of issues facing our diverse society and I would like to take this time to thank him for this untiring involvement in the welfare of South Florida.

IN HONOR OF MAY AARONSON

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to my constituent, May Aaronson, of Chevy Chase, MD, who will celebrate her 84th birthday on January 6.

When May was 45, after raising three children and volunteering in many community activities, May Aaronson enrolled in college. She went on to graduate at the top of her class at Howard University and then embarked on a 31-year career at the National Institute of Mental Health in the field of early child development. Her work there has had lasting impact on the health and well-being of countless children, especially at-risk youngsters.

She helped to create a model in-home education program for at-risk preschoolers; she authored a book for young parents on how to raise a healthy infant; and she coauthored and authored measurement tools for parent and child behavior and interaction. In her work for the Department of Health and Human Services she reviewed and oversaw grants in the area of Early Child Development and helped create a national network of information sharing about programs providing services for young children. She also created a screening test, the Children At Risk Screener, to aid in the important task of identifying preschoolers who need early educational, psychological or medical intervention. This typifies her work as it combines her creativity with practicality in designing a test in the form of a game that can be administered in less than 10 minutes.

May Aaronson is also proud of the accomplishments and contributions of her children: Doris Aaronson, a professor of psychology at New York University; David Aaronson, a professor of law at American University; and Jean Rosenfeld, a clinical social worker.

Two years ago, at the age of 82, she retired. As May celebrates her 84th birthday, she studies computer science, and she works as a volunteer on the Montgomery County Hotline, reaching out to those in need.

Mr. Speaker, May Aaronson is a role model for women, for senior citizens, and for all

Americans. Please join me in celebrating the birthday of this remarkable woman!

THANK YOU MR. DIJOSEPH

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Elma Town Supervisor John F. DiJoseph.

John DiJoseph tirelessly dedicated his life to the enhancement of the Elma community, and proved himself to be extraordinarily available to his constituents, or as he thought of Elma's citizens, friends.

Since 1975, Mr. John DiJoseph has been involved in his community's local politics and various community organizations, including Celebrity Waiters Dinner for the Leukemia Society, Kiwanis, Elma Historical Society, Executive Committee of the New York State Association of Towns, Eric County Association of Town Governments, Elma Conservation Club, Erie County Agricultural Society, Elma Fire Council, Elma Fire Companies, Elma Community Council Services, Saint Vincent de Paul Roman Catholic Church, and others too numerous to mention.

In 1980, John DiJoseph first served the Town of Elma in public office as Councilman, and served in that capacity with distinction until 1986, when he became Town Supervisor. As Supervisor, John DiJoseph will best be remembered by his community, as the Elma Town Board Proclamation so eloquently stated, as someone "to strive to emulate his total dedication to family and to his extended family, and the citizens of Elma."

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to join with the citizens of Elma, and indeed, the entire western New York Community, to honor Mr. John F. DiJoseph, who is survived by his wife, Shirley; his children, John, Jr., Michael, and Norine; his parents, Frank and Mary; his brother, Patrick; and sister, Laureen for his distinguished service to the Town of Elma.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM LIGHTFOOT

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Speaker, due to my son's hospitalization I was unable to be present and voting on January 3, 1996.

Had I been present I would have voted in favor of overriding the veto of H.R. 1530, the National Defense Authorization Act and in favor of overriding the veto of H.R. 2076, the Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Appropriations Act.

SUPPORT GEPHARDT MOTION

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to reopen the departments and agencies which have been closed

and to stop holding Federal workers hostage while we negotiate a balanced budget. This will be the third resolution passed by the Senate to put our Federal employees back to work and all have been rejected by the House Republicans.

I represent thousands of Federal workers who provide very important services for hundreds of thousands of taxpayers in the 19th Congressional District and this Nation. Just last week I met with several hundred Federal workers in my district who are being punished for doing nothing more than working for a government agency for which there is no funding authority. These are people who take on the very important responsibility of caring for our veterans at the VA medical center. These are men and women who have the difficult task of running the high security Federal prison at Marion. There are many others who go to work every day with the goal of providing service to the taxpayers of this Nation, including the Forest Service and Fish and Wildlife employees.

And what are they getting for their trouble? They work in agencies which are apparently not important enough to fund through the regular appropriations bills, are too important to keep off the job, but in the final analysis are not important enough to pass a clean funding bill so they can be paid. This is truly outrageous, and I know the people in my district are fed up with the games being played in Washington.

We should come to agreement on those appropriations bills which we can pass to put these agencies back in business. For those where agreement cannot be reached, we should pass a clean continuing resolution and at least let the basic functions of those agencies and departments continue. And we should come to terms on a 7-year balanced budget as scored by the Congressional Budget Office.

I have cosponsored and voted for the "Coalition" budget which represents the middle-ground for both sides in this debate. I would urge the negotiators once again to take a look at our approach—balanced in 7 years, better for Medicare and Medicaid than the leadership plan and rejecting a tax cut which we can't afford—and come to an agreement.

I support the motion to put our people back to work and to pay them for their time and effort. And I urge the negotiating teams to work in a bipartisan spirit to reach agreement on the overriding goal of balancing the Federal budget.

TRIBUTE TO PROF. HAROLD
NORRIS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1995

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to Prof. Harold Norris, a gifted attorney and profound humanitarian who imbued generations of law students with a love and a passion for justice. This fall, Professor Norris retired from the Detroit College of Law where he taught constitutional and criminal law for the past 35 years. Professor Norris is far more than just a teacher. He is a tireless crusader for human rights. He is blessed with the soul

of a poet, the insight of a historian, the curiosity of a philosopher, and the courage of a warrior.

Law students in his final constitutional law class presented him with a plaque on the Bill of Rights. That plaque illustrates his impact on them and on thousands of other young people. It reads in part:

While the Bill of Rights grants assurance to the individual of the preservation of liberty, it does not define the liberty it promises . . . only in recent American history has the Bill of Rights been used as a shield in the battle against indignity, abuse, oppression, inequality, unfairness and intrusion. And while the Bill of Rights is the individual's shield against governmental abuse and power, that shield is of little use without a hand to hold it high. Throughout his life Professor Harold Norris has held that shield and taught his students and others to do the same. He has taught us that the Bill of Rights does not implement itself, it is only by the conviction, courage and strength of people who recognize its indispensable protections that the true spirit of its contents are achieved.

Born in Detroit, Harold Norris' early life was shaped by the Great Depression. He was keenly aware of the Depression's devastating impact on the lives of working-class people who desperately sought help and guidance from the Government. That experience helped crystalize his feelings about the importance of justice as a reality, not just a concept.

Over the years, Professor Norris has engaged in ground-breaking work in the areas of civil and human rights. As a delegate to the Michigan Constitutional Convention of 1961, he served as vice-chair of the Committee on the Declaration of Rights, Suffrage, and Elections. He wrote numerous key provisions of the Michigan constitution of 1963, including provisions that prohibited racial and religious discrimination and provisions that created a right to appeal in a criminal case. He was co-author of the provisions creating a civil rights commission.

He is former chairman of the constitutional law round table of the Association of American Law Schools. He was counsel to the Committee on Constitutional Revision of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, and he has been a consultant to the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Professor Norris' passion for the law affected every aspect of his life. At his retirement party, Norris' son, Victor, a Detroit-area attorney, observed that the first gifts given to him and his sister, Barbara, by their father caused us to be the only kids on the block with their own individually framed copy of the Bill of Rights.

Harold Norris received a bachelor of arts degree from the University of Michigan in 1939. Two years later, he earned a master's degree in economics, also from the University of Michigan. In 1942, he joined the Army Air Corps and attended the Harvard Business School program to train statistical control officers. He spent almost 3 years overseas before being discharged in 1946. When he returned home, he enrolled in Columbia University and earned his law degree in 2 years. He and his wife, Frances, had two children, Victor and Barbara, both born during the Columbia years.

In 1948, Harold Norris was admitted to the Michigan bar. For the next 13 years, he en-

gaged in private practice. During that time, he became active in bar associations where, as he recalled in a 1991 magazine interview, "I helped initiate and secure prepaid legal insurance, the principle of fair employment practice legislation, compulsory automobile liability insurance, and the inclusion of lawyers in the Social Security Act." Norris wrote the Michigan Automobile Liability Accident Claims Act.

In addition to his private practice and his work with the bar associations, Harold Norris involved himself with the American Civil Liberties Union where, among other things, he represented teachers and students who were subpoenaed by the House Un-American Affairs Committee. He pushed for one-man, one-vote, and he spoke out on the need for fair and impartial evaluations of citizen complaints against the police.

In 1961, a number of forces converged on Professor Norris and moved him toward the realization of one of his goals: to be a teacher. While serving as president of the ACLU's Detroit chapter, Norris met the late Charles King, dean of the Detroit College of Law, who asked him to join the faculty. In 1961 Norris became a professor at Detroit College of Law; that same year he was elected a delegate to the Michigan constitutional convention. In the classroom and in the political arena, he was able to expand his efforts to help this country live up to its promise of freedom and justice for its citizens.

Despite Professor Norris' awesome accomplishments, he remains an unpretentious man who always makes time to talk to students and friends. He encourages open debate in his classes, and he considers it his mission to spark an unquenchable thirst for justice in his students.

Professor Norris' passion for justice is a natural part of his lifelong search for balance and harmony in the universe. His talent as a writer and social commentator has won him praise in the literary field as well as in the legal field.

As an author, Professor Norris' works include "Mr. Justice Murphy and the Bill of Rights," published in 1965; "Reflections on Law, Lawyers, and the Bill of Rights, a Collection of Writings 1944-1984," published in 1984 and "Education for Popular Sovereignty Through Implementing the Constitution and the Bill of Rights," published in 1991. Included among the collected writings found in "Education for Popular Sovereignty Through Implementing the Constitution and the Bill of Rights," is "Due Process and the Rule of Law: Earning Citizen Cooperation with Police." Presented at a public meeting in Detroit, the speech is as relevant today as it was when Professor Norris gave it in 1961. Detroit police were engaged in a unlawful crackdown on African American citizens. Some 1,500 dragnet arrests resulted in only 40 warrants. Much of the community was outraged over the trampling of individual rights. Professor Norris went directly to the heart of the issue when he wrote:

We believe that the public has a tremendous interest in law enforcement, but it has an even greater long-range and permanent interest in the rule of law. We hear of promoting world peace through law. We need the rule of law to promote the peace of the Detroit community. Justice through law is the objective of government and law enforcement, not merely the apprehension and prevention of crime. Inscribed upon the portals of the building housing the United State Supreme Court in Washington, are the words

Equal Justice Under the Law . . . the watchwords of our constitutional faith. In other words, it is the purpose of the Bill of Rights and Due Process to make all citizens self-governing and equally secure against any arbitrary and unlawful intrusion, private or public. The Bill of Rights was born in controversy and lives in controversy. Due Process of law is to be observed in emergencies as well as in conditions of safety.

Harold Norris also is a sensitive poet whose work has been praised by Archibald MacLeish and Theodore H. White. White said Norris' poetry is "infused with an almost forgotten sense of love—love of country and of people, love of America's monuments and places, love of its future and heroes."

Professor Norris' poem, "The Liberty Bell" hangs in the lobby of the Detroit College of Law and in the public lobby of Philadelphia's Independence National Park's Administration Building, the home of the Liberty Bell.

In a moving tribute to civil rights legend Rosa Parks, Norris wrote in part: "I will walk. My will is responsible. I am this nation. This nation is what I do. It will not be done. Unless I do it. This nation is determination. This nation is conduct. Conduct with a free will. During his career, numerous groups have honored Professor Norris with awards and commendations. Included among these awards are the National Judge Finch Law Day Speech Award from the American Bar Association for his address on "Law, the Language of Liberty," the "Champion of Justice Award" by the State Bar of Michigan and the "Distinguished Warrior for Civil Rights Award" by the Detroit Urban League.

In 1987, the Michigan supreme court presented him with a citation for his vision, faith, and commitment that have inspired a lifetime of contributions to the jurisprudence of our State. In that citation, he was aptly described as a lawyer, educator, poet, and statesman.

Professor Norris enjoyed a unique and beautiful relationship with his wife, Frances, whose death in 1990 ended a forty-seven year marriage.

Their son, Victor, recently provided one of a most telling and insightful assessment of Pro-

fessor Norris. Asked to describe his father, Victor said:

"Even if he wasn't my father, I would say that I have never known anyone who on a minute-by-minute, day-by-day basis feels so responsible to his country and to making it a better place to be."

When Professor Norris' name is mentioned, the most respected and successful lawyers and judges in Detroit say he shaped their law perspective about justice and led them to understand that the Bill of Rights is a living document that must be protected by those who practice both justice and the law.

Harold Norris' presence has made this a better, stronger, and more decent Nation. During a teaching career that spanned four decades, he touched the lives of thousands of lawyers who now carry on his mission of our Nation.

One of Professor Norris' last acts at Detroit College of Law was to create and to help fund the Harold Norris Colloquium, which is an annual even that will explore key issues in the fields of constitutional law, civil rights, and civil liberties.

Detroit, the State of Michigan, and the United States are deeply indebted to Professor Harold Norris—humanitarian, lawyer, teacher, and poet. Because of his appreciation and understanding of the living power of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, generations of citizens have been able to live with a greater measure of freedom, opportunity, and dignity. I am pleased that my family and his have been friends, neighbors, and leaders in helping define and resolve the issues that yet may make this form of government great.

PASS THE FOREIGN AID BILL

HON. PETER DEUTSCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months, the House Republican leader-

ship have stubbornly help up the entire foreign aid package, including MEPFA and aid to Israel, in order to score political points on a domestic political issue.

Unfortunately, this intransigence has put the three most vital benefits of foreign aid to Israel in serious jeopardy. First, without delivering foreign aid by January 1, the economic stability of Israel could be threatened. The Israeli Government will come dangerously close to defaulting on its financial commitments. Moreover, funding for a variety of social projects in the region will be imperiled including money earmarked for roads, housing and hospitals.

Second, the failure to pass the foreign aid bill will have a serious impact on the American economy. It is a little known fact that 83 percent of all aid to Israel is spent here in the United States creating good jobs for Americans. Without passage of the foreign aid legislation, billions of dollars that would have been injected into the American economy will be lost.

Third, failure to pass the foreign aid bill will endanger the fragile Middle East peace process. Both Israel and the Palestinians rely heavily on American aid to stabilize their domestic economies. Eliminating this funding will encourage extremism in both societies and threaten all of the hard fought progress that has occurred over the last several years.

On a practical level, the United States has a choice between either providing aid to Israel or sustaining a large military presence in the Middle East. I urge the House Republican leadership to negotiate a compromise on this legislation and pass the foreign aid bill. Without some type of action, we are in jeopardy of seriously undermining the peace process in the Middle East.