Financial constraints, environmental concerns, and the availability of less expensive, less environmentally intrusive alternatives led the House to reject previous Auburn Dam proposals—and they will do so again if the issue is brought before Congress. Every time this proposal has been reincarnated, its estimated costs have risen dramatically. This time, the price tag has ballooned to just under $1 billion. At a time when the Congress is grappling with the question of exactly how to balance the Federal budget and desperately seeking solutions on how the deal with our $5 trillion public debt, how can the Congress possibly justify the unnecessary expenditure of such a gross amount of money?

It is not necessary to build a dam at Auburn in order to protect the California Central Valley community and the city of Sacramento from flooding in the event of a storm the size of any which have previously struck. In order to justify the latest proposal, proponents claim that the dam is needed to protect the region from storms that are far larger than the greatest flood that may reasonably be expected on the American River. Fortunately, however, the Corps of Engineers and regional flood control authorities have identified much less expensive alternatives which will significantly improve the performance of Sacramento's flood control system. And it is possible that these alternatives could be paid for by the local community without any Federal funding—or at least without the majority of project costs being borne by Federal taxpayers.

In order to build the latest Auburn Dam, project supporters expect U.S. taxpayers to bear 75 percent of its approximate cost of $1 billion. I feel strongly that the Federal civil works program is not an entitlement program, and that it certainly should not be expected to bear this kind of burden in the case of a regional water project. Those who know flood control concur with this assessment. In fact, the National Academy of Engineering released a blue ribbon report on the American River flood control project which found that, since the project was without widespread benefits and located in an area with substantial financial resources, there was no Federal interest in additional flood control work on the American River.

But cost is far from the only reason why I am introducing this bill today. A few months ago, the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] declared an Auburn Dam to be environmentally unacceptable. Each year, about half a million people visit the American River canyons that would be inundated by such a dam, and many of them strongly oppose actions by their government to take this resource away from them. Up to 39 miles of pristine canyon habitat would be flooded by a dam built according to the latest proposal, robbing wildlife of precious habitat. Citizens and editorial boards throughout California have denounced the dam in both its past and present incarnations.

This dam was stopped in the seventies because of concerns about seismic safety. It never moved forward during the eighties because of President Reagan's commitment to seek full reimbursement for the water and power benefits which a multipurpose dam would provide to the region and its residents. In the nineties, Congress has thus far said no once already to an Auburn Dam because of economic and environmental concerns. My introduction of this legislation today is intended to send a strong message: Congress must say no to building an Auburn Dam once again—for all of the above reasons.

A REQUEST FOR KINDNESS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1996

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Kindness Week in the city of Dallas, scheduled for the week of February 11, 1996. The mission of this event is to celebrate and promote the value and spirit of kindness, and to help bring all races, religious, and socioeconomic groups within the city of Dallas together to foster understanding among us all.

As a part of the celebration of Kindness Week, I ask all the citizens of Dallas to come together in the true spirit of the week, and if possible, to attend a formal ''Kindness Celebration'' at Thanksgiving Square, at 12 p.m. on February 14, 1996.

This week-long event presents the city of Dallas an opportunity that seldom occurs: a chance to lead the Nation, and hopefully the world, in making our small planet a better place to live. Attitudes are contagious, and with a unified effort, Dallas can assist the Nation in creating an attitude of kindness that can carry on for years to come.

I ask all of my friends in Dallas to participate in Kindness Week in a variety of ways, all of which are easily done but pay big rewards. Such things as visiting a senior center, driving safely and courteously, and speaking with an old friend take very little effort and time, and create a good feeling for each person involved. Compliment rather than criticize; help rather than shout; and smile rather than frown. Each of us has a role to play, and I hope we will all do our part in Kindness Week.

TRIBUTE TO REAR ADMIRAL FREDERICK JULIAN BECTON

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1996

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened today to bring to your attention the recent passing of Frederick Julian Becton, a retired Rear Admiral of the United States Navy. A true hero, Admiral Becton demonstrated his courage and mettle many times over throughout his 35 years of military service.

A World War II hero, Admiral Becton passed away in his hometown of Wynnewood, PA, on Christmas Eve at the age of 87. No episode better portrays Admiral Becton's tenacity and bravery than when he refused to abandon his ship during one of the most punishing attacks of the war. Admiral Becton was later awarded the Navy Cross for extraordinary heroism as Commander of the USS *LAFFEY* in action against Japanese forces off Okinawa, on April 16, 1945 . . . with his ship under savage attack by 30 hostile planes.''

I would like to submit for the RECORD an article that appeared on December 26, 1995 in the Philadelphia Inquirer regarding Admiral Becton. When you read this article, I am sure that you too will come to understand what a fine gentleman and hero that America has lost. I know that my colleagues join me today in mourning the passing of Admiral Becton, an American hero.

F. BECTON, NAVY HERO IN WWII

(By Larry Fish)

Frederick Julian Becton, a retired rear admiral who was awarded the Navy Cross for refusing to give up his ship after one of the most punishing attacks of World War II, died Sunday in Wynnewood at age 87.

A native of Arkansas and a 1931 graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, Adm. Becton was a lieutenant when the war broke out. He was to see action in the Atlantic and Pacific Theaters and would win many decorations and medals for his exploits.

The most dramatic came in April 1945, when the destroyer USS Laffey, commanded by Adm. Becton, was off Okinawa on radar picket duty.

The Laffey was a relatively new ship but had already been bloodied—in June 1944, when it supported the D-Day invasion of Normandy and participated in the bombardment of Cherbourg, France. Among its scars from that engagement was an unexploded 8-inch shell lodged in the superstructure.

By this late stage of the war, the Japanese had begun to expand the use of Kamikaze attacks, the suicidal crashing of armed planes into Allied ships.

For the Laffey, the attack began shortly after sunrise April 16 with a formation of four planes. The kamikazes split up to make it more difficult for the crew to keep guns trained on them, and the assault was on.

It was to last 79 minutes, and eventually, 22 planes drew a bead on the Laffey. Adm. Becton, wearing a steel helmet and life vest, stood in the open to better see the action.

Planes seemed to come from every direction and altitude, he said in an Inquirer interview shortly before the 50th anniversary of the battle this year.

Though the Laffey's gunners and those from nearby craft were aided by U.S. warplanes, some of the kamikaze inevitably found their mark.

''Each time one crashed, there was always a flood of gasoline from the plane—and one hell of a fire,'' Adm. Becton told The Inquirer.

The guns took out at least eight of the planes, but five hit the destroyer, jamming its rudder and spreading fire everywhere.

''Near the end of the action, one of my officers, Frank Mason, came to me and said, 'Captain, we're in pretty bad shape aft. Do you think you'll have to abandon ship?'

''It never entered my mind to abandon ship. The ship might sink under us. We might not be able to sail her. But I wasn't going to abandon her.

''So I said, 'No, Frank, I'll never abandon ship as long as a gun will fire.' ''

Thirty-one crew members died, and the Laffey had to be towed to Seattle, where a newspaper reported that it was ''riddled like a sieve above the water line.''

The citation for the Navy Cross praised Adm. Becton's ''extraordinary herosim'' in keeping his ship afloat and in action.

He was promoted to captain in 1951 and to rear admiral in 1959, and was assigned to the Bureau of Naval Personnel and other posts. When he retired in 1966, he and his wife, the former Elizabeth Hilary Reuss, moved to her hometown of Wynnewood.

He wrote a book on his experience—The Ship That Would Not Die—and kept in touch with many former crew members.

He is also survived by two daughters, Hilary Becton Wagner and Julie Bradford Becton.

A viewing will be held at 10 a.m. Jan. 3 at Ardmore Presbyterian Church, Montgomery Avenue and Mill Creek Road; a service will follow at 11 a.m. Burial will be 11 a.m. Jan. 4 at Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Va.

THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

HON. JIM BUNN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1996

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a plan, already approved by the Judiciary Committee in the other body, to reorganize the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. This proposal, which is long overdue, would divide a circuit that is twice as large as the national average in terms of geographical area, population, and caseload.

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals was originally designed during the Civil War, when 6 of the 9 States in the circuit had not yet been admitted to the Union. Since then, the laws of the Nation, and the resources required to interpret those laws, have grown exponentially. Caseload growth is a concern in many circuits, but no circuit suffers the burden as does the ninth circuit.

One large problem is the magnitude of cases that has led to lengthy delays. Even Chief Judge Wallace, the top judge in the ninth circuit, admitted that cases can be delayed for 4 months over the national average. While the judges have worked very hard to improve an unacceptable situation, I believe we can do better.

The number of judges alone prevents consistency in the ninth circuit. There are 28 judges in the ninth, more than twice the national average of 12.6, leading to thousands of possible combinations of three judge panels to hear a case. Because there are so many sitting and visiting judges, there is little uniformity among decisions, leading to greater uncertainty of the law of the land. Furthermore, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has a higher rate of cases being overturned by the U.S. Supreme Court than the national average.

In addition, Chief Judge Wallace recently called for 10 additional judges to ease the burden on the current judges, while others have requested that the number of judges be doubled to 56. However, adding judges to the already unwieldy panel of 28 would only worsen the problem; reorganizing the ninth circuit into two more manageable circuits provides a much more efficient solution.

There is recent precedent for the successful split of a Circuit Court of Appeals. The Hruska Commission recommended in 1973 that both the fifth and the ninth circuits be divided due to overwhelming size and caseload. The fifth circuit was split in 1980 with great success in improving efficiency. Chief Judge Tjoflat of the eleventh circuit testified before the other body's Judiciary Committee that while the new fifth and the eleventh circuits have approximately the same number of judges as does the ninth, the two new circuits are able to process 50 percent more cases than the current ninth circuit.

Judges, lawyers, and legislators have been calling for a reorganization of the ninth circuit since the formal recommendation in 1973, and the attorneys general of nearly all of the States involved have endorsed the ninth circuit split. While many people agree that much greater reform of the Federal judicial system is needed, this bill is a crucial first step. I ask my colleagues to join me in support for this important legislation.

REMARKS BY SENATOR NUNN AT NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1996

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a great personal pleasure for me to introduce into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following statement by our distinguished colleague and my good friend, Senator SAM NUNN. His speech, delivered at the National Prayer Breakfast this morning, was very powerful and given with his usual sense of thoughtfulness and sincerity. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to take a moment and read this moving address given the Senator NUNN.

[National Prayer Breakfast, Feb. 1, 1996]

SENATOR SAM NUNN—TRANSCRIPT OF REMARKS

Thank you Bob Bennett, President and Mrs. Clinton, Vice President and Mrs. Gore, fellow sinners. Have I left anyone out? I say to my good friend, Alan Simpson, Billy Graham called me also, Alan. He said, as he did in his message, that he was praying for us all. But, he felt particularly compelled to pray for Alan Simpson and for me. Alan, I don't know what he meant by that, but you and I appreciate it.

A few years ago during the Bresznev era, Dr. Billy Graham returned from a highly publicized trip to Moscow and was confronted when he returned by one of his critics with these words, ''Dr. Graham, you have set the church back 50 years.'' Billy Graham lowered his head and replied, ''I am deeply ashamed. I have been trying very hard to set the church back 2,000 years.''

Today we represent different political parties, different religions and different nations, but as your invitation states, we gather as brothers and sisters in the spirit of Jesus who lived 2,000 years ago, and who lives in our hearts and minds today.

The first prayer breakfast was held in 1953 in a world of great danger. President Eisenhower was newly inaugurated and had just returned from Korea where our young soldiers were fighting desperately. World Communism was on the move. Eastern Europe and the Baltics were locked behind the Iron Curtain. All across the globe, the lights of religious freedom and individual rights were going out, and the specter of nuclear destruction loomed over our planet.

I wonder this morning how those who attended that first national prayer breakfast 43 years ago would have reacted if God had given them a window to see the world of the 1980's and 1990's.

They would have seen truly amazing things: Catholic nuns kneeling to pray in the path of 50-ton tanks—the power of their faith bringing down the Philippine dictatorship; the Iron Curtain being smashed, not by tanks of war, but by the hands of those who built it and those who were oppressed by it; the Cold War ending, not in a nuclear inferno, but in a blaze of candles in the churches of Eastern Europe, in the singing of hymns and the opening of long-closed synagogues. I believe that God gave Joseph Stalin the answer to his question, ''How many divisions does the Pope have?''

They also would have seen a black man in South Africa emerge from prison after 26 years and become the President of his nation, personifying forgiveness and reconciliation; the first hesitant but hopeful steps toward peace between Jews and Arabs in the Middle East, and between Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland. They would see that in 1996 we are blessed to live in a world where more people enjoy religious freedom than at any other time in history. Can we doubt this morning that a loving God has watched over us and guided us through this dangerous and challenging period?

During the early days of the Russian parliament, the Duma, I joined several other Senators in attending a meeting with a number of newly elected members of that body. The second day, a few of us were invited to a very small ''prayer breakfast'' with a group of Duma members who were just forming a fellowship, no doubt stimulated by Doug Coe. As in the larger meeting the day before, the breakfast discussion started with a degree of coldness and tension. One of the Russians, in obvious sadness and a little embarrassment, remarked that Russia was in great economic distress and that the United States was the only remaining superpower. It was clear that this was a very sensitive point for them. It had been abundantly clear the day before.

Senator Dirk Kempthorne and I then pointed out that in the real sense there is only one superpower in the world, our heavenly Father who watches over us all. The tension immediately eased and the spirit of fellowship was built, and we prayed together to that superpower, the God who loves us all.

Our world is a strange and tragic place. It is very ironic in many ways. The Cold War is now over, but in a tragic sense, the world has now been made safer for ethnic, tribal, and religious vengeance and savagery. Such tragedy has come to the people of Somalia, Bosnia, Rwanda, Burundi, Sudan, Haiti and others.

At home, the pillar of our national strength, the American family, is crumbling. Television and movies saturate our children with sex and violence. We have watered down our moral standards to the point where many of our youth are confused, discouraged and in deep trouble. We are reaping the harvest of parental neglect, divorce, child abuse, teen pregnancy, school dropouts, illegal drugs, and streets full of violence.

It's as if our house, having survived the great earthquake we call the Cold War, is now being eaten away by termites. Where should we turn this morning and in the days ahead?

Our problems in America today are primarily problems of the heart. The soul of our nation is the sum of our individual characters. Yes, we must balance the federal budget and there are a lot of other things we need to do at the Federal level, but unless we change our hearts we will still have a deficit of the soul.

The human inclination to seek political solutions for problems of the heart is nothing new. It is natural. Two thousand years ago, another society found itself in deeper trouble than our own. An oppressive empire strangled liberties. Violence and corruption were pervasive.

Many of the people of the day hoped for the triumphant coming of a political savior, a long-expected king to establish a new, righteous government. Instead, God sent his son, a baby, born in a stable. Jesus grew up to become a peasant carpenter in a backwater town called Nazareth. He condemned sin but made it clear that he loved the sinner. He befriended beggars and prostitutes and even