History was made by public statements of public figures. Before pollsters, media consultants and ghost writers, great orators like Daniel Webster, Henry Clay and John C. Calhoun mesmerized their audiences in the halls of Congress, thus securing their roles in the nation's history. People rushed to the Capitol, filled the galleries and watched the great debates in person. Of those, Daniel Webster's speech on the Senate floor for a united country, one liberty and one people, is among the most famous in American history. Webster proclaimed that public speech, while it may be manipulated or sculpted, ''[It] must exist in the man, the subject, and in the occasion.''

But are those principles of dialogue maintained in modern times? How public speech is delivered, and reported has changed dramatically over time. Modern reporting is instantaneous and relentless. Papparazzi pursue celebrities with cameras and microphones, while news is beamed continuously to households around the world, around the clock. To cope with modern reporting, media advisors and press secretaries craft skillful, but evasive, replies for their bosses. Throughout the Monica Lewinsky scandal, President Clinton has emerged as a master of evasiveness and media ''spin'' on the political battlefield. Why don't public figures just speak their minds? They may be taking their lessons from what rash public statements have done to others before them.

On the real battlefield, General George S. Patton, Jr. swept the Third Army through Europe and helped secure an allied victory in World War II. Characterized by his gruff personality and hard demeanor, Patton demanded strength and discipline from his men. Inwardly, he studied philosophy and wrote poetry; but outwardly he was ruthless and offensive. He may have carried his troops more than once by determination alone. Never afraid to speak his mind, Patton once was asked by a preacher whether he ever managed to read from the Bible he kept on his nightstand. ''Every—damned day,'' Patton replied.

At times hated and loved by his men, Patton commanded loyal troops who performed the impossible during the war. His fierce determination to pursue and conquer the enemy, coupled with his unapologetic prose was at times glorious and disastrous. He was one of the greatest tactitions and generals the United States has ever seen. General Patton led his armored units with speed and daring, his philosophy: ''Catch the enemy by the nose and then kick him in the pants.'' This philosophy carried the Third Army across more territory and captured more prisoners than any other army in American history.

Patton, as battlefield commander, enjoyed unparalleled success. Patton, as a public figure, suffered greatly. Many times his brash, unapologetic statements, made off the record, ended up as newspaper headlines. His statements about fighting the Russians to free Eastern Europe and using ex-Nazi's during reconstruction were hotly criticized. Those controversial, but matter-lf-fact statements were said quietly, or in private. But they eventually cost one of our guest generals his command of the Third Army.

It is no wonder today's public figures sometimes hesitate to speak their mind. Modern reporting, often geared towards sensationalism, creates that need for evasiveness and spin in public speaking. This dichotomy fuels public cynicism and distrust. But sensationalism sells. So long as it does, public figures will guard their words, and the public long for heroes, like Patton, whom are unafraid to speak their minds.

TRIBUTE TO PROFESSOR SUSAN PFUEHLER

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 18, 1998

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and congratulate Susan Pfuehler on a distinguished career as a Theatre Professor at Eastern Washington University in Cheney, Washington. I have come to know Susan as the mother of one of my staff members, and have had the privilege to learn and hear about her from her son. I know that he is very proud of her.

From Susan's days as a child, growing up on a small turkey farm in rural western Illinois, she displayed a flair for the dramatic. Her reading about a ''runty'' pig earned her local accolades and launched her career in theatre. Susan was one of those rare individuals who knew her calling at a young age and pursued it full tilt. Once she graduated from her local college in Monmouth, Illinois, she headed across the Mississippi River to the University of Iowa for her masters degree. Although she was there a few years before me, we are proud to count her among our alumni.

After a short teaching stint at the University of Arizona, Susan and her husband found themselves in the small town of Cheney where she made her career as a professor and raised her family. Some might say Susan was among the original feminists—those strong and pioneering women who launched successful careers in the early 1950's. While Susan returned to the job a mere ten days after her son was born and her work often kept her in the theatre into the wee hours, she still possessed an amazing ability to find time for her family and include them in the activities at her workplace. As is, unfortunately, all too common today, it was not easy for women to succeed professionally. But Susan had deep resolve and drew strength from her family to have an outstanding career.

From setting up the first ever costume production facility and academic program at, then, Eastern Washington State College, to creating a dynamic costume program at the Interlochen Center for the Arts, to being named among Who's Who in Entertainment for the past two years, Susan has forged ahead heartfelt passion and steadfast determination.

I was once told that Susan's definition of successful teaching was to draw that one quiet kid in the classroom out and inspire them to do great things. I think it's safe to say that Susan has been successful time and time again. Teaching is a noble profession. But perhaps it is those teachers who are indeed humble in their contributions who are truly our national treasures. Susan certainly belongs in that category.

Over nearly 50 years of service to the job she loved—teaching our young people—Susan has inspired thousands of students in thousands of ways. From the classroom podium, Susan found a comfortable forum from which both to teach and to learn. As she looks forward to her next stage, I know that she will dearly miss that platform from which to speak and to listen.

Indeed the educational community has lost a great friend, but if I know Susan, she will be active in retirement and will, hopefully, have a little fun along the way. I wish all the best to you, Susan, on your well-deserved retirement.

EXPRESSING UNEQUIVOCAL SUPPORT FOR MEN AND WOMEN OF OUR ARMED FORCES CURRENTLY CARRYING OUT MISSIONS IN AND AROUND PERSIAN GULF REGION

SPEECH OF

HON. MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 17, 1998

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today very reluctantly to voice opposition to H. Res. 612. If this resolution is truly about honoring our servicemen and women, I would vote differently. However, it is clear to me that voting for this resolution is tantamount to endorsing the President's capriciously-timed, to use a euphemism, invocation of the War Powers Act. That is something my conscience cannot allow.

I have the most profound respect for our nation's military and it is for just this reason that I cannot support this resolution. I have come to this floor on innumerable occasions to provide for my unconditional support of those initiatives which prudently and honestly promote our armed forces. My support of H. Res. 322 in November of last year which urged military action to assure full Iraqi compliance with U.N. Security Council resolutions, for example, delineates my record on the use of military force in the Persian Gulf.

It is the right thing to do at the wrong time. The timing of Wednesday's air strikes on Iraq raised too many red flags for me. I am left with too strong a perception that our men and women of the military are being put in harm's way for political reasons. I say this for several reasons:

Red Flag #1—On several occasions over the past few years, we have walked to the brink of further military engagement with Iraq. In every instance, we have walked away from that brink. Yet on the eve of a historic vote, one that has not occurred for the last 130 years in the House, we choose to cross the line? For thirteen months, the President has watched and dithered, then, after 400 days of inaction, hours before the House vote, the President decides that this is the day to take America to war. The President declared Saddam Hussein a ''clear and present danger''. But, he has been a clear and present danger for 400 days. Now all of a sudden, kowtowing is out and the danger is present.

Red Flag #2—There seems to be discrepancy in the messages that we get out of the White House. Rowan Scarborough's article in The Washington Times pointed out that the White House notified the Joint Chiefs of Staff on Sunday that President Clinton would order air strikes this week. Now that's a full 48 hours before he saw the United Nations report declaring Iraq noncompliant. However, on

Wednesday night and in a number of press briefings since then, Administration officials insist that Mr. Clinton made the decision to strike based on the U.N.'s finding of noncompliance. My question is: which version is it? Did they decide it on Sunday or did they decide on Tuesday? This, at minimum, undermines their argument that they learned about it Tuesday and had to act Wednesday. Excluding the two interim reports and several infringements they knew about it for weeks and days and chose to strike Wednesday.

Red Flag #3—Though I agree with what the President said on Wednesday night, the problem lies in the fact that it is old news. In some ways it's old news over the last year, and it has certainly been reinforced several times over the last several months. Scott Ritter, a former United States Marine Corps officer and Gulf War veteran, resigned his post on the U.N. Inspection Team in August. In September he testified before Congress on the reasoning behind that resignation. In both his testimony and his resignation, Mr. Ritter's reasoning and facts were the same that the President suggested was new information on Wednesday. In fact, since mid-November, the Iraqis have thrown a series of impediments in front of the U.N. inspection teams. As you might remember, the inspections team returned to Iraq on November 17th and within days their efforts were being thwarted on November 25th, November 26th, November 29th, December 4th and December 9th the Iraqis hampered our efforts. The government of Iraq thwarted UN Inspection Teams in a number of different efforts ranging from proposed schedule of work to inspections of a variety of different sites. The White House knew about each of these incidents and in fact, Richard Butler produced two interim reports. Suddenly, this week, the Administration has painted Saddam Hussein as a ''clear and present danger'' when his actions are no different now than they were last year or earlier this year.

Red Flag #4—I am struck with the unconventional use of force. Any of the Pentagon folks that I've been around over the last several years have suggested that the American military typically places overwhelming force at the beginning of engagement to minimize the risks of casualties to Americans. That is certainly not the case in this present conflict with Iraq. In 1991, we had a full six carrier battle group in the Persian Gulf. Today, we have just one. Even on November 15, the date of our last staredown with Saddam, we had 2 carrier battle groups in place in the Persian Gulf. Now, we are told by Secretary Cohen, another carrier battle group is on the way and will be there by the weekend and that more aircraft are on the way. This raises another question: Is our new military strategy to amass a force slowly after the initial moment of engagement?

On this point, not only have we amassed our forces slowly, we have little over 200 planes prepared for this engagement, while we had 2,700 aircraft in the Persian Gulf of 1991. More significantly, we've essentially made no efforts to build support in the region for our undertaking. In the Persian Gulf War, we had 36 allies. In this engagement, only Great Britain has joined us in risking military personnel.

Red Flag #5—This hasty engagement broke previous procedure used prior to the use of force. I spoke with Porter Goss, head of Select Intelligence Committee in the U.S. House of Representative, who learned of this incident the same way I did—on CNN. This is highly unusual policy. Typically in a military engagement or a buildup to a military engagement, he would have been forwarded and briefed.

Red Flag #6—We are not sure of our strategy. Some have suggested that because of the onset of Ramadan, a month of peace in the Muslim world, we will be wrapping up our efforts in a matter of days. If so, this pin prick effort is sure not to do any great damage to Saddam. Using 2,700 aircraft in a 42 day engagement, he stayed in power. Does he have to do little more than hide for a few days if he knows an engagement is going to be curtailed by a religious holiday?

Red Flag #7—With air strikes limited to just a few days, what is the outcome we hope to get? We were told that we want to thwart his ability to produce weapons of mass destruction and yet the very nature of biological or chemical weapons makes them very difficult to detect. If one was charged with hiding gallon-sized milk jugs across the state of Texas, and then someone else 30 days later was charged with bombing those gallon sized milk jugs, my bet is that at the end of the month there would be plenty of well-hidden milk jugs absolutely unharmed. Similarly, we can tear down buildings maybe 4, maybe 40, maybe 400, but if they are not buildings that weaken what the military calls his center of gravity, his access to strength, then it will do little to no good. If we're serious about this we ought to be aiming for his Republican Guard and other pieces of the formula that's keeping him in power. There are no clear efforts to weaken these components of his power.

In summary, as you walk through these red flags, too many of them suggest that the timing of this engagement may have been politically motivated. I think we should make every effort to ensure that even the appearance of that politicization doesn't come back to rest on the shoulders of American troops. We can do better than that and the men and women of our armed services deserve it.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN GLENN POSHARD

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 19, 1998

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the public service of my very good friend, Congressman GLENN POSHARD.

GLENN and I were elected to Congress during the same year, 1988, and worked together as a team to represent the 22nd and 21st Districts of Illinois until those districts changed in 1992. Since then, GLENN has represented the 19th District and I have represented the 12th District, which covers a large amount of territory formerly in GLENN's old congressional seat.

I can tell you that there is no one in Southern Illinois who is held in higher esteem than GLENN POSHARD. During his race for Governor in 1998, GLENN ran a race that made all of his colleagues in the Illinois Delegation proud. However, I can tell you that the constituents in my district who know and love GLENN POSHARD were also very proud of his congressional service and his race for Governor.

GLENN has always been a unique representative. He made the decision early in his congressional career to refuse money from political action committees, a commitment he made as well in his race for Governor. He imposed on himself a term-limit of five terms in Congress, which he fulfills by leaving at the end of this session of Congress. He has carried himself with a quiet dignity, working hard for the people of his district while promoting those policies he thought best for the entire nation.

His sources of inspiration have been those individuals who overcame difficult circumstances to excel in life, including his parents, and notable public figures like Lech Walesa and Nelson Mandela. GLENN was born poor in Southeastern Illinois and rose to achieve a PhD and go on to one of the highest honors an individual can attain in the United States—to serve his fellow men and women in the Congress.

GLENN POSHARD will leave this Congress with a distinguished record: fighting for a balanced federal budget; increasing the pay, working conditions and health care for working men and women; protecting the Constitution and improving the economy of rural America. But he will also leave here with enormous affection and gratitude of his colleagues, and the thanks and devotion of his constituents, who may be seeing the end of his days in the Congress but surely not the end of his public service.

I join my colleagues in saluting the honored service of my good friend, GLENN POSHARD.

CUSTOMER SERVICE

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 19, 1998

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in these times of automated phone responses, impersonal corporations, and indifferent employees, some see customer service as a deduction from the bottom line. However, good customer service is more important now than ever. In private industry, and in government, good service fosters trust and good feelings between constituencies and those who serve them. In a competitive market, those who perform above and beyond what people expect survive and prosper. Government leaders can always learn from good examples in American businesses.

Some of the nation's most successful business leaders have built upon a philosophy of service to their respective constituencies. Herb Kelleher, CEO of Southwest Airlines, was never content to a rest while his employees toiled. He once helped flight attendants serve drinks on a Southwest flight. On Thanksgiving and Christmas, the busiest travel times, it was rumored he worked in baggage service alongside his employees. Imagine the inspiration, working with their CEO, as they sacrificed time with their families to ensure thousands of others could be together on those important holidays. Likewise, wayward travelers at some hotels are not directed, but accompanied by employees to the destination they seek within the hotel. Such kind assistance is likely to lift the spirits of even the weariest of guests.

Sam Walton, founder of Wal-Mart, and recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom,