

(6) Boris Korczak should be compensated for his service to the United States and for the enormous personal risk he and his family incurred over an extended period of time.

SEC. 2. PAYMENT.

The Director of the Central Intelligence Agency shall pay out of funds available to the Director the sum of \$225,000 to Mr. Boris Korczak of 10392 Willa Mae Court, Fairfax, Virginia.

SEC. 3. LIMITATION.

No amount exceeding 10 percent of the payment made under section 2 may be paid to or received by any attorney or agent for services rendered in connection with the payment. Any person who violates this section shall be guilty of an infraction and shall be subject to a fine in the amount provided under title 18, United States Code.

A SALUTE TO ADMIRAL MARSHA
EVANS

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1998

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Rear Admiral Marsha J. Evans, a remarkable woman who served for the past two years as Superintendent of the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California before her recent retirement from the U.S. Navy.

Admiral Evans has accumulated a long and distinguished military career. In addition to her position as Superintendent, Admiral Evans' leadership experience includes command of the Naval Station at Treasure Island, Commander of Navy Recruiting Command, interim director of the Marshall European Center for Security Studies, Executive Officer at Recruit Training Command, and Commanding Officer at the Naval Technical Training Center. She has also served at the Defense Intelligence Agency, the office of the Chief of Naval Operations, and the office of the Commander in Chief of U.S. Naval Forces Europe. Her extensive government experience includes serving as executive secretary and special assistant for the Secretary of the Treasury under President Carter, and serving as Deputy Director of President Reagan's Commission on White House Fellowships.

Admiral Evans was not only a pioneer for women in the military, but a strong advocate for the needs and concerns of women serving in the defense of their country. In addition to being selected for promotion to the rank of Admiral, she was also the first female surface assignments officer in the Bureau of Naval Personnel, as well as the first woman to assume command of a naval station. She was also active in gender-related issues, having served as Executive Director of the Standing Committee on Military and Civilian Women in the Navy, chairing the Women Midshipmen Study Group in the 1980's, and serving on the 1987 Navy's Women's Study.

In September 1995, the Naval Postgraduate School was fortunate to have Admiral Evans appointed as Superintendent, and she did not disappoint. Under her leadership, the school further strengthened and developed its academic mission. It began exploring important new fields, such as how to prevent and contain the use of weapons of mass destruction,

and expanded such programs as its successful international officer exchange programs at the Center for Civil-Military Relations.

Most recently, under Admiral Evans' direction the Naval Postgraduate School hosted a military-wide conference on Professional Military Education, which successfully brought together leading military and civilian educators and policy-makers from around the country to discuss how best to educate our soldiers to fight the conflicts of the future.

Admiral Evans is a remarkable leader and pioneer, and I am sorry to see her depart as Superintendent of the Naval Postgraduate School. The Navy is losing a fine officer and outstanding individual, and her presence will be greatly missed. I wish her the best in her new endeavors, and urge other young, aspiring women and men in the military to look to Admiral Evans' great service as a model for success and leadership.

GOOD SCHOOLS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1998

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, December 10, 1997, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT MAKES A GOOD SCHOOL?

There are few more important questions facing a society than how to best educate its young people. Imparting knowledge from one generation to the next, conveying the historical, scientific, cultural, and moral ideals to those that follow, this process of teaching and educating is critical to the strength and stability of any civil society. It has been our schools that have largely shouldered this awesome responsibility. Good schools are building blocks for a good society.

What then makes a good school? Hoosiers have consistently made it clear that a quality educational system is a high priority. They understand how important schools are to their children and their communities. In meeting with constituents over the years, I have been impressed to see that many parents agree on some basic attributes of a good school.

Good schools must have good teachers. No other factor can make as much difference in the making of a good school as the influence of good teachers. The classroom is the front line of our educational mission and it is where ultimately we can gauge if children will or will not receive a quality education. Many parents agree that good schools begin in the classroom. Good teachers motivate, inspire, open new doors for students, and play a key role in the learning process. The quality of instruction goes a long way in determining the quality of an education. Good schools develop good teachers by strong efforts to raise the quality of teaching and respect for the profession of teaching. They can also help by providing opportunities for teachers to continue their education, and by providing teachers with small classes and the opportunity to plan.

A good school has a high level of parental and community involvement. Good teachers alone do not make a good school. The involvement of the family and community is also a necessary ingredient in any enriching educational program. In the many schools I have visited in the Ninth District, two attributes the best schools shared were the ac-

tive role of parents in the educational process and the strong hands-on involvement of community leaders.

When learning is reinforced at home and when parents take an active interest in their child's education, then schools can truly flourish. Family and community support is important in bringing energy and new ideas to the school system. Local support helps to hold schools accountable for the quality education of their students.

The local school is the traditional focal point of many Hoosier communities. It is of course, the place where our children are educated, but it also is a place where we can gather as a community to watch basketball games and attend school plays and other student activities. The strong bond that American families have with their local schools goes a long way in determining the success of their public school systems and their communities as a whole.

A good school has adequate resources. Even though a good school is more than just bricks and mortar, these physical resources certainly help. The availability of adequate funding, current textbooks, and a building with plenty of space and no leaky roofs contributes to an effective learning environment. Nowadays, this emphasis on resources means access to computers, to the Internet, and general technological know-how. Children today must grow up with a mouse in their hand. In such a technological and information-driven economy, having these resources in the school can mean the difference between adequately preparing or not preparing tomorrow's competitive workforce. Good schools also must have the resources to provide challenging after-school activities that engage the interests of both students and staff and improve upon classroom learning.

A good school is a safe school. Parents often emphasize the importance of a safe and orderly environment in schools. Students must be comfortable and not feel threatened or feel they are in a hostile environment. There has been increased concern across the country about drugs and weapons in schools. Concern about gangs, fighting, and other disciplinary problems is common among most parents. Parents recognize that providing a safe and orderly environment is conducive to learning.

A good school sets high standards. Excellence in education will not be achieved without high standards. These standards should not be mandated from above, but rather self-imposed by state and local schools that expect the best from their programs. Rigorous standards challenge students to reach their potential. Such standards help in attaining high levels of scholastic achievement. If the school doesn't expect the best from its students, then the students won't expect the best from themselves. I agree with many parents who believe that the schools and students should be held accountable for doing their best.

We should have clear expectations that students learn the essential basics of math, science, English, and social studies. Learning these basic skills will help kids in school, in the future workplace, and in life. I also like schools which spend time promoting ethics and core values such as compassion, honesty, and respect for others.

Conclusion. Not a single one of these factors alone can determine if a school is ultimately good or not. All of these factors are interrelated. For example, good teachers without parental involvement, or good teachers in an unsafe school can lead to frustrating, and many times unsuccessful, results.

I share the high priority Hoosiers give to education. I support local leaders in their efforts to improve the quality of education. I believe that state and local governments

ought to take the lead and take primary responsibility in our local schools. The federal role in local education is limited to providing resources to educate disadvantaged students, and this limited role should be maintained.

By encouraging good teachers, applauding a high level of parental involvement, and providing a safe learning environment while upholding rigorous standards, local communities play the most important role in providing quality education. The future of our schools, our nation, and our society is all the better for it.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID DeFORE

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1998

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to David DeFore, who has served as the President of the Encino Chamber of Commerce for the past two years.

President Kennedy once said, "Leadership and learning are indispensable to each other." While David has acted as a role model and source of inspiration for the members of our community, he has continued to learn and grow in his own life through the pursuit of education.

A testament to his strength of character and the respect he has earned from his colleagues is illustrated through the amount of speaking engagements to which David has been invited. He has spoken on issues such as self-responsibility, goal setting, and the importance of always being a student of your profession.

David has exemplified these principles through his daily activities and his efforts within the community. He has served as the President of the Valley Cultural Center, is on the Board of Directors of the Valley Community Clinic and has served two years on the North Hollywood Project Area Committee. In addition, David has recently been appointed by Mayor Riordan to serve on the Greek Theater Advisory Committee.

His warm personality and caring nature have enabled him to be a respected leader in the business community as well. He is among the top producing commercial sales professionals in the San Fernando Valley. David also continues to take classes at UCLA Extension in a variety of areas.

Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, please join me in honoring David DeFore. He is a role model for the citizens of our community.

"A WELCOME ENTRANT INTO AN IMPORTANT DEBATE"

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1998

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, during our recess I was delighted to have a chance to address a forum sponsored by the Committee of Concerned Journalists at the Columbia School of Journalism in December. This committee, chaired by one of our most distinguished journalists, Bill Kovach, deals

with the critical subject of the responsibility of people in the journalism profession. I attended as one who both believes passionately in the importance of a free and vigorous press for our democracy, and is disappointed in the work product of that journalism much of the time. Because it is wholly inappropriate for government at any level and in any form to try to dictate to journalists, even for the best of reasons and under the best of motives, it is essential if we are to see the improvements that I think necessary in this area that we have this sort of self-scrutiny by distinguished journalists.

It is for this reason that I welcome and congratulate the journalists who have convened this committee and the work they are doing. Because I believe this deserves the full attention of everyone concerned about the state of our democracy, I ask that their organizing statement be printed here, along with the list of those who serve as the leadership of the committee. As of the end of October more than 400 journalists had signed on as members, and while that list is—happily—too long to be printed here, I would be glad to share it with any who are interested.

COMMITTEE OF CONCERNED JOURNALISTS—AN OVERVIEW

The Committee of Concerned Journalists is an unusual collaboration of reporters, editors, producers, publishers, owners and academics worried about the future of their profession.

The group believes this is a critical moment in American journalism. Revolutionary changes in technology, in economic equations, in our relationship with the public, threaten the core principles that define journalism's role in democratic society.

With splintering audiences and information overload, companies at once diversifying and merging, confronted by unimaginable complexity, we have begun to doubt ourselves and the meaning of our profession.

To secure journalism's future, the group believes that journalists from all media, geography, rank and generation must be clear about what sets journalism apart from other endeavors. There is a price for our press freedoms: We have a professional obligation to broker honestly the information that citizens must have to fulfill their duties in a self-governing society. It is well enough to entertain and amuse, but we must also provide democracy's grist and glue.

The group is proposing to seek a clear expression of those purposes and those core principles that unite journalists and define journalism. We have issued a statement of concern, articulating why a national effort at self-examination is necessary. That statement is circulating in newsrooms across the country, gaining signatories. The plan is to convene public meetings for all types of journalists and the public. The group will listen carefully for common ground and then prepare a written report on what we have learned. It will not be a report of recommendations or a code of conduct. Like the seminal Hutchins Commission Report "A Free and Responsible Press" 50 years ago, the report will attempt to clarify the common ground journalists share.

The series, which begins in November in Chicago and ends in Boston next June, will examine key questions of principle. What is journalism? Who is a journalist? Can journalism really be neutral? What are the responsibilities imposed by the First Amendment? More than half a dozen major educational institutions have already agreed to sponsor them.

This is only a beginning. A web site will serve as a host for discussions about forum

topics, current news stories and other journalistic issues. We believe other projects will evolve.

The effort was convened by the Nieman Foundation and the Project for Excellence in Journalism in June 1997 in Boston. The Committee is an extraordinary group. Members come from various media, backgrounds, ages and institutions, from David Halberstam, the New York author, to Mark Trahan, a Navajo Indian newspaper editor from Idaho; from Lucy Himstedt Riley, a news director in Montgomery, Ala., to Vanessa Williams of the Washington Post and the President of the National Association of Black Journalists, to the heads of several journalism schools.

The group has no set agenda. It is not interested in placing owners at odds with reporters, journalism with business, print with TV or the internet. It is simply a united belief that journalism is a unique form of communication. It is a mission, a service. We must communicate what that means.

A STATEMENT OF CONCERN

This is a critical moment for journalism in America. While the craft in many respects has never been better—consider the supply of information or the skill of reporters—there is a paradox to our communications age. Revolutionary changes in technology, in our economic structure and in our relationship with the public, are pulling journalism from its traditional moorings.

As audiences fragment and our companies diversify, there is a growing debate within news organizations about our responsibilities as businesses and our responsibilities as journalists. Many journalists feel a sense of lost purpose. There is even doubt about the meaning of news, doubt evident when serious journalistic organizations drift toward opinion, infotainment and sensation out of balance with news.

Journalists share responsibility for the uncertainty. Our values and professional standards are often vaguely expressed and inconsistently honored. We have been slow to change habits in the presentation of news that may have lost their relevance. Change is necessary.

Yet as we change we assert some core principles of journalism are enduring. They are those that make journalism a public service central to self-government. They define our profession not as the act of communicating but as a set of responsibilities. Journalism can entertain, amuse and lift our spirits, but news organizations also must cover the matters vital to the well being of their increasingly diverse communities to foster the debate upon which democracy depends. The First Amendment implies obligation as well as freedom.

For much of our history, we believed we could let our work enunciate these principles and our owners and managers articulate these responsibilities. Today, too often, the principles in our work are hard to discern or lost in the din, and our leaders feel constrained.

Now we believe journalists must speak for themselves. We call on our colleagues to join as a community of professionals to clarify the purpose and principles that distinguish our profession from other forms of communication.

Since the change we face is fundamental, it requires a response of the same magnitude. We need a focused examination of the demands on journalism of the 21st Century.

We propose to summon journalists to a period of national reflection. First, we ask our colleagues young and old to sign this declaration of concern. We believe the consortium of journalists who share a commitment to common principles is so broad and so significant that it will constitute a powerful movement toward renewal.