company newsletter, Lockheed Martin Today, that it produces the rockets used to propel both the mock warhead and the “kill vehicle” involved in NMD “hit to kill” tests. This is certainly on a grand scale. Lockheed Martin and the BMDO are thinking of stacking the deck on the next intercept test to insure a successful result.

Of the four largest NMD contractors (the others are Boeing, Raytheon and TRW), Lockheed Martin has the most to gain. If US/Russian arms-reduction talks are stymied by US stubbornness on NMD, Lockheed Martin will be able to sustain its key nuclear weapons programs. And if NMD deployment moves forward, Lockheed Martin will receive billions in additional funding for production of nuclear targets and subcomponents of the national missile defense system.

Given what’s at stake, the companies have decided to leave nothing to chance. Since Republicans took control of both houses of Congress in January 1995, weapons industry PAC’s have given twice as much to Republican Congressional candidates as they have to Democrats, a far higher margin than prevailed when the Democrats ruled Capitol Hill, when they received 55 percent of defense industry PAC funds, compared with 45 percent for Republicans. Hard-line Star Wars Warriors have gotten the bulk of this industry largesse. A World Policy Institute analysis of two recent pro-Star Wars letters to President Clinton from twenty-five senators organized by Jesse Helms stating that they would kill any arms-control deal with the Russians that attempted to put any limits on the scope of future NMD deployments, the other thirty-one Republican senators pushing the Center for Security Policy’s pet project, a sea-based missile defense system—reveals that the signatories of these pro-Star Wars missives have received a total of nearly $2 million in PAC contributions from missile defense contractors in this election cycle.

Lockheed Martin has not neglected the presidential candidates. On the Republican side Lockheed Martin vice president Bruce Jackson, who served as chairman of the US Committee to Expand NATO, was overheard by one of an industry group having last year bragging about how the industry’s troubles will be over if George W. Bush is elected, since Jackson would be personally absorbed by the immense defense plank of the Republican platform. And Loral CEO Bernard Schwartz, who has longstanding ties to Lockheed Martin dating from when Lockheed purchased Loral’s defense unit in 1986, was the top individual donor of soft money to the Democratic Party in the 1996 presidential cycle; Loral employees gave $601,000 to Democratic Party committees. Schwartz has nearly doubled that amount in the run-up to the November 2000 elections, with $1.1 million in soft-money contributions to Democratic committees to date. He was briefly out last year when he was accused of lobbying the Clinton Administration to ease the standards for the export of satellite technology to China.

NMD AND BEYOND

The continued pursuit of NMD will have far-reaching consequences for the future of arms control and goal of nuclear abolition. It will mean a false sense of security for Americans and an increased threat of nuclear war for the world.

Instead of going down the road, the US government should focus its energy and resources on preventative measures. When Clinton met with Putin on June 4, he could have pledged to get US/Russian nuclear reductions back on track through steps that include

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ERNEST J. ISTOOK, JR. OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, due to a family medical emergency, I was unable to vote on H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act of 2000. Had I been in Washington, I would have voted yes. I regret that I was not able to vote on this vote, an important bill to help our defense system, as it is an enormous tax burden on the American public.

I was also unable to vote on the amendment to remove the prohibition on the Occupational Safety and Health Administration’s (OSHA) proposed ergonomics regulations. I would have voted to keep the prohibition.

TRIBUTE ON THE CELEBRATION OF JUNETEENTH

HON. NICK LAMPSO OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 19th, thousands of African Americans in Galveston, Texas, the birthplace of Juneteenth, and around the Nation will celebrate this holiday of freedom and justice.

Juneteenth, as this holiday is known, is a celebration of emancipation from slavery. On June 19, 1865, 30 months after President Lincoln had signed the Emancipation Proclamation, General Gordon Granger, who had been placed in command of the Federal occupation troops, arrived at Galveston Bay. He issued General Order No. 3—Emancipation. This was the birth of Juneteenth in Texas. Juneteenth celebrations were held informally for 115 years.

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge Texas State Representative Al Edwards. In 1978, Mr. Edwards envisioned that blacks could have a formal celebration of emancipation from slavery. During his first year as a legislator he wrote and lobbied to get passed into law the bill making June 19th a legal State holiday. Overcoming numerous setbacks, Representative Edwards pushed the bill through successful votes of the Texas House of Representatives and Senate within the last 24 hours of Texas’ 66th Legislative Session. At a memorable and historical ceremony on the grounds of the Texas State Capitol in Austin, hundreds of supporters witnessed the bill’s signing into law by Governor William P. Clements on June 13, 1979. As a result of Representative Edwards’ efforts, Texans now witness the “New Celebration of Juneteenth,” an official State holiday.

Mr. Speaker, freedom is a cherished word to all humanity, particularly to those in bondage. I challenge all of us to take this opportunity while we celebrate our rich history of freedom to rededicate ourselves to equal opportunity for all Americans, because that is at the heart of Juneteenth and the American ideal.

ROBERT P. CASEY: LIBERAL

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the June 5, 2000 Washington Post contained an excellent column by Mark Shields concerning Robert P. Casey, entitled “A Conservative in Name Only.”

The column points out the progressive nature of Bob Casey’s reign as Governor of Pennsylvania from 1987–1995. During this time, Shields writes, Governor Casey enacted a Children’s Health Insurance Program which mandated early intervention and coverage for every child until age 5, rebuilt the state water supply system, chose more women cabinet members than any other Governor at the time, appointed the nation’s first African American woman to a state Supreme Court, and brought family and parental leave to the state.

So with this record, why is he considered a conservative? Because he happened to be strongly anti-abortion in a party that is strongly pro-choice. Thankfully, our party has come a long way since those days in terms of tolerance for other views on this and other issues, and therefore it should no longer be the case that one issue should entirely overwhelm a public official’s lifetime public record.

Robert P. Casey was an effective public servant and improved the lives of thousands of families in his state. He is survived by his wife and children, and many, many of us who will think of him fondly, and with great respect for what he stood for.