

laboratory and through hands-on experimentation teaches students that learning can be both interesting and fun.

Mrs. Ray is also a teacher that enjoys her job. In her acceptance speech, she said, "My family encouraged me at the end of last year to think about retiring. Perhaps they were optimistic for better meals, or for ironed shirts. I'm not a very good cook and I sure don't want to iron. I'm still having a great time in the classroom." Her enthusiasm is contagious, so contagious that she was nominated not by her principal, or a group of her peers, but by the parent of a former student. She has also benefited from the school system in which she serves. A product of Kentucky public education, she graduated from Bryan Station High School in Lexington, and went on to receive a Bachelor's Degree from Eastern Kentucky University, followed by a Master's Degree from the University of Kentucky.

As the students and faculty of Lafayette High School celebrate Charlotte Ray's award, I would like to commend her on this achievement, and encourage all of us to look to her as an example of one of education's brightest stars.

BRIGADIER GENERAL JOHN P. GEIS: 30 YEARS OF HONOR, DUTY AND SERVICE

### HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, September 21, 1999*

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Brigadier General John P. Geis, who is retiring after 30 years of honorable service in the United States Army. On October 6, 1999, General Geis will be stepping down after one year as commander of the Army Armament Research, Development and Engineering Center (ARDEC) at Picatinny Arsenal in New Jersey.

General Geis was born in Jonesboro, Arkansas on January 31, 1947, and later attended Arkansas State University. He completed the Reserve Officers Training Corps program there, and graduated as a Second Lieutenant in 1969 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration. He went on to earn a Master of Arts degree in Logistics Management from Central Michigan University, and received additional training through a number of advanced military courses, including the Army War College.

General Geis developed his expertise in weapons systems as a result of his extensive involvement with the Army's research and development programs. Prior to his service as commander of TACOM-ARDEC, General Geis served as Commanding General of U.S. Army Simulation, Training and Instrumentation Command (Florida); Executive Office to the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition); Project Manager, Advanced Field Artillery System/Future Armored Resupply Vehicle; Project Manager, Future Armored Resupply Vehicle; Director for Program Integration, ASA (RDA); Chief, Logistics Plans and Operations, Combined Field Army, Korea; Commander, 27th Main Support Battalion, 1st

Cavalry Division; Logistics Staff Officer, ODCSLOG, HQDA; and Chief, Weapons Systems Assessments, HQ Army Material Command.

While serving as Picatinny Arsenal's commanding officer, General Geis has exercised calm and caring leadership to help move the base ahead in a time of downsizing, realignment and change. During General Geis' tenure at Picatinny, TACOM-ARDEC has received numerous awards for its work on the Army's weapons of the future, including the Crusader Self-Propelled Howitzer, the Lightweight 155 Towed Howitzer, the Objective Individual Combat Weapon (OICW), and the Precision Guided Mortar Munition (PGMM).

Under General Geis' command, the awards bestowed upon Picatinny include the Army Communities of Excellence, Chief of Staff of Army Award; the New Jersey Quality Achievement Award; the U.S. Army R&D Organization of the Year; and the U.S. Army R&D Excellence Award. These awards acknowledge what I have long known, that the men and women working at Picatinny Arsenal are the recognized experts in munitions technology.

Mr. Speaker, I again commend General Geis for his 30 years of service to his country. I wish him and his wife Lee all the best in the years to come as they embark on their new life in Virginia.

UNFETTERED LEGISLATIVE DEBATE MUST TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER A WITCH HUNT FOR GAYS IN THE MILITARY—LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT INITIATED BY CONGRESSMAN BARNEY FRANK AND TOM CAMPBELL

### HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, September 21, 1999*

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strongest support for the efforts of our distinguished colleagues and my friends, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman BARNEY FRANK, and the gentleman from California, Congressman TOM CAMPBELL, for their principled commitment to the sanctity of unfettered legislative debate. These two colleagues—one a Democrat and the other a Republican—acted quickly and responsibly by sending a letter to the President in the matter of Arizona State Representative Stephen May, who is facing possible discharge from the Army Reserves because he discussed his sexual orientation within a relevant context during an official debate in the Arizona House of Representatives.

Like my colleagues, I find it absolutely intolerable that a duly elected States legislator should be punished by the military for appropriate comments which he made during the course of an official debate in the Arizona State Legislature. Taking action against a State representative for what he said in debate as elected legislator is a violation of the spirit of the "speech and debate clause" of the United States Constitution. The overwhelming majority of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, have strongly defended the democratic

privilege of American legislators to speak freely, without having to fear that they will be prosecuted for comments they choose to make during official, public debate.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman FRANK and Congressman CAMPBELL have written an eloquent defense of the principle of legislative debate to the President of the United States. I thank them both for their leadership on this issue, and I ask that the full text of their excellent letter be placed in the RECORD. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join in signing this excellent letter to the President.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

*Washington, DC*

Hon. WILLIAM J. CLINTON,  
*President, The White House*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to urge you to honor the tradition of full and unfettered legislative debate in America by instructing the Defense Department to drop charges against State Representative Stephen May of Arizona.

As you know, Representative May now faces potential discharge from the military because in his capacity as a member of the Arizona Legislature, during formal debate on legislative matters, he alluded to his sexual orientation in a context in which such an allusion was fully relevant.

The signers of this letter have varying views on the merits of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy regarding the military. But we do not write this letter as a commentary on that policy. Rather, we are writing because we as elected representatives believe strongly in that principle embodied in the "speech and debate clause" of the American Constitution which seeks to extend full protection to members of legislative bodies from any sanction for comments they legitimately make in the course of legislative debate.

We recognize, of course, that the speech and debate clause does not technically apply to members of State Legislatures. If it did, presumably this letter would be unnecessary. But we do believe in the policy embodied in that clause—namely that only when elected legislators are confident of their ability to speak out freely without any fear of external sanction from outside the legislative body can the process of representative government flourish.

As a student of Constitutional history, you know that this clause made its way into the United States Constitution in reaction to the harassment of members of the British Parliament that occurred in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries. There was then a tradition of members of the House of Commons in particular suffering penalties for speaking freely in the course of legislative debate. Thus, the speech and debate clause as it is known says "and for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place."

The purpose of this is so that members of legislative bodies in fulfillment of their duty fully to represent their constituents need not fear that members of the Executive, or Judicial branches will penalize them for comments of which they disapprove. What is being proposed regarding Representative May is for the federal Executive Branch to punish an elected member of the Arizona State Legislature because of comments he chose to make that were fully relevant to a public policy debate in the legislature to which he was duly elected. We find it difficult to believe that you, as a believer in the importance of full legislative debate, would