

decision by the Board of Governors to increase the price of a postage stamp is questionable in lieu of the fact that the Postal Service has made a profit of over \$6 billion in the last four years.

Clearly, we need to exercise the oversight function of Congress more vigorously in the future. I want to congratulate my good friend, Representative JOHN MCHUGH, Chairman of the Government Reform Subcommittee on Postal Service for his diligence in this oversight arena. However, he cannot do the job alone. Congress needs to be more vigilant in ensuring that we exercise our oversight responsibilities. In that regard, I would like to include in the record a column by the President of the United Postal Service, James P. Kelly on the operation of the Postal Service. Reading and taking notice of Mr. Kelly's words is a good start in helping Congress to become more aware of the Postal Service problems.

[From the Washington Times, July 15, 1998]

THE MAIL MONOPOLY

(By James Kelly)

The woman on the other end of the phone sounds frightened and angry. She owns a small Parcel Plus store in Maryland and just found out that the United States Postal Service is opening up shop right around the corner. She's worried that the arrival of the Postal Service will put her own small store out of business and wants to know what she can do about it. She has reason to be scared.

In the past, the opening of a local post office wouldn't raise an eyebrow. But that was before the Postal Service began targeting private-sector companies with predatory pricing on services and products that few businesses can match. The business owner in Maryland knows she can't compete with a government agency that enjoys huge advantages not available to private-sector companies. Her plight is but one example of why the Postal Service needs significant reform.

Most Americans agree that fair competition is necessary for a healthy economy and a strong private sector. At our company, we have embraced competition and believe it makes us a smarter, stronger, more responsive business. But the Postal Service represents something that no competitor should have to face—a government monopoly that is able to use its government-granted advantages to unfairly undermine its private-sector competitors. In this age of government reform and downsizing, the Postal Service is the poster child for needed government reform.

Most Americans don't know that the Postal Service pays no taxes, local, state or federal, pays no vehicle licensing fees, is exempt from OSHA enforcement, can ignore zoning regulations, and is immune from anti-trust accountability. These advantages would not be of much concern if it weren't for the fact that the Postal Service is using them like a weapon in the marketplace to beat out private-sector businesses. That is simply, unequivocally not the role of government.

One particularly egregious example of how the Postal Service is able to use revenue from its monopoly on first-class mail to subsidize products that compete with the private sector is obvious. The Postal Service charges \$26.63 to ship a 10-pound package from San Francisco to London via Global Package Link. But the agency charges \$29.80 to ship that same package Express mail from Washington, D.C. to Baltimore, Maryland.

Common sense tells us that a package shipped across a continent and over the Atlantic Ocean should cost more than a package shipped 35 miles up I-95. But the Postal

Service vice keeps its Global Package Link prices artificially low with revenue from its letter mail monopoly, with which private businesses are prohibited from competing. This pricing disparity is particularly puzzling given that the private-sector charges an average of \$110 to ship a 10-pound expedited package from San Francisco to London.

Now consumers are being asked to pay an additional billion dollars through a penny increase in the price of a stamp. Why is the Postal Service asking for another billion dollars every year when the agency has generated more than a billion dollars in surplus every year for the past three years and is doing so again this year?

If the Postal Service were truly committed to its mandate of providing universal letter mail service, why is it entering into numerous other activities wholly unrelated to this mission? The Postal Service is now processing bill, selling mugs, T-shirts and hats, and is hawking telephone cards. What does this have to do with delivering the mail? Absolutely nothing. In fact, it forces the Postal Service to lose focus on its primary mission.

It is painfully obvious that reform is desperately needed. Congress is working this year to craft fair legislation that would level the playing field for the Postal Service. Any reform bill must require the agency to abide by the same laws as the private sector when competing with private businesses. Postal reform must remove the massive advantages enjoyed by the Postal Service so that real competition can provide consumers with real choice. At the same time, the Postal Rate Commission, the Postal Service's oversight body, must be given real authority to regulate the agency both domestically and internationally.

Congress must act quickly to level the playing field so the Postal Service can focus on delivering mail—not delivering small business owners into the unemployment line.

ROSIE THE RIVETER NATIONAL
PARK SERVICE AFFILIATED SITE
STUDY ACT OF 1998

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the "Rosie the Riveter National Park Service Affiliated Site Study Act of 1998." This legislation authorizes the National Park Service to conduct a feasibility study to determine if the Rosie the Riveter Park located in Richmond, California meets the requirements of being nationally significant to become an NPS Affiliated Site.

Rosie the Riveter Park is located on the Richmond waterfront on the site of Kaiser Shipyards where the Liberty and Victory ships were built during World War II. These ships were built almost entirely by women who took over shipbuilding jobs to replace men who went off to war. Quickly these women became known as "Rosie the Riveter" and "Wendy the Welder" as their numbers grew and their competency as shipbuilders became well known.

These "Rosies" and "Wendys" built some 747 ships which were immediately commissioned into the U.S. Navy and sent to fight in the war. Their individual and collective stories are rich with excitement of being involved in producing the Liberty and Victory ships, as well as the realities of facing numerous new

fears. We must remember that prior to this time, most women did not enter the work force, especially once married with children. With their husbands off to war, they were faced with the responsibility of providing food and shelter for their families alone. Encouraged by the familiar slogan of "We can do it" and the lure of salaries never before offered to women, thousands of women of all ethnicities flocked to the town of Richmond in search of jobs not previously available to them.

Realizing the value of the women workers, many shipyards including Kaiser conducted around the clock day care centers and schools on site so the mothers could work knowing their children were well cared for nearby. Some perceive this as a new concept that is cost prohibitive for business, but it was just the regular order for shipyards during this time.

With the support of the City Council and in particular Councilperson Donna Powers, the City of Richmond in my district has dedicated the Rosie the Riveter Park to honor all the women of the World War II effort. Plans to erect a monument remnant of the Liberty and Victory ship are underway as are collections of oral histories from the women workers.

Mr. Speaker, I was honored to be among so many of the former "Rosies" and "Wendys" at the kickoff for the memorial on October 5, 1996. Many told me of the fears they had working deep in the bowels of a huge ship or dangling over the side in order to do their job. Several stated that when the fear enveloped them, they would think of their loved ones in the war and just keep moving. This feeling of connection with the men fighting on the ships caused the workers to try for perfection with each task.

What little safety and protective equipment existed in the 1940's was made for men and tended not to give the same protection to the women who used them. Numerous women still bear the scars they received during such unprotected work. I learned so much from talking with the women about their experiences and quickly realized that these stories are part of who we are as a nation and must be preserved for generations to come.

Rosie the Riveter Park and the history it represents should be designated an affiliated area to the National Park Service and I'm confident that the study proposed in my legislation will come to the same conclusion. I hope the Congress will move quickly to enact this legislation.

SALUTE TO ROBERT ESTEL ENGLAND AND ALL THE BRAVE MEN WHO SERVED IN THE NAVY ARMED GUARD

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, throughout our nation's history, men and women from all corners of our country have stood tall in her defense. It is the bravery and honor with which these men and women have served that has helped keep America free and strong over the years.

Today, I would like to commend one such individual: Gunners Mate 3rd Class Robert

Estel England of Laurel County, Kentucky. Gunners Mate England served during the Second World War as a member of the U.S. Navy's Armed Guard. His first assignment was aboard the SS *West Cheswald*, which was charged with carrying arms, ammo and food to allied troops in Russia.

During his service, Gunners Mate England fought bravely and honorably. Like so many others who served on ships, in the air, or in the trenches during World War II, Robert England and his fellow servicemen saw battle and fought bravely. Unlike so many of his fellow servicemen, England and the other members of the Navy Armed Guard have never been properly recognized for their outstanding service.

The Armed Guard was created as a branch of the Navy during World War I to protect the merchant ships of the United States. During World War II the Armed Guard was reactivated in response to the German attack and sinking of merchant ships, event those of neutral countries, that appeared to be bringing goods to Allied Nations. The mission of the merchant ships was absolutely critical: they were the lifeline for many allied troops, delivering ammunition, food, weapons, clothing, and other badly-needed supplies.

The men of the Armed Guard who helped protect these ships were heroes in the true sense of the word. They made tremendous sacrifices, and many died in the hands of an unforgiving sea. They endured torpedoes, gunfire, and bombs. They were the target of enemy destroyers, submarines and bombers. They fought off Japanese planes and German U-boats. They fought for freedom and democracy, and they made our nation proud.

Mr. President, for too long the men of the U.S. Navy Armed Guard have not received the recognition they deserve, but, earlier this year the House of Representatives moved to correct this injustice. The Defense Authorization Act for 1999 contains a provision that recognizes the service, honor and bravery of the men who served in the Armed Guard. It expresses the appreciation of the Congress and American people for their service and their sacrifices.

During their service, the men of the Navy Armed Guard served with honor, dignity, and courage. Nearly 145,000 men served in the Armed Guard on 6,236 merchant ships during WW II. Nearly 2,000 of these men made the supreme sacrifice by giving their lives in the defense of their country.

It is time these men—men like Robert England—receive the appreciation of a grateful nation. It is time that these men receive the recognition they deserve.

AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP DAY
GREETINGS

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Guam Organic Act was signed into law by President Harry S. Truman on August 1, 1950. As this law granted citizenship to the people of Guam, August 1 is celebrated on the island as "Citizenship Day." I would like to share with my colleagues my statement for this year's ob-

servance. I have also included a speech presented by a former Guam legislator. Carlos Taitano, was a member of the Guam Congress and the Speaker of the 8th Guam Legislature. For his contribution towards the passage of the Guam Organic Act, he was invited to witness President Truman sign the bill into law.

AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP DAY GREETINGS

(By Robert A. Underwood)

As we commemorate the centennial anniversary of the Spanish-American War, it is most appropriate to reflect on this, the 48th Anniversary of the Organic Act of Guam and the grant of U.S. citizenship. The dawning of the American Era in Guam in 1898 brought with it the promise of the freedoms, rights, duties and responsibilities of American Democracy, and the birth of the Chamorro quest for political justice, equality and self-governance under the American flag. Though couched differently at various times, this has been our unchanging theme for nearly a hundred years.

In 1901, just three years after Guam became an American possession, our grandfathers and great-grandfathers sent a petition to Washington, calling on the Federal government to clarify the political status of Guam and its people. Subsequent efforts were geared toward the acquisition of U.S. citizenship as a means of political rights and protection. The passage of the Organic Act in 1950 satisfied the Guamanian desire of citizenship and civilian governance, but we still have unfinished business in the political status of Guam. Our desire for greater self-government is undaunted, even as we continue the quest. The struggle of the Chamorro people has been long and arduous, the triumphs have been hard-won, but our cause is steadfast and our faith in America remains steadfast.

Today, as we celebrate nearly half a century of U.S. citizenship, enjoying the rights and privileges therein, I humbly restate the undying commitment of the people of Guam for political recognition, equality and greater self-government, in memory of all of Guam's political pioneers who surely must be with us in spirit, happy to know that their efforts were not in vain.

(By Carlos Taitano)

At the end of the past century, The United States almost simultaneously took possession of the Philippines, Guam, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. The full or "plenary" powers of the U.S. Congress were extended to these new possessions. Fifty years later, all these territories, except Guam, had received some attention from the U.S. Congress resulting in some changes from their initial status. Hawaii, for example, was made an incorporated territory and its people were granted U.S. citizenship. Later, it would become a U.S. state.

In the Philippines, the military government which began with the U.S. occupation after the end of the Spanish-American War, was replaced by a civilian government. The Philippines was granted independence in 1946.

In Puerto Rico, the military government that was established after the island was acquired from Spain in 1898, was replaced by a civilian government only two years later. An organic Act for Puerto Rico was enacted by Congress in 1917, including a grant of U.S. citizenship.

The treaty ending the Spanish-American War required the United States to determine the civil and political rights of the Chamorro people. By failing to act on this provision of the treaty, the U.S. Congress allowed autoc-

racy to exist within the American democracy. Two generations of Chamorros lived under a U.S. military government in which a single person, a naval governor, exercised absolute control over all Chamorros on Guam and every aspect of their lives. During the 50 years that Guam was under military government, the Chamorros sent several petitions to Washington for U.S. citizenship. All were denied.

After 50 years living under conditions of inequality and without regard for the rights of the individual . . .

After 50 years of military occupation in which virtual martial law applied . . .

After 50 years of a government policy of discrimination in our own homeland, resulting in the loss of our dignity, self respect, and freedom . . .

After a series of congressional legislation providing opportunities for many people around the world to become U.S. citizens . . . opportunities extended to Chinese, Filipinos, and others . . . but not to Chamorros.

By 1949, we were a restless people. We decided to demand in an aggressive, but peaceful manner, some action from the U.S. Congress hopefully, leading to some fundamental reforms in the way we were governed.

I was a member of the House Assembly of the Guam Congress at that time. This body decided to stage a "walkout" on March 5, 1949 and to stay out of the halls of the Guam Congress until we saw some evidence that some reforms were in the making. This was the first revolt by the Chamorros against an occupying power since the Spanish-Chamorro wars at the end of the seventeenth century.

Unlike most other people under colonial rule, the Chamorros were not seeking independence from the colonial power. On the contrary, they had been petitioning all along for closer association with the United States.

The "walkout" received nation-wide publicity, made possible by two newsmen that I had met three months earlier . . . one from the United Press, the other from the Associated Press. Influential newspapers and individual citizens across the nation were now calling for fundamental reforms in the Governance of Guam.

President Harry S. Truman quickly took over and ordered the transfer from a military government to a civilian government of Guam. The President successfully convinced the leaders of the U.S. Congress that organic legislation for Guam could no longer be ignored.

The Chamorros were finally granted U.S. citizenship. This could have been the only grant by the U.S. Congress and the Chamorros would have been happy and grateful. Citizenship would open many doors leading to economic opportunities. But, most important, the Chamorro was now an American.

The government created by the Guam Organic Act was not exactly self-government for Guam. It was limited Home Rule. The people did not constitute a sovereign power. All political authority was derived from the federal government.

Nevertheless, when one considers the 50 years of political neglect, these gains were substantial. 1950 is the most important year in the history of Guam's Chamorro people over the centuries since they lost their independence to Spain in 1693 at the end of the Spanish-Chamorro wars. Nothing that has happened to them since that time can compare with the dramatic reforms contained in the Guam Organic Act.

Because of the role I played in the "walkout," I was invited to be present at the signing ceremony of the Guam Organic Act at the White House on August 1, 1950. Also present at the signing ceremony were senators and congressmen who guided the Guam