

Instead of going down the road, the US government should focus its energy and resources on preventative measures. When Clinton meets with Putin on June 4, he could pledge to get US/Russian nuclear reductions back on track through steps that include seeking increased funding for the Cooperative Threat Reduction program—which has helped finance the destruction of thousands of Russian nuclear warhead and weapons facilities—and working toward continued reductions in US and Russian nuclear forces under START agreements. Clinton could also pledge to work for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which was defeated last fall by the Senate despite overwhelming public support. Above all, Clinton could assure Russia that the United States has no intention of withdrawing from the ABM treaty. That would put Al Gore in a much stronger position to criticize George W. Bush's misleading proposal to pursue unilateral cuts in US nuclear forces in combination with an ambitious NMD plan that would usher in an era of instability by demolishing what's left of the global nuclear arms control regime.

The newly resurgent peace and arms-control movement, led by organizations like Peace Action, the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Global Network Against Nuclear Weapons and Power in Space, and the Fourth Freedom Forum, is trying to generate a large-enough outcry for "arms reductions, not missile defense" over this summer to beat back missile defense hysteria. But stopping NMD is just one step toward a sane nuclear policy; ultimately only the abolition of all nuclear weapons can provide the safety and security that Reagan and his latter-day disciples have pledged to provide through the false promise of missile defense.

---

#### 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 very important bill to help reduce the 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 LAMPSON

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.

---

#### FLOYD D. SPENCE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

SPEECH OF

### HON. MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4205) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of a strong national defense, but in reluctant opposition to the FY 2001 Department of Defense Appropriations Act (H.R. 4576). A strong defense is not simply a function of how much we spend, but also of how intelligently we spend it. Depending on who's counting, the United States spends as much on defense as the next six or seven highest countries combined. The 281 billion that the United States spent on defense in 1998 was more than all of our NATO allies combined and accounted for more than a third of all world military spending. Yet today, our military faces serious problems in training, recruiting, retention, and readiness.

One reason for this situation is the lack of a coherent national strategy. Our men and women in uniform have been dispatched across the globe in operations that are not in the national interest. This wears out our soldiers and equipment, and leaves the military less prepared to defend real national interests. The common lament I hear is that we are "spreading ourselves too thin". The lion's share of responsibility for this problem lies with the Administration.

But we're spreading ourselves too thin in the defense budget process as well, and responsibility for that falls on Congress. Congress continues to spend critical defense dollars on items that the Pentagon does not want or need.

For example:

1. F-15 aircraft—The Air Force requested no funds for additional F-15 aircraft, but the House passed \$400 million for 5 addition F-15E's. The Air Force has difficulty getting spare parts for the planes it already has. Building more unrequested planes only aggravates that problem.

2. Cold Weather Equipment—Congress added \$24 million for Gore-Tex cold weather gear that the Pentagon did not request, at the request of a Congressman whose constituents manufacture the gear. With the recruiting problems the military has, it has difficulty getting enough soldiers just to fill out the gear it already has.

3. Wolverine Heavy Assault Bridge—The Army requested no funds for the Wolverine heavy assault bridge. In fact, although the