

appropriated from the respective tribes for the Grand Coulee Project, or approximately 39.4 percent of the past and future compensation awarded the Colville Tribes.

Although the Department of the Interior and other federal officials were well aware of the flooding of Indian trust lands and other severe impacts the Grand Coulee Project would have on the fishery and other critical resources of the Spokane and Colville Tribes, no mention was made of these impacts or the need to compensate the Tribes in either the 1933 or 1935 authorizations. Federal interdepartmental and interoffice correspondence from September 1933 through October 1934 demonstrate the government knew the Colville and Spokane Tribes should be compensated for the flooding of their lands, destruction of their fishery and other resources, destruction of their property and annual compensation from power production for the use of the Tribes' land and water resources contributing to power production.

Congress passed legislation in 1940 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate whichever Indian lands he deemed necessary for Grand Coulee construction and to receive all rights, title and interest the Indians has in them in return for his appraisal of its value and payment of compensation by the Secretary. The only land that was appraised and compensated for was the newly flooded lands for which the Spokane Tribe received \$4,700. There is no evidence that the Department advised or that Congress knew that the Tribes' water rights were not extinguished. Nor had the Indian title and trust status of the Tribal land underlying the river beds been extinguished. No compensation was included for the power value contributed by the use of the Tribal resources nor the loss of the Tribal fisheries or other damages to tribal resources.

In a 1976 opinion, Lawrence Aschenbrenner, Acting Associate Solicitor with the Department of the Interior's Division of Indian Affairs, stated, "The 1940 act followed seven years of construction during which farm lands, and timber lands were flooded, and a fishery destroyed, and during which Congress was silent as to the Indian interests affected by the construction. Both the Congress and the Department of the Interior appeared to proceed with the Grand Coulee project as if there were no Indians involved there. . . . It is our conclusion that the location of the dams on tribal land and the use of the water for power production, without compensation, violated the Government's fiduciary duty toward the Tribes."

The Colville settlement legislation of 1994 ratified a settlement agreement reached between the United States and the Colville Tribes to settle the claims of the Tribes to a share of the hydropower revenues from the Grand Coulee Dam. This claim was among the claims which the Colville Tribes filed with the Indian Claims Commission (ICC) under the Act of August 13, 1946. This Act provided for a five year statute of limitations to file claims before the Commission. While the Colville Tribes had been formally organized for over 15 years at this point, the Spokane Tribe did not formally organize until 16 days prior to the ICC statute of limitations deadline. In addition, evidence indicates that while the Bureau of In-

dian Affairs was aware of the potential claims of the Spokane Tribe, it does not appear that the Tribe was ever advised of the potential claim.

Since the mid-1970's, both Congress and Federal agencies have expressed the view that both the Colville and Spokane Tribes should be compensated. The legislation I am introducing today will provide for compensation to the Spokane Tribe. There is ample precedent for such settlement legislation that addresses the meritorious claims of a tribe and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

HONORING AMERICA'S HEROS

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1999

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, early this month I had the privilege of presenting military medals to several of my constituents—a recognition which was long overdue.

Julian Burnside was serving in the U.S. Army's 106th Infantry Division when he was captured by German Nazis during the Battle of the Bulge. He spent 10 days squeezed into a railroad boxcar with other U.S. soldiers. The conditions were so bad that the men had to keep their legs folded and were only fed 4 of the 10 days.

Julian was eventually taken to a prisoner-of-war camp near Dresden, Germany. While there, he was forced to pull bodies from piles of burned human remains and dig holes for their burials. During his captivity he suffered from frozen feet, malnutrition, dysentery and yellow jaundice.

On May 9, 1945, Julian was freed when his German captors surrendered to the Allies. He spent months recovering in a hospital before being discharged in October 1945. While in the hospital, someone told Julian about all of the medals that he was eligible to receive, including the Order of the Purple Heart for Military Merit, commonly called the "Purple Heart." An officer then told him that they were no longer giving the Purple Heart for injuries like his. Julian didn't care. He was just happy to be free.

But heros like Julian Burnside should never be forgotten, and on July 3, 1999, I was honored to present Julian with both the Purple Heart and the POW medal. The Order of the Purple Heart is awarded to members of the Armed Forces of the United States who are wounded by an instrument of war in the hands of the enemy. It is a combat decoration.

The POW medal may be awarded to anyone who "was taken prisoner and held captive while engaged in an action against an enemy of the United States, while engaged in military operations involving conflict with an opposing foreign force, or while serving with friendly forces engaged in an armed conflict against an opposing armed force in which the United States is not a belligerent party."

The front of the circular medal features a golden eagle standing with its wings outspread against a lighter gold background, ringed by barbed wire and bayonet points. Although symbolically imprisoned, the American eagle is

alert to regain freedom, the hope that upholds the prisoner's spirit. On the reverse side of the medal, there is the inscription: "For Honorable Service While A Prisoner of War."

Another American hero who should not be forgotten is Luis Reyes. Luis was also in the U.S. Army Infantry, but he served during the Korean War from August 1950 until August 1951. He was wounded in the Injim River area during the War and suffered a bullet wound in his leg. On July 3, I presented him with the Purple Heart for wounds received in action against an armed enemy.

That day, I was also honored to present the POW/MIA medal to the family of a third Army veteran, Lowell Pirkle. Lowell was killed while working for Air America in Vietnam in 1967. During his lifetime, he received two Purple Hearts, the Vietnam Service Medal and the Good Conduct Medal.

Lowell, who served two tours in Vietnam, was attempting to load wounded Laotian soldiers into a helicopter when the aircraft was hit by a rifle shell and exploded. The pilot and co-pilot escaped. Lowell and a Laotian soldier were not so lucky. His body was not recovered.

Lowell was survived by his wife, Deborah, and two children, Robin and Scott. Lowell's family and the Air America Association pressed the federal government for information about Lowell after discovering he had never been listed among those missing in action.

The crash site was discovered in 1995, and Lowell's remains were identified by the U.S. Army in January 1998. On August 3, 1998—thirty-one years to the day after being shot down—Lowell was laid to rest in Arlington Cemetery.

The POW/MIA medal depicts a bald eagle, which symbolizes all unaccounted for Americans, amidst the bamboo of a Southeast Asian jungle. The eagle retains the American spirit of freedom in its vigilant stance. On the reverse side is a representation of the Vietnam Campaign Medal lying on a table, issued, but not yet claimed by its owner. The words, "You Are Not Forgotten" reflect the sentiment of family, loved ones, and all Americans waiting their return.

Mr. Speaker, Julian, Luis and Lowell all answered the call to duty when their country needed them. They are true American heros.

IN RECOGNITION OF DEDICATED SERVICE BY MR. ROBERT TOBIAS

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1999

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, and colleagues, I rise today to salute a great American, Mr. Robert Tobias, the retiring president of the National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU).

Mr. Tobias' career at NTEU spans thirty busy years including the last sixteen as the union's president. As he led the fight on behalf of federal employees, he became a leading authority on these issues. In doing so he vastly expanded NTEU's influence in the halls of Congress and in the White House.

His accomplishments and memberships are an impressive collection of who's who and where's where. His memberships include President Clinton's National Partnership Council, the Executive Committee of the Internal Revenue Service, the American Arbitration Association board of directors and the Federal Salary Council that advises the President of the United States. He is the co-founder of the Federal Employee Education and Assistance fund and in 1996 was appointed by the President to the Federal Salary Council.

While this is an impressive listing of Mr. Tobias' commitments and involvements, I believe his lasting legacy will be the great contributions he helped achieve on behalf of America's federal employees.

Developing the Federal Employees Retirement System (FERS), restructuring the IRS, protecting the Federal Employee Health Benefits Plan, advocating the closure of the pay gap for federal employees, reforming the Hatch Act, securing the right to initiate mid-term bargaining and to engage in informational picketing are all significant achievements with long lasting effects.

These actions will continue to directly impact America's working people and their families and the people they serve for years and years to come. The impact of these actions cannot be overstated.

Like many of his friends, I will miss Mr. Tobias' visionary leadership, his strong support and his hard work at NTEU. The union, its membership, the vast federal workforce and indeed this Congress are all the better for his stewardship at NTEU.

I thank Robert Tobias for his dedication and his efforts on behalf of America's federal employees and wish him the very best of luck.

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE ACT
OF 1999

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1999

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week the President signed H.R. 4, the National Missile Defense Act of 1999, into law. This measure unequivocally states that it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense system as soon as it is technologically feasible. In signing the bill, the President has at long last acknowledged that the missile threat that he has so long denied, and the need to defend against it.

Mr. Speaker, there was no signing ceremony, no fanfare, not even a press conference announcing this significant action. Unfortunately, there is a reason the President chose to downplay this event. In characteristic style, he is already trying to redefine the meaning of this law. The ink on the bill was not dry when the President released a statement noting that the "legislation makes clear that no decision on deployment has been made. . . . Next year, we will, for the first time, determine whether to deploy a limited national missile defense. . . ." This is Orwellian. The President signs a bill that says that it is our policy to deploy a national missile de-

fense, and in the same breath says that a decision to deploy will be made next year. It would be comical if the stakes were not so high.

I guess we should not be surprised anymore. The President has already successfully redefined the word "is," and once again it provides him with a convenient escape hatch. Perhaps we should have reconsidered the use of that word in our policy statement before submitting it to the President, because he has already made it clear that to him, "is" does not always mean "is." But most people understand that when we say it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense, that the decision to deploy has been made. The question is not whether to deploy, only when. And contrary to the President's interpretation, Congress was clear on this point.

Before the House voted on this measure, both the original bill and the conference report, I called on my colleagues to vote against this bill if they agreed with the President that we should hold off the decision on whether to deploy, and told those who agreed with moving forward with that decision now to vote for it. There was considerable discussion about whether we could deploy a system now. It was repeatedly noted that the bill was not mandating when to deploy, it was simply stating that the decision was being made to do so as soon as it is technologically feasible. Similar debate ensure in the Senate.

This time, the President says that Congress itself has qualified that it "is" the policy to deploy. He argues that the bill language subjecting deployment to the authorizations and appropriations process means that no decision has been made. That argument is a Trojan horse, because all policy decisions are subject to the authorization and appropriations process. He further argues that the bill's language supporting continued reductions in strategic nuclear arms means that the decision must account for arms control and nuclear non-proliferation objectives. Congress said nothing of the sort, and made absolutely no linkage of these objectives.

Mr. Speaker, no amount of tortured linguistics by this President or anyone else can change the legislative record. We were clear that passage of this bill would formalize U.S. policy to deploy a national missile defense system, and it was overwhelmingly adopted in both bodies. It is time for the President to stop rewriting the dictionary, and get down to the business of executing the law and ensuring the security of this nation.

THE RETIREMENT OF DDO JACK
DOWNING

HON. PORTER J. GOSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1999

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to recognize the contributions of Jack Downing, CIA's Deputy Director of Operations, or DDO, to the security and well-being of this Nation. Just this once, on the occasion of Jack's retirement on 31 July, I want to bring this remarkable man, our Nation's "head spy,"

out of the shadows and into the spotlight of this forum.

Barely 2 years ago, Jack was pulled out of an earlier retirement from CIA to take over its directorate of operations, or DO, at a time when the morale, sense of mission, and strength of the DO had been sapped by careerism, corridor politics, and lack of leadership. At that time, I knew only two things about Jack: first, he couldn't be a careerist because he had already retired once. Second, he couldn't be a "corridor cowboy" back in Washington because he had spend almost all of his legendary career in the field where case officers belong. Jack, in fact, was our chief of station on the very front lines of the cold war.

What I did not know at the time, and what now causes me to offer this tribute, is the leadership that Jack would bring to the DO and to its officers. In two short years, Jack has refocused the DO on its core capability: the clandestine collection of intelligence. Under Jack, DO officers have found ways to penetrate terrorist cells, to get inside the cabinet rooms of rogue states, and to detect and disrupt the movement of narcotics. Under Jack, the DO has been put in a position to collect intelligence on whatever threats and challenges come our way in the next century.

Jack's leadership, however, is more than these accomplishments. In the unique, often peculiar, business of espionage, the DDO is more than someone who directs the operations of the DO; for young officers, particularly, the DDO is a role model in the clandestine service. And the DO, in my opinion, has never had a better role model than Jack Downing.

As chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, I visit stations overseas and talk with the young officers who hop fences, slip down alleys, and take real risks to collect the intelligence we need back here in Washington.

Over the past 2 years, the change I have seen in these young officers overseas has been extraordinary. Where there used to be malaise is now a sense of mission. Where there used to be risk aversion is now a feeling of confidence. Perhaps the most telling change under Jack Downing, and most central to the character of this former marine, is that his troops at risk in the field know that he will stand behind them when things go wrong.

I can offer no higher tribute than what Jack's own troops think of him. I commend this man for what he is and what he has done. Our country is and will be a better place because of him.

Godspeed, to Jack Downing, you are "the right stuff" and have served us well.

DISAPPROVING EXTENSION OF
NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT TO PRODUCTS OF PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SPEECH OF

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1999

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of extending normal trade relations status to