

and public affairs from Princeton University and a law degree from George Washington University. He is also a graduate of the Army Command and General Staff College and the National War College. He is a member of the Pennsylvania and Washington, D.C. Bars and he is also a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

General Christman's major command assignments include serving as the nineteenth United States Representative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Military Committee, Brussels, Belgium (1993-94); Commanding General, United States Army Engineer Center and Fort Leonard Wood, and Commandant, United States Army Engineer School, Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri (1991-93); Commander of the Savannah District, United States Army Corps of Engineers in Savannah, Georgia (1984-86); Commander of the 54 Engineer Battalion in Wildflecken, Germany (1980-82); Company Commander in the 326th Engineer Battalion, Hue, Vietnam (1969-70); and Company Commander, 2nd Engineer Battalion, Changpo-Ri, Korea (1966).

His major staff assignments involved service as a Staff Officer in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C. (1976-78) and as a Staff Assistant with the National Security Council, The White House (1975-76). In both of these assignments, General Christman was responsible for advising the Army Chief of Staff and senior staff on the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT). Further, he was called upon to testify before the House Select Committee on Intelligence regarding Soviet compliance with earlier arms control agreements.

General Christman served for 21 months as Assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General John M. Shalikashvili (1994-96). In this capacity, he supported Secretary of State Warren Christopher as a member of the Middle East Peace Negotiating Team and in arms control negotiations with the Russian Federation. Additionally, General Christman served for a year and a half as Army adviser to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral William J. Crowe, and then as Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States for National Security Affairs.

General Christman also served as Director of Strategy, Plans and Policy in the Department of the Army Headquarters, Washington, D.C. His duties in this assignment focused on negotiations relating to the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) arms control talks between the NATO and the Warsaw Pact. In the course of supporting these negotiations on behalf of the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Christman briefed former President Bush and traveled to Europe to brief allied heads of state and the NATO Secretary General. He has also been called upon to testify before the Congress on CFE initiatives, as well as on other topics relating to our NATO commitments and Army force structure.

On June 24, 1996, Lieutenant General Daniel W. Christman arrived for duty as the 55th Superintendent of the United States Military Academy at West Point. In this capacity, he was charged with educating, training, and inspiring the Corps of Cadets, so that each

graduate is a commissioned leader of character committed to the values of duty, honor, and Country; professional growth throughout a career as an officer in the United States Army; and a lifetime of selfless service to our Nation.

Among his military decorations are the Defense Distinguished Service Medal (two awards), Distinguished Service Medal (two awards), Defense Superior Service Medal, Legion of Merit (two awards), Bronze Star Medal (two awards), Meritorious Service Medal (two awards), and the Air Medal (three awards).

Mr. Speaker, Dan Christman has come to epitomize those qualities that we as a Nation have come to expect from our Army—absolutely impeccable integrity and character, as well as professionalism. He has served our Country with distinction for the past 36 years, and he has demonstrated a dedication to duty that is in keeping with the highest standards and proud traditions of the Armed Forces of our Nation. As he moves into new endeavors, I call upon my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to wish him and his lovely wife, Susan, much continued success.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF'S AWARD FOR INSTALLATION EXCELLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as the elected representative of North Carolina's Third Congressional District, I have the privilege of representing several fine military bases. As such, I am honored to represent the men and women in uniform at these installations who give their all to make the United States military the greatest fighting force in the world.

They carry out their duties daily knowing that at any moment they might be asked to put their lives on the line to defend our freedoms.

While I feel this same dedication to all of the military personnel in my district and around the world, I am here today to pay special tribute to two of the bases in my district, Seymour Johnson Air Force Base and Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune.

On March 23, the Pentagon announced the winners of the Commander in Chief's Award for Installation Excellence. Camp Lejeune was named best of the Marine Corps and Seymour Johnson was honored as being the best of all military bases across the services.

Each year, U.S. military installations around the world compete within their branch of service for this award. Five awards are given out to the best of the best of all of the bases. It is quite a distinction. The criterion for qualifying is daunting. So I cannot truly express the pride that I felt to learn that two of the five best bases in the world are in the Third District of North Carolina.

These awards are a tribute to commitment to excellence of the men and women who serve at these bases. They

are also tributes to the fine leadership at each installations: General Norman Seip at Seymour Johnson Air Force Base and General Ron Richard at Camp Lejeune.

I commend all of them for not just the dedication that it takes to win these pivotal awards but to their great service to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this Friday the five bases that received the Commander in Chief's Award for Installation Excellence will be honored during a ceremony at the Pentagon.

□ 1615

While schedule conflicts will unfortunately prevent me from attending the ceremony, I wanted the men and women who serve at Seymour Johnson Air Force Base and the Marine Corps' Camp Lejeune to know I am truly humbled and honored to be their representative in the United States Congress.

So I offer my most heartfelt congratulations to Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune and the people of Jacksonville, North Carolina, and to Seymour Johnson Air Force Base and the people of Goldsboro, North Carolina, on being recognized for what we in North Carolina have known all along, that they are indeed the best in the world.

ECONOMIC DISASTER IN KLAMATH BASIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of an economic disaster in the Klamath Basin of Oregon that demands the attention of Congress and this country.

The good people of this Basin were lured there by a promise made by the Federal Government nearly a century ago: "Come settle the West, and we will provide you with land and water; produce food for our Nation, secure our western expansion, and we will reward you."

Moreover, the government gave first priority to the men and women who fought for our Nation's freedom in World War I and World War II. Yes, our veterans who risked life and limb were rewarded, indeed enticed, to help the government reclaim the land and feed the country.

In 1905, the newly created Bureau of Reclamation started construction of the Klamath Reclamation Project on the land surrounding Upper and Lower Klamath Lakes in Oregon. It is on the Oregon-California border. The project, using dams, canals and ditches, brought water to the arid land.

Three years later, President Theodore Roosevelt designated our country's first national wildlife refuge in

the Klamath Basin. Roosevelt understood and supported the need for irrigated agriculture and the inter-relationship the project had with the refuge.

For years, farming and wildlife coexisted beneficially. Water from the project fed into the refuge, and farmers grew crops that in part were available for the birds. A resurgence of bald eagles occurred.

Today, of all this is threatened; the quality of the refuge, the livelihood of the farmers. Why? Because over time the government has passed new laws that reallocate the water in more ways than there is water. And on April 6, the Bureau of Reclamation announced for the first time in this country's history, there would be no water for farmers. None. Zip. Zilch. Nada. The headgates would remain closed. The canals would remain dry. The farmers were on their own.

Suckers, that is right, sucker fish, in Upper Klamath Lake now had to be saved at all costs. Higher lake levels were set. Meanwhile, other biologists said more water must flow down the Klamath River to help threatened salmon runs. More water in the lake. More water in the river. But no water for farmers.

The Endangered Species Act is supposed to have a reasonable and prudent test, so I ask you, is it reasonable and prudent to bankrupt nearly 2,000 farm families? Is it reasonable and prudent to bring economic disaster to an entire basin? Is it a reasonable and prudent operations plan for the project to not operate the project? Monday, a Federal Court basically said yes.

Well, I could not disagree more, and these new requirements are anything but reasonable and prudent for the farming families and the communities in the Klamath Basin.

So today we are facing a disaster, and today we must decide as a Nation if we are going to pass laws for the "benefit" of the whole country; then, if those laws bring about the demise of a few, the whole Nation needs to compensate the few for their loss.

So I am proceeding with aggressive efforts to get disaster relief to the farmers and others in the Basin who are living this hardship every day. I am also working closely with the Bush administration to step up efforts to add to the water storage in the Basin, so that fish and farmers will have adequate supplies in the years ahead.

If the government is going to allocate more water than it has, then it darn well better figure out how to keep its commitment by adding to the storage.

I commend the gentleman from Utah (Chairman HANSEN) for appointing a bipartisan task force to look into the Endangered Species Act and how it is affecting people and communities. Today I have asked him to use the situation

in the Klamath Basin specifically as a perfect example of the problem we face.

Too often in the past, the Federal Government has set the standards and then gotten in the way of our ability to achieve them. Today, I met with Federal officials and urged them to let Oregonians have more say in how we meet Federal laws. What we need most right now is for the Federal Government to work with us, not against us; to stand up for balance, not disaster.

This administration has tried in vain to find a way to provide water to farmers this year, but they were boxed in by the unworkable requirements of the Endangered Species Act. They have inherited a mess, but at least they are working with us to bring a change.

From the dust bowl and disaster that will result this summer perhaps will rise the change that is so needed and so overdue. We should never have ended up in this place.

Perhaps the recognition will come that people and communities must be part of any successful effort to improve our environment and not simply double-crossed and run off the land.

PROTECTING ROADLESS AREAS IMPORTANT TO COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well today to alert the House to a decision that the administration will make this Friday, May 4, extremely important to the future of our forests in this Nation, because this Friday, this administration will either come to the aid, to the preservation of our roadless areas and our Forest Service land, or it will take a dive and refuse, in fact, to defend the law of the United States that is designed to protect these roadless areas in a lawsuit in Idaho. I am here to urge this administration to follow the law, to follow the will of the American people to protect these last remaining roadless areas in our forest lands.

Let me tell you why I feel strongly about that. A couple months ago the President came to this Chamber and gave a speech that was well received. One of the things he said, he quoted Yogi Berra, which I liked, he quoted Yogi Berra in the famous quote, "When you come to a fork in the road, take it." But unfortunately, recently this President has taken the fork and he stuck it in every environmental policy that has come before him on his plate.

May 4, this Friday, is an opportunity for this President to change that pattern of failure for our environment by, in fact, defending the roadless area policy that needs defending in a lawsuit in Idaho.

Let me tell you why, clearly, the administration ought to take these steps.

Number one, the American people want it. In one of the most exhaustive processes in adopting the roadless area policy, we have come to a very clear consensus that in fact the American people want this roadless policy. They want their wilderness areas protected. They want their old growth protected from the incursions of roads for clear-cutting, for oil drilling, for mining.

How do I know that? I know that because the Forest Service conducted over 600 meetings over the last couple of years in every corner of this country. In my State of Washington they had scores of meetings, in towns like Morton and Okanogan, not just Seattle, but little areas, 600 meetings, where over 1.6 million Americans told their Federal Government what they thought about the roadless policy.

The results were amazing. In Washington State there were tens of thousands of people who contacted their government. You know what they told their Federal Government? Ninety-six percent of the people who responded in the State of Washington told their Federal Government to protect these roadless areas. As a consequence, the last administration issued a rule that did exactly that, that followed 96 percent of the people in the State of Washington, who responded to this issue, to protect these roadless areas.

So it seems to me, when 96 percent of the people tell their Federal Government what they want, the Federal Government ought to respond, ought to listen to those wishes. But, unfortunately, following a long series of listening to the special interests, we are very concerned that the Bush administration will in fact take a dive in this lawsuit of folks who are seeking to overturn this rule.

The reason I say that is a recent Washington Post article that revealed that the administration had asked the Attorney General for ways to get out from underneath this rule, to in fact take a dive. We had testimony in my Committee on Resources a couple of weeks ago where a Department of Agriculture official revealed, in fact, they had been asked about how to do exactly that in this rule. That would be wrong. What would be right would be to listen to the will of the American people and let this roadless policy stand.

I will tell you why Americans feel so strongly about it. It is my second point here today. This roadless area policy is required to respond to certain American values of taking care of your natural world, to preserve it for your heritage and your kids and grandkids and great-grandkids.

In fact, what we found the testimony in these 600 meetings revealed is, people do not want to see their salmon habitats destroyed by clear-cutting, because what we found in the State of Washington is, when you do this clear-