No matter how many buildings are destroyed, And all the destruction that others can bring, The United States will always rise to the top, All Americans unite, and Let Freedom Ring.

## CONCURRENT RECEIPT PART II—VETERANS

### HON. DARLENE HOOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 23, 2002*

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, most of this body is aware of the so-called concurrent receipt penalty affecting our military retirees with service-connected disabilities. While Congress has undertaken gradual steps to remedy this situation, numerous veterans in my home state of Oregon have contacted me about a situation which I feel is equally unfair.

With the conclusion of the Cold War, the Department of Defense employed numerous separation programs to comply with Congressional mandates and decrease the number of active military personnel. The DoD implemented the Special Separation Benefit (SSB), and the Variable Separation Benefit (VSI) which were both designed to award servicemen and women with immediate compensation in return for early retirement from the Armed Services.

What many of these servicemen and women did not know is that by agreeing to leave active duty and accept the SSB or VSI payment, they were effectively signing away the right to receive future service-connected disability payments from the Veterans Administration. As it currently stands, any service member who accepted the SSB payment and is diagnosed with a service-connected disability must repay their payment in full before he or she can receive disability pay. Likewise, members who receive the VSI payment cannot receive the full disability payment to which they would otherwise be entitled.

I find this practice reprehensible. Many service-related disabilities might not become apparent for several months or years after separation. Consequently, everyone who made use of these programs could not have possibly known the way in which they would be affected by the offset provisions. What's more, many service members made the decision to accept the separation pay only because the alternative would be an eventual, forced retirement.

To remedy this problem, I am introducing bipartisan legislation with my colleagues JIM GIBBONS from Nevada and Richard Baker from Louisiana. Please, join me in helping bring an end to this reprehensible practice.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 23, 2002*

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I was attending to a family emergency and missed the following recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted, Yes on rollcall vote 171, Yes on rollcall vote 172, Yes on rollcall note 173, Yes on rollcall vote 174, Yes on rollcall vote 175, Yes on rollcall vote 176, Yes on rollcall vote 177, Yes on rollcall vote 178, Yes on rollcall vote 179, Yes on rollcall vote 180, Yes on rollcall vote 181, Yes on rollcall vote 182, Yes on rollcall vote 183, Yes on rollcall vote 184, Yes on rollcall vote 185, Yes on rollcall vote 186, Yes on rollcall vote 187, Yes on rollcall vote 188, Yes on rollcall vote 189, Yes on rollcall vote 190, Yes on rollcall vote 191, No on rollcall vote 192, Yes on rollcall 193, Yes on rollcall 194, No on rollcall 195, No on rollcall 196.

## BOB STUMP NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003

SPEECH OF

### HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 9, 2002*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4546) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2003 for military activities of the Department of Defense, and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes;

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to continue with my statement against H.R. 4546, the fiscal year 2003 Department of Defense authorization act. In my prior comments, I detailed how some quality-of-life improvements for active duty and retired military personnel that I strongly supported were overshadowed by unnecessary spending on weapons systems like the Crusader artillery system and the Comanche helicopter.

Unfortunately, as I mentioned in two previous statements about H.R. 4546, the House Rules Committee blocked any amendments to reform or eliminate unnecessary weapons systems from being considered. Today, I want to talk about another weapons system of dubious value, the F–22 Raptor fighter jet, that was fully funded in H.R. 4546. There is no threat that justifies the pursuit of this fighter jet program. Particularly when the Pentagon is simultaneously pursuing two other new fighter jet programs, the Joint Strike Fighter and the F–18E/F.

I offered two amendments on the F–22 that came directly out of the recommendations in a March 2002 GAO report. My first amendment would have reduced the number of low rate initial production aircraft from 23 to 13. My second amendment placed two conditions on the program: requiring a reassessment of the costs, and requiring the Air Force to monitor key manufacturing processes of the private contractors. Neither of these amendments was allowed to be debated by this House. In addition to the GAO, a variety of independent analysts have raised concerns about the F–22. Even the House of Representatives has gone on record expressing concerns. In the House report for the fiscal year 2000 Department of Defense appropriations bill, the Armed Services Committee highlighted a number of concerns about the program including various technical problems, the inability to control rising costs, and the questionable need for the aircraft. The House report even mentioned suitable alternatives to the F–22.

The problems highlighted in the House report have only gotten worse. Unfortunately, Congress seems content to bury its collective head in the sand and move forward with procuring F–22s that are too expensive, don't work, and are unnecessary. A March 2002 GAO report identified a number of ongoing problems with the F–22. In summary, GAO found ''The F–22 did not meet key schedule goals for 2001, the cost to complete planned development is likely to exceed the $21 billion reported to Congress, and the program is not far enough along in flight testing to confirm Air Force estimates of the aircraft's performance.''

The problems identified by GAO include:

Rising cost concerns: In the FY02 DOD authorization bill, Congress removed the development cost cap. Current estimates are the development costs will be $21 billion. However, that cost is likely to rise because flight testing delays may lead to an extension of the development program, and Lockheed Martin's costs, which are borne by taxpayers, have increased. Over the last two fiscal years, Lockheed's costs have exceeded budgets by $218 million. In addition, restructuring the test schedule increased costs by $557 million.

Delays in testing: The Air Force realigned the testing schedule in June 2001 because development test aircraft are taking longer to assemble than anticipated, available test aircraft are not achieving the number of test objectives per flight hour that are specified in the plan, and completion of the test schedule is highly dependent on a single test aircraft rather than the three as originally planned. The Air Force has a goal of ten test points per hour, but the program is only accomplishing seven per hour, 30 percent less than planned. GAO notes, ''avionics testing with development test aircraft has been limited.'' Only around 22 percent of planned avionics test points have been completed. GAO computations show that development flight testing necessary for the planned start of operational testing might not be completed until March 2004, 11 months later than planned.

However, the Air Force now plans to overlap development flight testing with operational flight testing. But, GAO wams ''there is an increased risk involved in the concurrency, and there is still a high risk of not completing an adequate amount of development flight testing before operational testing is scheduled to begin.''

The Air Force has also decided to dumb down the testing. GAO notes, ''the Air Force eliminated and consolidated some test points (specific test objectives conducted during flight testing) and deferred other test points . . . as a result, the combined total flight test points remaining have been reduced by approximately 4,708 points, or 31 percent.''

A recent review by the Air Force Operational Test and Evaluation Center concluded there was insufficient testing completed to assess nine of the ten key performance parameters. GAO projects that airframe flight testing will have to continue until February 2008 to accomplish all the remaining 8,199 test points with one aircraft, which is almost four years beyond the current schedule. GAO concludes that the Air Force's cheerleading about the success of the test program is largely overblown. GAO wrote, ''the Air Force's estimates are based on limited flight test data, computer models, ground tests, and analyses. Flight test progress has been slower than expected, thus

delaying the confirmation that the F-22 will deliver requirement performance.''

I am also concerned about quality control problems in the F–22 program. According to the GAO, ''The Air Force has estimated that the F–22 should at this point in development be able to complete 1.55 flying hours between maintenance actions . . . However, development aircraft have been completing only .60 flying hours between maintenance.''

GAO also identified problems with the compound that helps make the F–22 stealthy. GAO noted that even the new formula has been prone to cracking and swelling. The Air Force is also investigating a problem with the aircraft's vertical tails that could impact performance. GAO wams: ''Buying production articles before they can be adequately tested can result in buying systems that require significant, and sometimes costly modifications to achieve satisfactory performance; accepting less capable systems than planned; and deploying substandard systems to combat forces.''

Finally, I am concerned about inadequate oversight of private contractors. In November 2000, when the F–22 program office ceased collecting information on the percentage of key processes in control, the contractor had only 44 percent of its manufacturing processes in control. GAO expressed concem about this lack of oversight. ''During our current review, the F–22 program officials told us that neither they nor the prime contractors track the status of manufacturing processes in control because of the cost involved in tracking these processes. They rely on subcontractors to manage their own manufacturing processes. Hence, the program office may be committing to increased production quantities without knowing the percentage of key manufacturing processes that are in control. Continuing to increase the F–22 aircraft production quantities in low rate production before 100 percent of the key manufacturing processes are under control increases the risk that manufacturing and assembly problems evident with the development test aircraft will carry over into the production program.''

In a strongly worded conclusion, GAO wrote, ''The cost involved in correcting manufacturing and assembly problems would most likely exceed ,he cost of tracking and manufacturing processes.'' My amendments would have addressed the concerns of the GAO and protected taxpayers. Unfortunately, as I mentioned before, the Rules Committee refused to allow a real debate and blocked my amendments from floor consideration.

## PAUL WILBUR KLIPSCH: AN INNOVATOR AND AN INSPIRATION

### HON. MIKE ROSS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 23, 2002*

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an extraordinary Arkansan, a great inventor, engineer, and scientist, who left his mark not only on my district, but on our nation's history as well. His name was Paul Wilbur Klipsch.

Paul Klipsch was well known for many things, but was best known for his contributions in revolutionizing the world of audio. From a very young age, he became fascinated with acoustics and radio, and even built his own radio receiver a year before the first public radio broadcast. That fascination would follow him the rest of his life.

His career began in 1926 after graduating from New Mexico State University with a degree in Electrical Engineering, when he was employed by General Electric to work with radio. He went on to earn his Master's Degree in Electrical Engineering at Stanford University, continuing research in audio frequency and efficiency.

After serving in World War II, Paul decided to dedicate his life to building loudspeakers, determined to achieve accurate sound reproduction. From his home in Hope, Arkansas, he spent years researching and conducting experiments, and much of his work was patented. In his lifetime, Klipsch was granted three patents in ballistics, eight in geophysics, and twelve in acoustics. His Heritage Line of speakers are known worldwide for their quality and accuracy that set industry standards. In fact, I enjoy using them in my own home

Paul Klipsch received numerous awards during his lifetime. He has had buildings, lecture halls, and auditoriums named in his honor. Perhaps his most distinguished honor came in 1997, when he was inducted and enshrined in the Engineering and Science Hall of Fame joining members like Thomas Edison, Jonas Salk, and the Wright Brothers. He was recognized as a visionary for improving the quality of life for all humanity.

The same can be said for both his professional and personal life. An avid philanthropist, Klipsch spent his 98 years on this Earth trying to better the lives of his neighbors. He always gave credit to Divine Guidance, and invoked it frequently. He has been described as raw, eccentric, straightforward, controversial, fascinating, whimsical, and extraordinary.

My heart goes out to Paul's wife of nearly 26 years, Valerie, their son, Raymond, and their two grandchildren as they deal with this difficult loss, and I am keeping all of them in my thoughts and prayers. While he may no longer be with us, his life and legacy will be remembered for generations to come.

## ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

### HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 23, 2002*

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with Mr. WU, Chairman of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, and other members of the caucus to observe Asian Pacific American Heritage Month. I commend Mr. Wu for his leadership of the Caucus.

The theme this year is ''Unity in Freedom.'' In the wake of the September 11 terrorist attack, our nation has gained a new sense of unity and a new appreciation for our freedoms. Immigrants and ethnic groups are a vibrant and vital part of who we are as a country, and we must use these challenging times to learn about, and to draw strength from, each other.

Asian Pacific Heritage Month provides us with the opportunity to recognize the important contributions of Asian Pacific Americans. In the San Francisco Bay Area, we have three exciting projects underway that will help educate all Americans on the experiences of immigrants from Asia and the Pacific region.

In the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in San Francisco, plans are underway to establish two important links to our past: the Pacific Coast Immigration Museum and the Building 640 Interpretive Center. I am seeking funding this year to advance these two projects.

The immigration museum will serve as a western counterpart or ''bookend'' to the famous Ellis Island Immigration Museum. It will celebrate the unique experience of Americans who came to the West Coast from Asia, the Pacific Islands, Latin America and other regions. It will be the only museum to present the history of all immigrants who settled on the West Coast. The Pacific Coast Museum will also provide active linkages to other historical sites and institutions throughout the region.

Building 640 at the Presidio was the site of the original all-Nisei language school of the Military Intelligence Service of World War II, the forerunner of the famous Defense Language Institute in Monterey. While their families were living in internment camps, Japanese Americans were trained in Building 640 to assist the U.S. military with translation and battlefield interrogation. The interpretive center will be dedicated to the Military Intelligence Service and to the exploration of the Japanese American experience.

An important related project is the effort underway to preserve the Angel Island Immigration Station in San Francisco Bay. Congresswoman WOOLSEY is leading the drive to obtain federal funding for Angel Island.

Between 1910 and 1940, hundreds of thousand of immigrants from around the world entered the United States through Angel Island. The immigration station is best known for the experience of Chinese immigrants from 1882 to 1943, when the Chinese Exclusion Act prohibited many Chinese from coming to the U.S. and denied citizenship to foreign-born Chinese. Many Chinese were interned at Angel Island for up to two years.

Together, these three projects offer a way to tell stories of great resonance to current and future generations. The contributions of people of different origins to our common heritage and our military security have never been more relevant.

I am pleased to have this opportunity today to honor all of the contributions of Americans of Asian and Pacific Islander heritage.

## ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

### HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 23, 2002*

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Asian Pacific American Heritage Month. It is my pleasure to acknowledge the tremendous achievements and contributions that the Asian Pacific American community has made to our society. Asian Pacific American (APA) Heritage Month provides us with an opportunity to reflect upon the diversity that makes our nation so strong, and the particular accomplishments of the APA community.