

year three elementary schools started year-round education. This new strategy is sure to benefit our students and our island.

The Catholic school system rose to prominence after World War II. Many fine educators and religious leaders built the foundation of our present Catholic school system. On a personal note, I would also like to mention the contributions of my aunt, Mary Underwood—formerly Sister Ines. After joining the Sisters of Mercy, she returned to her native Guam after World War II to help organize the Catholic school system. After many years of retirement in San Francisco, she recently returned to Guam.

Congratulations to all the Catholic schools on Guam, Archbishop Anthony Sablan Apuron, Sr. M. Dominic Reichart, RSM, interim director of Catholic schools, and to the other members of the Archdiocesan Board of Education: Dr. Katherine Aguon, Sr. Emiline Artero RSM, Mr. Zenon Belanger, Mr. Frank Campillo, Mrs. Fay Carbullido, Mr. Manuel Cruz—vice-president, Mr. Carl Dominquez—president, Mrs. Teresita Hagen, Mr. Paul Boyd, Dr. Richardo Eusebio, and attorney Jay Arriola. These individuals, along with every teacher and student, make Guam's Catholic schools, schools we can believe in. Si Yu'os Ma'ase yan todos hamyo.

NCEITA TO PARTICIPATE IN THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS REFORM DEBATE

HON. RICHARD BURR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1996

Mr. BURR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the fine efforts of the North Carolina Electronics and Information Technologies [NCEITA] to play a constructive role in the debate over telecommunications reform this year. NCEITA was formed in 1993 as the primary association representing North Carolina's high-technology companies. Rapid growth in our State's electronics and information industries has made it the second largest employer in North Carolina, accounting for more than 145,000 jobs. North Carolina, with its Research Triangle Park, the Nation's oldest and largest research park, has become one of the Nation's premier locations for firms in electronics, telecommunications, computer systems, and other high-technology fields.

As Congress considered the sweeping rewrite of our communications laws this year, NCEITA encouraged policymakers to take a close look at North Carolina's commitment to build a fully interactive fiber-optic network throughout the State and the advanced telecommunications capabilities available to its citizens. At the end of 1994, over 40,000 sheath miles of fiber-optic cable had been deployed throughout our State, providing the backbone for data transmission. Currently, over 97 percent of North Carolina businesses have access to digital switching. This interactive broadband network allows students to participate in classroom debates taking place on the other side of the State or browse through the library collections at distant universities. Cardiac specialists in Chapel Hill can now examine video images of the beating heart of an elderly woman in her doctor's office in the mountains of Hendersonville, NC.

Using North Carolina as a model of the benefits of advanced telecommunications capabilities, NCEITA urged legislators to promote the deployment of advanced telecommunications networks nationwide to enable all Americans to originate and receive affordable, high-quality voice, data, image, graphic, and video telecommunications services. NCEITA emphasized deregulation and competition in the local telephone exchange as the means toward spurring investment in these advanced broadband networks. As a result of their efforts on the legislative front, Congress chose to include a provision authorizing the Federal Communications Commission to encourage the timely deployment of advanced telecommunications capabilities, if necessary, through policies of pricing regulation, regulatory forbearance and promoting competition in the local telephone exchange. Quite simply, this will enable Americans to communicate better tomorrow than they can today. For that, NCEITA member companies—particularly Broad Band Technologies, Siecor, Nortel, and General Instruments—deserve special recognition.

BASIS FOR CHARGE THAT BILL CLINTON "LOATHES" THE MILITARY

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1996

Mr. DORNAN, Mr. Speaker, at your own request, Mr. GINGRICH, I am including the following letters from a young Bill Clinton to his ROTC draft board adviser Bataan Death March survivor Col. Eugene Holmes, as well as Colonel Holmes' response 20 years later. Also included are some of my comments on this issue that you and other Members have requested be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Times]

TEXT OF BILL CLINTON'S LETTER TO ROTC COLONEL

The text of the letter Bill Clinton wrote to Col. Eugene Holmes, director of the ROTC program at the University of Arkansas, on Dec. 3, 1969:

I am sorry to be so long in writing. I know I promised to let you hear from me at least once a month, and from now on you will, but I have had to have some time to think about this first letter. Almost daily since my return to England I have thought about writing, about what I want to and ought to say.

First, I want to thank you, not just for saving me from the draft, but for being so kind and decent to me last summer, when I was as low as I have ever been. One thing which made the bond we struck in good faith somewhat palatable to me was my high regard for you personally. In retrospect, it seems that the admiration might not have been mutual had you known a little more about me, about my political beliefs and activities. At least you might have thought me more fit for the draft than for ROTC.

Let me try to explain. As you know, I worked for two years in a very minor position on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I did it for the experience and the salary but also for the opportunity, however small, of working every day against a war I opposed and despised with a depth of feeling I had reserved solely for racism in America before Vietnam. I did not take the matter

lightly but studied it carefully, and there was a time when not many people had more information about Vietnam at hand than I did.

I have written and spoken and marched against the war. One of the national organizers of the Vietnam Moratorium is a close friend of mine. After I left Arkansas last summer, I went to Washington to work in the national headquarters of the Moratorium, then to England to organize the America here for demonstrations Oct. 15 and Nov. 16.

Interlocked with the war is the draft issue, which I did not begin to consider separately until early 1968. For a law seminar at Georgetown I wrote a paper on the legal arguments for and against allowing, within the Selective Service System, the classification of selective conscientious objection for those opposed to participation in a particular war, not simply to "participation in war in any form."

From my work I came to believe that the draft system itself is illegitimate. No government really rooted in limited, parliamentary democracy should have the power to make its citizens fight and kill and die in a war they may oppose, a war which even possibly may be wrong, a war which, in any case, does not involve immediately the peace and freedom of the nation.

The draft was justified in World War II because the life of the people collectively was at stake. Individuals had to fight, if the nation was to survive, for the lives of their countrymen and their way of life. Vietnam is no such case. Nor was Korea an example where, in my opinion, certain military action was justified but the draft was not, for the reasons stated above.

Because of my opposition to the draft and the war, I am in great sympathy with those who are not willing to fight, kill and maybe die for their country (i.e. the particular policy of a particular government) right or wrong. Two of my friends at Oxford are conscientious objectors. I wrote a letter of recommendation for one of them to his Mississippi draft board, a letter which I am more proud of than anything else I wrote at Oxford last year. One of my roommates is a draft resister who is possibly under indictment and may never be able to go home again. He is one of the bravest, best men I know. His country needs men like him more than they know. That he is considered criminal is an obscenity.

The decision not to be a resister and the related subsequent decisions were the most difficult of my life. I decided to accept the draft in spite of my beliefs for one reason: to maintain my political inability within the system. For years I have worked to prepare myself for a political life characterized by both practical political ability and concern for rapid social progress. It is a life I still feel compelled to try to lead. I do not think our system of government is by definition corrupt, however dangerous and inadequate it has been in recent years. (The society may be corrupt, but that is not the same thing, and if that is true, we are all finished anyway.)

When the draft came, despite political convictions, I was having a hard time facing the prospect of fighting a war I had been fighting against, and that is why I contacted you. ROTC was the one way left in which I could possibly, but not positively, avoid both Vietnam and resistance. Going on with my education, even coming back to England, played no part in my decision to join ROTC. I am back here, and would have been at Arkansas Law School because there is nothing else I can do. In fact, I would like to have been able to take a year out perhaps to teach in a small college or work on some community